

FIFTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS
ON STATE COLLECTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF
911 AND ENHANCED 911 FEES AND CHARGES
FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 2022 TO DECEMBER 31, 2022

Submitted Pursuant to
Public Law No. 110-283

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Jessica Rosenworcel, Chairwoman

December 29, 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Heading	Paragraph #
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. KEY FINDINGS	2
III. BACKGROUND.....	3
IV. DISCUSSION	8
A. Summary of Reporting Methodology	9
B. Overview of State 911 Systems	11
C. Description of Authority Enabling Establishment of 911/E911 Funding Mechanism	16
D. Description of State Authority That Determines How 911/E911 Fees Are Spent.....	18
E. Description of Uses of Collected 911/E911 Fees	20
F. Description of 911/E911 Fees Collected	23
G. Diversion or Transfer of 911/E911 Fees for Other Uses	29
1. Diversion Analysis	35
a. States/Jurisdictions Self-Identifying as Diverting/Transferring Funds.....	35
b. States/Jurisdictions Identified by the Bureau as Diverting/Transferring Funds.	36
2. Public Safety Radio Expenditures.....	44
3. Multi-Purpose Fees.....	47
H. Oversight and Auditing of 911/E911 Fees.....	50
I. Description of Next Generation 911 Services and Expenditures.....	52
J. Cybersecurity Expenditures.....	56
K. Measuring Effective Utilization of 911/E911 Fees.....	58
L. Underfunding of 911.....	60
Appendix A–Summary of State and Other Jurisdiction Responses Regarding Collections During 2022 Annual Period	
Appendix B1–Overview of Total State and Other Jurisdiction 911 Fees – 2009 to 2016 Reports	
Appendix B2–Overview of Total State and Other Jurisdiction 911 Fees – 2017 to 2023 Reports	
Appendix C–State and Other Jurisdiction 911/E911 Fees by Service Type	
Appendix D–Information Collection Questionnaire	

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Chairwoman, 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 fifteenth 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

¹ See 47 U.S.C. § 155(a) (stating, *inter alia*, that “[i]t shall be [the Chair’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 CFR § 0.191(k) (providing delegated authority to the Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau to develop responses to legislative inquiries).

period January 1, 2022 to December 31, 2022.⁴ This report also reflects the tenth annual collection of data elements relating to the number of 911 call centers and telecommunicators, 911 call volumes, 911 expenditure categories, implementation of Next Generation 911 (NG911), and cybersecurity for 911 systems. This year's report is the second to include data collection specifically related to underfunding of 911 and its impact.

II. KEY FINDINGS

2. Forty-nine states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the United States Virgin Islands responded to this year's data request. The following is a compilation of key findings based on the responses:

- In calendar year 2022, states and other reporting jurisdictions collected 911/E911 fees or charges totaling \$3,850,866,702.58.
- Twenty-six states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported collecting 911/E911 fees at the state level, two states reported collecting fees at the local level, and twenty states collected fees at both the state and local level.
- The Bureau identified three states (Nevada,⁵ New Jersey, and New York) as diverting or transferring 911/E911 fees for purposes other than 911/E911 in 2022.
 - Nevada, New Jersey, and New York used a portion of their 911/E911 funds to support non-911 related public safety programs.
 - New Jersey and New York used a portion of their 911/E911 funds for either non-public safety or unspecified uses.
 - The total amount of 911/E911 funds diverted by all reporting jurisdictions in calendar year 2022 was \$205,401,927.93, or approximately 5.33% of all 911/E911 fees collected.
- For the second year, the report includes a question on the impact of underfunding on 911 services. Many responding states and jurisdictions reported that underfunding results in degradation of 911 service and staffing challenges for Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs), and that underfunding contributes to delays in 911 system maintenance, equipment replacement, and deployment of new technology such as NG911.
- Forty-four states, the District of Columbia, Guam, and Puerto Rico reported expenditures on NG911 programs in calendar year 2022. The total amount of reported NG911 expenditures in 2022 was \$512,168,670.94.
- Thirty-seven states and jurisdictions reported having Emergency Services IP Networks (ESInets) operating in 2022. Of that total: (1) twenty-five states and jurisdictions reported having statewide ESInets; (2) fourteen reported having regional ESInets within the state; and (3) eleven reported local-level ESInets. Twelve states reported having more than one type of ESInet operating in 2022.
- Forty-seven states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico collectively reported that 3,423 PSAPs were text-to-911 capable as of the end of 2022.⁶ Guam and the U.S. Virgin Islands anticipate providing new text-to-911 capability in 2023.

⁴ The period January 1, 2022 to December 31, 2022 is hereinafter referred to as calendar year 2022.

⁵ As noted in Section IV.G.1.a below, while Nevada did not divert 911 fees at the state level, at least two local Nevada jurisdictions diverted 911 fees in 2022.

- While almost every state collects 911 fees from in-state subscribers, seven states, the District of Columbia, and Guam 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.⁷ Of the 42 jurisdictions that have such audit authority, 11 states and Puerto Rico conducted audits in 2022.
- On the topic of cybersecurity preparedness, 27 states and the District of Columbia stated that they had made expenditures on 911-related cybersecurity programs for PSAPs in 2022. Twenty-one states, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands indicated that they spent no funds in 2022 on 911-related cybersecurity programs.

III. BACKGROUND

3. *NET 911 Act.* Section 101 of the NET 911 Act added section 6(f)(2) to 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1, which required the Commission to report annually on the collection and distribution of fees in each state for the support or implementation of 911 or E911 services, including findings on the amount of revenues obligated or expended by each state “for any purpose other than the purpose for which any such fees or charges are specified.”⁸ Pursuant to this provision, the Commission has reported annually to Congress since 2009 on the status of the collection and distribution of 911 fees and charges in each state and other jurisdiction.⁹

4. *Section 902, Consolidated Appropriations Act.* On December 27, 2020, Congress enacted the Don’t Break Up the T-Band Act of 2020, as part of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021.¹⁰ Section 902 of the legislation required the Commission to take new steps to help address the diversion of 911 fees and charges by states and other jurisdictions for purposes unrelated to 911.¹¹ In particular, section 902 directed the Commission to adopt rules “designating purposes and functions for which the obligation or expenditure of 9-1-1 fees or charges, by any State or taxing jurisdiction authorized to impose such a fee or charge, is acceptable.”¹² Section 902 also amended 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(2) to replace the statutory language “any purpose other than the purpose for which any such fees or charges are specified” with “any purpose or function other than the purposes and functions designated in the final rules issued . . . as purposes and functions for which the obligation or expenditure of any such fees or charges is acceptable.”¹³ In addition, section 902 added a new paragraph (4) to section 615a-1(f), requiring a state or taxing jurisdiction receiving a grant under section 158 of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. § 942) after December

(Continued from previous page) _____

⁶ As of the November 3, 2023 edition, the Commission’s PSAP Text-to-911 Readiness and Certification Registry lists 3,026 text-capable PSAPs. See <https://www.fcc.gov/general/psap-text-911-readiness-and-certification-form> (web page last updated Dec. 4, 2023).

⁷ American Samoa also reports that it lacks authority to audit service providers; the Bureau does not include it in this count of jurisdictions without audit authority because American Samoa reports that it has not established a funding mechanism. American Samoa Response at 5-6, 15.

⁸ NET 911 Act at § 6(f)(2); 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(2) (prior version in effect until December 27, 2020).

⁹ These annual reports can be viewed at <https://www.fcc.gov/general/911-fee-reports>.

¹⁰ Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021, Pub. L. No. 116-260, Division FF, Title IX, Section 902, Don’t Break Up the T-Band Act of 2020 (section 902).

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² Section 902(c)(1)(C) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(3)(A) (as amended)).

¹³ Section 902(c)(1)(B) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(2) (as amended)).

27, 2020 to provide, as a condition of receiving such a grant, the information requested by the Commission to prepare its annual fee report.¹⁴

5. *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order.* On June 25, 2021, consistent with the section 902 statutory directive, the Commission released a Report and Order adopting rules that define which expenditures of 911 fees or charges by states and jurisdictions constitute fee diversion for purposes of section 902 and the Commission’s rules.¹⁵ The rules adopted in the *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order* went into effect on October 18, 2021.¹⁶ Under the new rules, acceptable expenditures of 911 fees or charges for purposes of section 902 and the Commission’s rules are limited to (1) “[s]upport and implementation of 911 services provided by or in the State or taxing jurisdiction imposing the fee or charge,” and (2) “[o]perational expenses of public safety answering points within such State or taxing jurisdiction.”¹⁷ The rules include illustrative, non-exhaustive examples of acceptable and unacceptable uses of 911 fees or charges at the state and local level.¹⁸ The rules also provide an elective safe harbor for states and taxing jurisdictions that designate multi-purpose fees or charges for “public safety,” “emergency services,” or other similar purposes where a portion of those fees or charges supports 911 services.¹⁹ Additionally, the Commission adopted a process by which a state or taxing jurisdiction may petition for a determination that an obligation or expenditure of 911 fees or charges for a purpose or function other than the purposes or functions designated as acceptable in the Commission’s rules should be treated as acceptable.²⁰

6. *911 Strike Force Report and Recommendations.* Section 902 also required the Commission to establish the “Ending 9-1-1 Fee Diversion Now Strike Force” (911 Strike Force) to study “how the Federal Government can most expeditiously end diversion” by states and taxing jurisdictions of 911 fees or charges.²¹ As required by section 902, the 911 Strike Force studied three topics: (i) “the effectiveness of any Federal laws, including regulations, policies, and practices, or budgetary or jurisdictional constraints regarding how the Federal Government can most expeditiously end diversion by

¹⁴ Section 902(c)(1)(C) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(4) (as amended)).

¹⁵ *911 Fee Diversion; New and Emerging Technologies 911 Improvement Act of 2008*, PS Docket Nos. 20-291 and 09-14, Report and Order, 36 FCC Rcd 10804 (2021) (*911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*), corrected by Erratum - 911 Fee Diversion; New and Emerging Technologies 911 Improvement Act of 2008 (PSHSB Aug. 12, 2021). The rules adopted in the *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order* may be found at 47 CFR § 9.21 *et seq.* The Commission received two petitions for reconsideration of the *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*, one from the Boulder Regional Emergency Telephone Service Authority (BRETSA), and the other from the City of Aurora 911 Authority and 15 other Colorado emergency telephone service entities. BRETSA Petition for Reconsideration, PS Docket Nos. 20-291 and 09-14 (filed Sept. 16, 2021), <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/10916823228843/1> (BRETSA Petition); City of Aurora 911 Authority et al. Notice of Final Rules Petition for Reconsideration, PS Docket Nos. 20-291 and 09-14 (filed Sept. 15, 2021), <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/10915145788739/1> (City of Aurora 911 Authority et al. Petition). At the time of this report, these petitions are under consideration by the Commission. *Petitions for Reconsideration of Action in Proceeding*, PS Docket Nos. 20-291 and 09-14, Public Notice, Report No. 3184 (CGB Dec. 15, 2021), <https://www.fcc.gov/document/petitions-reconsideration-action-proceeding-20>.

¹⁶ *Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau Announces the Effective Date of Rules Adopted Pursuant to the 911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*, Public Notice, 36 FCC Rcd 12629 (PSHSB 2021) (*Effective Date of 911 Fee Diversion Rules Public Notice*).

¹⁷ 47 CFR § 9.23(a)(1)-(2).

¹⁸ 47 CFR § 9.23(b)(1)-(5), (c)(1)-(3).

¹⁹ 47 CFR § 9.23(d).

²⁰ 47 CFR § 9.24(a).

²¹ Section 902(d)(3)(A) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1 Statutory Notes (as amended)).

a State or taxing jurisdiction of 9-1-1 fees or charges”; (ii) “whether criminal penalties would further prevent diversion by a State or taxing jurisdiction of 9-1-1 fees or charges”; and (iii) “the impacts of diversion by a State or taxing jurisdiction of 9-1-1 fees or charges.”²² The Commission also referred several additional issues to the 911 Strike Force for further study in its *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*, including seeking recommendations on the “precise dividing line” between acceptable and unacceptable expenditures of 911 fees or charges on public safety radios, and developing additional specific examples of the allowable use of 911 fees for public safety radio systems.²³ The 911 Strike Force submitted its report with recommendations and findings on these topics to Congress on September 23, 2021.²⁴

7. *Information Request and Responses.* In April 2023, 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 2022.²⁵ The Bureau received responsive information from 49 states, American Samoa,²⁶ the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.²⁷ The Bureau did not receive responses from Idaho and the Northern Mariana Islands.

²² Section 902(d)(3)(B)(i)-(iii) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1 Statutory Notes (as amended)).

²³ See, e.g., *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*, 36 FCC Rcd at 10825, 10827, 10829, paras. 45, 50, 55 (referring to the 911 Strike Force for further guidance the issue of applying the standard for acceptable 911 expenditures to public safety radio equipment).

²⁴ Ending 9-1-1 Fee Diversion Now Strike Force, Report and Recommendations (2021), <https://www.fcc.gov/file/21893/download> (*911 Strike Force Report and Recommendations*). See also Section 902(d)(3) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1 Statutory Notes (as amended)) (requiring the 911 Strike Force to submit its report not later than 270 days after the enactment of section 902). September 23, 2021 was 270 days after the enactment date of section 902.

²⁵ See Appendix D – Annual Collection of Information Related to the Collection and Use of 911 and E911 Fees by States and Other Jurisdictions (FCC Questionnaire). The 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 GAO, “Most States Used 911 Funds for Intended Purposes, but FCC Could Improve Its Reporting on States’ Use of Funds,” GAO-13-376 (Apr. 18, 2013), <https://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-13-376>. GAO prepared this report pursuant to a directive in the Next Generation 9-1-1 Advancement Act of 2012. See Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012, Pub. L. No. 112-96, 126 Stat. 156, 242 (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, as last year, the Bureau did not include the BIA regional offices in this year’s data collection. However, the annual FCC Questionnaire includes a request to states and jurisdictions for data relating to Indian Tribes. See FCC Questionnaire at C1 (“Has your State, or any political subdivision, Indian Tribe, village or regional corporation therein . . . established a funding mechanism designated for or imposed for the purposes of 911 or E911 support or implementation . . .”).

²⁶ In its response filing, American Samoa reported that it does not collect any 911 fees on phone service and instead funds 911 service 100% out of its General Fund. American Samoa Response at 5-6, 8-11. Throughout this report, the Bureau tallied American Samoa’s questionnaire responses, but with a notation that American Samoa has not established a funding mechanism.

²⁷ Copies of reports from all responding jurisdictions are available on the FCC website at <https://www.fcc.gov/fifteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

IV. DISCUSSION

8. This report describes how states and other entities collected 911/E911 funds in calendar year 2022, how much they collected, and how they oversaw the expenditure of these funds.²⁸ The report describes the extent to which states diverted or transferred collected 911/E911 fees to funds or programs other than those that support or implement 911/E911 services or cover operational expenses of PSAPs. The report also examines the collection and expenditure of funds on NG911 and cybersecurity programs, and the impact of any underfunding on 911 services.

A. Summary of Reporting Methodology

9. Section 6(f)(1) of the NET 911 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.”²⁹ 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.”³⁰

10. For this year’s report to Congress, the Bureau’s information collection questionnaire asked each state or jurisdiction to confirm whether, in calendar year 2022, it spent 911/E911 funds solely for purposes and functions designated as acceptable under the Commission’s rule at 47 CFR § 9.23.³¹ Although some state statutes expressly authorize the diversion or transfer of collected 911/E911 fees, the Bureau reviews the reported expenditures to determine whether such diversions or transfers are limited to “[s]upport and implementation of 911 services provided by or in the State or taxing jurisdiction imposing the fee or charge” and “[o]perational expenses of public safety answering points within such State or taxing jurisdiction.”³² The report on 911/E911 fee diversion in Section G below provides additional detail regarding this year’s fee diversion analysis.

B. Overview of State 911 Systems

11. 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 voice calls and 911 texts the state or jurisdiction received, and an estimate of the total cost to provide 911/E911 service.³³

²⁸ The FCC Questionnaire asked states to report 911 information on a calendar year basis, but some states instead reported their information on a fiscal year basis. Therefore, our analysis sometimes includes both calendar year and fiscal year data.

²⁹ NET 911 Act at § 6(f)(1) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(1)).

³⁰ NET 911 Act at § 6(f)(2) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(2)).

³¹ FCC Questionnaire (Question G1). As noted, the rules adopted in the *911 Fee Diversion Report & Order* became effective October 18, 2021. *Effective Date of 911 Fee Diversion Rules Public Notice*, 36 FCC Rcd 12629.

³² 47 CFR § 9.23(a).

³³ FCC Questionnaire at 2–4.

12. **Number and Type of PSAPs.** The questionnaire requested that states “provide the total number of active primary and secondary [PSAPs³⁴] in your state or jurisdiction that received funding derived from the collection of 911/E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2022.”³⁵ Table 1 shows that 49 states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands responded to this request, reporting a total of 4,627 primary PSAPs and 697 secondary PSAPs.³⁶

Table 1 – Number and Types of PSAPs That Receive Funding from the Collection of 911/E911 Fees³⁷

State	Total Primary	Total Secondary	Total PSAPs
AK	22	2	24
AL	106	170	276
AR	97	0	97
AZ	72	9	81
CA	392	49	441
CO	81	4	85
CT	103	4	107
DE	8	1	9
FL	142	55	197
GA	155	0	155

³⁴ A Primary PSAP is one to which 911 calls are routed directly from the 911 Control Office (such as a selective router or 911 tandem). A Secondary PSAP is one to which 911 calls are transferred from a Primary PSAP. See National Emergency Number Association (NENA), Master Glossary of 9-1-1 Terminology at 174 (June 22, 2021), https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/standards-archived/nena-adm-000.24-2021_final_2.pdf (defining Primary PSAP, Secondary PSAP, and E911 Control Office).

³⁵ FCC Questionnaire at 2 (Question B1).

³⁶ We note that because the Bureau’s data request focused on PSAPs that receive funding from 911 fees, the reported data do not necessarily include PSAPs that are funded through sources other than 911 fees. We also note that the sum of reported primary and secondary PSAPs does not equal the reported total due to discrepancies in certain states’ responses. See *infra* note 41 at the end of Table 1 for more information regarding the discrepancies.

³⁷ Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Nevada, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming provided substantive entries in Addendum Section B1 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/fifteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>. Arkansas, Georgia, Michigan, North Dakota, Oregon, Virginia and Wyoming indicate that some or all their secondary PSAPs are not funded (or that only primary PSAPs are funded) through collected 911 or E911 fees or surcharges. Although Michigan indicates it has only six secondary PSAPs and that none of them receives direct 911 fee funding, Michigan nevertheless lists six secondary PSAPs in response to Question B1 regarding PSAPs that received funding derived from 911/E911 fees. Arkansas Response at 2; Georgia Response at 2; Michigan Response at 2; North Dakota Response at 2; Oregon Response at 2; Virginia Response at 2; Wyoming Response at 2. Ohio states, “Ohio statewide 9-1-1 fee is only applied to wireless communications and PSAPs that initially answer wireless 9-1-1 calls are the only PSAPs eligible for 9-1-1 fee funding.” Ohio Response at 2.

State	Total Primary	Total Secondary	Total PSAPs
HI	6	4	[No Response] ³⁸
IA	112	[No Response]	112
ID	[DNF] ³⁹	[DNF]	[DNF]
IL	181	11	192
IN	91	26	117
KS	121	8	129
KY	117	NA	117
LA	76	unk[nown]	76
MA	212	4	216
MD	24	71	95
ME	24	[No Response]	24
MI	135	6	141
MN	96	7	103
MO	165	4	165
MS	123	49	172
MT	58	[No Response]	58
NC	114	11	125
ND	21	[No Response]	21
NE	68	[No Response]	68
NH	2	0	2
NJ	173	69	242
NM	42	[No Response]	[No Response]
NV	5	1	6
NY	150	23	173
OH	112	0	112
OK	126	0	126
OR	43	0	43
PA	61	0	61
RI	1	1	2
SC	68	10	78
SD	32	1	33
TN	111	12	123
TX	489	69	558
UT	30	0	30
VA	119	0	119
VT	6	[No Response]	6

³⁸ In all tables in this report, brackets indicate information entered by the Bureau, e.g., where the state or jurisdiction has provided no response, or the response is unknown because it cannot be derived from the information provided in the state or jurisdiction’s filing, or the state or jurisdiction did not file. Except as otherwise indicated, all unbracketed table entries in this report are taken verbatim from the responses provided by states and jurisdictions.

³⁹ In all tables in this report, the abbreviation “[DNF]” indicates that the state or jurisdiction did not file a response form this year (for this report, Idaho and the Northern Mariana Islands).

State	Total Primary	Total Secondary	Total PSAPs
WA	50	13	63
WI	0	0	0
WV	51	[No Response]	51
WY	28	1	29
Other Jurisdictions			
AS ⁴⁰	none	none	none
DC	1	0	1
Guam	1	1	2
NMI	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]
PR	2	1	3
USVI	2	0	2
Total⁴¹	4,627	697	5,268

13. **Number of Telecommunicators.** Respondents were asked to provide the total number of active telecommunicators⁴² in each state or jurisdiction that were funded through the collection of 911/E911 fees during calendar year 2022.⁴³ Table 2 shows that 49 states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands responded to this data request and reported a total of 35,506.5 full-time telecommunicators⁴⁴ and 2,910 part-time telecommunicators that are funded through the collection of 911 fees. Five states reported they do not know how many telecommunicators in one or both categories are funded through 911/E911 funds.⁴⁵ Fourteen states, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that telecommunicators are not funded by 911 fees, i.e., they explicitly stated this or provided responses such as “0” or “None.”

⁴⁰ American Samoa reports that it has not established a funding mechanism. American Samoa Response at 5-6.

⁴¹ The sum of primary and secondary PSAPs yields 5,324 PSAPs, which is 56 more than the reported total PSAPs shown in Table 1. A few states made errors in adding primary and secondary PSAPs for their reported totals.

⁴² For purposes of the FCC Questionnaire, 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 voice, text, and multi-media calls and/or who provides for the appropriate emergency response either directly or through communication with the appropriate PSAP. FCC Questionnaire at 3 n.3; *see also* NENA, *NENA Knowledge Base* (last updated Sept. 3, 2021), <https://kb.nena.org/wiki/Telecommunicator>.

⁴³ FCC Questionnaire at 3 (Question B2).

⁴⁴ Texas reports 731.5 full-time telecommunicators. Texas Response at 3.

⁴⁵ Louisiana reports “unk[nown]” only for the number of part-time active telecommunicators, and does provide a number for full-time active telecommunicators. Louisiana Response at 3. Georgia reports “Unknown” for numbers of full-time and part-time active telecommunicators, but at Addendum Section B2, Georgia states in part that “the local government may not use 911 fees to pay salaries.” Georgia Response at 3.

Table 2 – Total Telecommunicators Funded by 911/E911 Fees⁴⁶

State	Number of Telecommunicators Funded by 911 Fees		Reported “Unknown”	Not Funded by Fees
	Full-Time	Part-Time		
AK	342	24		
AL	1,551	[No Response]		
AR	1,011	146		
AZ	0	0		X
CA	0	0		X
CO	409	28		
CT	In accordance with CGS Sec 28-30a., E911 funds may be used for operational costs including salaries for telecommunicators. The number of E911 funded telecommunicators is unknown.	same as above	X	
DE	288	8		
FL	1,018	72		
GA	Unknown ⁴⁷	Unknown	X	X
HI	0	0		X
IA	0	0		X
ID	[DNF]	[DNF]		
IL	3,091	318		
IN	1,826	290		
KS	0	0		X
KY	1,224	119		
LA	850	unk[nown]	X	
MA	5,000	Included in Full-Time Response		
MD	1,620	68		
ME	0	0		X
MI	1,942	165		
MN	0	0		X
MO	1,454	252		
MS	960	212		
MT	NA	NA		X
NC	0	0		X

⁴⁶ Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming provided substantive entries in Addendum Section B2 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/fifteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

⁴⁷ Georgia states, “There are currently over 3,500 actively employed telecommunicators throughout the State of Georgia; however, the local government may not use 911 fees to pay salaries. Additionally, we are unable to differentiate between full-time and part-time telecommunicators.” Georgia Response at 3.

State	Number of Telecommunicators Funded by 911 Fees		Reported “Unknown”	Not Funded by Fees
	Full-Time	Part-Time		
ND	290	29		
NE	543	72		
NH	74	7		
NJ	0	0		X
NM	0	0		X
NV	25	2		
NY	3,929	289		
OH	663	110		
OK	624	92		
OR	754	40		
PA	2,100	280		
RI	28 Telecommunicators and 8 Supervisors ⁴⁸	0		
SC	unknown	unknown	X	
SD	349	47		
TN	Unknown	Unknown	X	
TX	731.5	25		
UT	332	24		
VA	0	0		X
VT	80	24		
WA	1,388	50		
WI	0	0		X
WV	760	111		
WY	50	6		
Other Jurisdictions				
AS ⁴⁹	none	none		X
DC	29	0		
Guam	26	0		
NMI	[DNF]	[DNF]		
PR	145	[No Response]		
USVI	0	0		X
Total	35,506.5	2,910	5	16

14. **Number of 911/E911 Calls and Texts.** The Bureau asked respondents to provide an estimate of the total number of 911 calls the state or jurisdiction received for calendar year 2022. The FCC Questionnaire also included a question specifically asking for the number of texts to 911 received.⁵⁰ Forty-six states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported a cumulative total of 217,654,456 voice 911 calls of all types during the 2022 annual

⁴⁸ For calculation purposes, we only count Rhode Island’s reported 28 telecommunicators toward the total.

⁴⁹ American Samoa reports that it has not established a funding mechanism. American Samoa Response at 5-6.

⁵⁰ FCC Questionnaire at 4 (B4a).

period.⁵¹ This total is approximately 1.1% lower, or over 2.4 million fewer calls, than the reported call volume of 220,107,525 voice calls for the 2021 annual reporting period.⁵² Of the total reported voice calls in 2022, respondents reported 157,999,298 calls from wireless phones, representing approximately 72.6% of the total reported call volume. The Bureau believes this likely understates the percentage of wireless 911 calls because Delaware, Georgia, Tennessee, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported total 911 calls but did not break out service categories separately. For this year’s question about the number of texts to 911, 41 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico reported a combined total of 824,609 texts to 911 in 2022. Table 3 provides specific call volume information reported 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.⁵³

Table 3 – Total 911 Calls by Service Type and 911 Texts⁵⁴

State	Type of Voice Service				Voice Call Total	Texts to 911	Estimated Annual 911 Calls Per Capita
	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Other			
AK	24,658	225,414	289	0	250,361	unknown	0.34
AL	123,628	2,573,532	227,157	1,057,022	3,981,339	16,636	0.78
AR	142,898	1,599,888	63,414	[No Response]	1,806,200	3,790	0.59
AZ	497,760	4,614,161	351,984	120,042	5,583,947	19,834	0.76
CA	1,514,134 (6%)	22,514,099 (86%)	1,687,529 (6%)	586,476 (2%)	26,302,238	90,326 (<1%)	0.67
CO	190,370	2,922,445	186,424	0	3,299,239	11,606	0.56
CT	166,743	1,696,139	167,572	[No Response]	2,030,454	6,602	0.56
DE	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	698,350	1,861	0.69

⁵¹ Two states (Montana and Wisconsin) responded “Unknown,” “NA,” or provided no response to all service type and total 911 voice call categories. North Dakota provided no response for total number of 911 voice calls, but did report individual numbers for most voice service type categories.

⁵² In the Fourteenth Report, respondents reported a total of 220,107,525 voice calls to 911 for calendar year 2021. FCC, Fourteenth Annual Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges at 12-15, para. 14, Table 3 (2022), <https://www.fcc.gov/file/24628/download> (Fourteenth Report).

⁵³ The Bureau’s per capita estimates in this report are based on United States Census data for each jurisdiction. See United States Census Bureau, *State Population Totals and Components of Change: 2020-2022*, <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/popest/2020s-state-total.html> (June 13, 2023). The populations for American Samoa, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands are based on World Bank data because Census data are unavailable. See The World Bank, *Population, total - American Samoa*, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL?locations=AS> (last visited Nov. 21, 2023); The World Bank, *Population, total - Guam*, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL?locations=GU> (last visited Nov. 21, 2023); The World Bank, *Population, total - Virgin Islands (U.S.)*, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL?locations=VI> (last visited Nov. 21, 2023).

⁵⁴ Alabama, Alaska, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, U.S. Virgin Islands, Virginia, and Wisconsin provided substantive entries in Addendum Section B4 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/fifteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

State	Type of Voice Service				Voice Call Total	Texts to 911	Estimated Annual 911 Calls Per Capita
	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Other			
FL	1,453,907	11,668,938	634,958	868,224	14,626,027	38,254	0.66
GA	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	11,924,612	20,796	[NA]
HI	188,531	1,083,044	50,248	-	1,321,823	4,266	0.92
IA	109,239	1,115,409	67,319	6,299	1,298,266	6,038	0.41
ID	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]
IL	813,491	6,892,979	873,984	0	8,580,454	7,895	0.68
IN	193,675	3,073,184	244,887	[No Response]	3,511,746	163,031 ⁵⁵	0.51
KS	96,413	1,351,143	152,890	[No Response]	1,600,446	11,024	0.54
KY	542,771	2,377,419	158,549	508,346	3,587,085	3,110	0.79
LA	362,991	2,844,514	149,130	[No Response]	3,356,635	12,719	0.73
MA	225,421	2,443,594	438,308	[No Response]	3,107,323	5,891	0.45
MD	772,958	3,310,236	Unk[nown]	N/A	4,164,284 ⁵⁶	20,245	0.68
ME	78,022	470,105	56,229	[No Response]	604,356	954	0.44
MI	589,926	4,998,996	465,455	0	6,054,377	29,337	0.60
MN	227,266	2,431,446	200,484	16	2,859,212	12,329	0.50
MO	376,104	1,846,826	147,547	337,162	2,707,639	10,362	0.44
MS	422,480	1,403,775	390,892	831,288	3,048,375 ⁵⁷	N/A	1.04
MT	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	[NA]
NC	716,276	5,805,918	700,106	[No Response]	7,222,300	14,899 ⁵⁸	0.68
ND	30,334	222,913	6,475	[No Response]	[No Response] ⁵⁹	800	0.00
NE	65,328	804,082	72,217	[No Response]	941,627	4,140	0.48

⁵⁵ At Addendum Section B4, Indiana states, “Inbound text 22,394[:]; Outbound text 140,637.” Indiana Response at 4.

⁵⁶ Based on addition of the individual numbers for voice service types, Maryland had a total of 4,083,194 voice calls to 911, which is 81,090 calls fewer than Maryland lists as its total number of 911 voice calls. Maryland Response at 4 (B4). At Addendum Section B4, Maryland states, “Maryland treats VoIP calls as wireline calls. Text to 9-1-1 value represents sessions, and not individual texts.” Maryland Response at 4.

⁵⁷ Based on addition of the individual numbers for voice service types, Mississippi had a total of 3,048,435 voice calls to 911, which is 60 calls more than Mississippi lists as its total number of 911 voice calls. Mississippi Response at 4 (B4).

⁵⁸ At Addendum Section B4, North Carolina states, “All PSAPs in North Carolina have been required by NC law to receive text-to-911 since July 1, 2020. Due to the transition to a new data analytics product, unfortunately data was not captured before deactivation of prior reporting capability. Data for 2021 used for this response.” North Carolina Response at 4.

⁵⁹ Based on addition of the individual numbers for voice service types, North Dakota had a total of 259,722 voice calls to 911, but it did not report a total. We calculate an annual 911 calls per capita figure of 0.33 based on the addition of individual numbers for voice service types.

State	Type of Voice Service				Voice Call Total	Texts to 911	Estimated Annual 911 Calls Per Capita
	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Other			
NH	36,018	357,310	51,452	17,484	462,264	803	0.33
NJ	2,131,247	7,827,076	514	unknown	9,958,837	Unknown	1.08
NM	297,825	1,090,925	74,049	647,738	2,110,537	0	1.00
NV	294,254	294,505	37,008	105,623.0	734,014 ⁶⁰	162	0.23
NY	1,881,372	10,616,594	862,060	688,388	14,048,414	62,568	0.71
OH	352,942	4,985,981	362,758	47,604	5,749,285	10,859	0.49
OK	225,697	2,143,457	164,305	62,431	2,595,890	16,240	0.65
OR	196,661	1,782,161	148,631	33,539	2,160,992	11,123	0.51
PA	1,801,010	5,887,985	667,088	75,828	8,431,911	31,777	0.65
RI	38,597	384,026	54,087	[No Response]	476,710	560	0.44
SC	299,581	3,321,331	240,880	[No Response]	3,861,792	16,780	0.73
SD	25,434	282,739	10,952	2,912	322,037	2,003	0.35
TN	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	U[n]known	6,082,245	Unknown	0.86
TX	1,574,941	17,091,894	1,030,827	351,985	20,049,647	102,265	0.67
UT	20,162	934,712	48,909	30,630	1,034,413	3,878	0.31
VA	517,713	3,538,003	304,354	[No Response]	4,360,070	Unknown	0.50
VT	29,523	176,014	28,993	[No Response]	234,530	622	0.36
WA	372,443	4,611,795	407,244	[No Response]	5,391,482	23,353	0.69
WI	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	Unknown	Unknown	0
WV	515,857	790,384	137,663	845,724	2,289,628	8,852	1.29
WY	114,263	173,397	13,560	11,928	313,148	957	0.54
Other Jurisdictions							
AS	1,424	30,099	N/A	N'A	31,523	[No Response]	0.71
DC	61,642	801,594	123,196	0	986,432	6,315	1.47
Guam	58,823	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	58,823	N/A	0.34
NMI	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]
PR	421,282	587,117	[No Response]	399,032	1,407,431	8,747	0.44
USVI	See Addendum B4 ⁶¹	See Addendum B4	See Addendum B4	See Addendum B4	33,686	0	0.32

⁶⁰ Based on addition of the individual numbers for voice service types, Nevada had a total of 731,390 voice calls to 911, which is 2,624 calls fewer than Nevada lists as its “Total” number of 911 voice calls. At Addendum Section B4, Nevada states, “Mineral County - Does not have ability to distinguish how many calls come in on 911 through wireless/wirelines/VoIP. Clark County - Listed as unknown origin. Consolidated Municipality of Carson City NV- Unable to report by service/line type-included the total combined for all 911 calls received in ‘Other’.” Nevada Response at 4-5. (B4)

⁶¹ At Addendum Section B4, the U.S. Virgin Islands states, “The present call receiving [sic] system does not allow for text to 911 nor breakdown as to the type of service calls. The total number of calls in this report are solely [sic] (continued....)

State	Type of Voice Service				Voice Call Total	Texts to 911	Estimated Annual 911 Calls Per Capita
	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Other			
Totals ⁶²	21,194,035	157,999,298	12,262,577	7,635,721	217,654,456	824,609	0.60

15. Cost to Provide 911/E911 Service. The Bureau asked respondents to provide an estimate of the total cost to provide 911 service during calendar year 2022, regardless of whether such costs are supported by 911 fees or other funding sources. As detailed in Table 4 below, 42 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands provided cost estimates totaling \$5,850,583,386.36.⁶³ Table 4 also includes the Bureau’s estimate of reported costs on a per capita basis for each reporting state and jurisdiction. Seven states and American Samoa did not provide cost estimates, with some 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.⁶⁴

Table 4 – Estimated Cost to Provide 911/E911 Service⁶⁵

State	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911/E911 Service	Explanation of Reported Figure or Why Estimation Could Not Be Provided	Annual Per Capita Expenditures
AK	\$14,313,303.63	[NA]	\$19.51
AL	\$134,395,660.33	[NA]	\$26.49
AR	\$70,191,250.97	[NA]	\$23.05
AZ	\$17,900,564.00	[NA]	\$2.43
CA	\$188,704,000	N/A	\$4.83
CO	\$86,898,443.69	[NA]	\$14.88
CT	\$34,291,825.00	Estimated Connecticut’s budget cycle is fiscal year July 1 - June 30.	\$9.46
DE	\$9,656,734.12	n/a	\$9.48

(Continued from previous page) _____
for dispatched calls. The U.S. Virgin Islands is currently in the process of integrating and testing the final components to provide text to 911 and to enable call type differentiation [sic].” U.S. Virgin Islands Response at 4.

⁶² Delaware, Georgia, Tennessee, and the U.S. Virgin Islands did not break down calls by category and only provided totals. Other states reported category data and totals with varying discrepancies. Therefore, the reported total for all voice 911 calls is approximately 18.6 million calls more than the sum of Wireline, Wireless, VoIP, and Other reported by states and jurisdictions, which is 199,091,631 voice 911 calls. The per capita figure in the Totals row is the average of the state per capita values above.

⁶³ For a comparison of total costs to total revenue from fees and charges, see *infra* Table 14.

⁶⁴ For example, Alaska, Colorado, Kansas, Michigan, Mississippi, and Missouri indicate that they do not have cost data from certain PSAPs or local jurisdictions, and as a result, Kansas and Missouri acknowledge that their actual costs could be higher than reported. Alaska Response at 4; Colorado Response at 3; Kansas Response at 3; Michigan Response at 3; Mississippi Response at 3; Missouri Response at 3-4.

⁶⁵ Alaska, Colorado, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Wyoming provided substantive entries in Addendum Section B3 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/fifteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

State	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911/E911 Service	Explanation of Reported Figure or Why Estimation Could Not Be Provided	Annual Per Capita Expenditures
FL	\$264,729,365.00	[NA]	\$11.90
GA	Unknown	The Georgia Emergency Communications Authority (GECA) does not capture the total cost to provide 911/E911 service throughout the state. 911 telephone fees are disbursed to local jurisdictions, but many jurisdictions supplement their 911 fees to cover their operational expenses.	[NA]
HI	N/A	Hawaii is a 'Home Rule' State and each county has its own cost accounting system which the E911 Board has no authority over. Their system is not set up to capture expenses associated with 911/E911 service only	[NA]
IA	\$167,388,143.00	[NA]	\$52.30
ID	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]
IL	Local 9-1-1 Authorities reported \$196,441,148.45 in 911 Expenses and the State paid \$12,892,593.59 for 911 network costs Total cost to provide 911/E911 is \$209,333,742.04	[NA]	\$16.64
IN	\$230,675,002.37	[NA]	\$33.76
KS	\$120,614,547.00	[NA]	\$41.07
KY	\$156,293,058.00	NA	\$34.64
LA	\$93,319,006.86	[NA]	\$20.33
MA	The estimated amount to provide 911 Service is: \$51,745,295 This estimated amount includes the costs associated with the Next Generation 911 service provider contract, MassGIS, Radio, and the mobile PSAP. This estimated amount does not include costs associated with grant programs, training programs, disability access programs, public education, administrative costs, or other	[NA]	\$7.41

State	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911/E911 Service	Explanation of Reported Figure or Why Estimation Could Not Be Provided	Annual Per Capita Expenditures
	costs for the administration and programs of the State 911 Department.		
MD	\$177,429,053.00	Amount reflects estimations based on actual and averaged annual [sic] costs.	\$28.78
ME	\$7,006,439	[NA]	\$5.06
MI	\$323,583,726.38	[NA]	\$32.25
MN	\$43,601,378.00	[NA]	\$7.63
MO	\$201,950,326.00	[NA]	\$32.69
MS	\$59,190,113.45	[NA]	\$20.13
MT	\$47M	[NA]	\$41.86
NC	\$197,535,864.00	[NA]	\$18.46
ND	\$30,100,000.00	[NA]	\$38.63
NE	\$62,821,713.00	The Nebraska Public Service Commission has jurisdiction over the 911 Wireless Surcharge funds, collection, and dissemination. The PSAP's have local control over their costs and general funds along with their 911 wireline surcharge monies. The amount reported in B3 is an estimate based on the total operating budget of the PSAPs as reported to the Public Service Commission.	\$31.92
NH	\$18,335,158.00	N/A	\$13.14
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.	[NA]
NM	\$13,706,572.00	[NA]	\$6.49
NV	\$25,207,281.90	Storey County - Self-funded. The Storey County Board of Commissioners have elected not to collect 911 fees or surcharges. White Pine County - 911 Surcharge account pays for small portion [sic] of IT salaries for maintaining systems. Eureka County - Unknown paid in full 2017 for 6 year contract.	\$7.93
NY	\$576,636,299.00	[NA]	\$29.30
OH	\$216,192,217.90	[NA]	\$18.39
OK	\$129,906,546.01	[NA]	\$32.32
OR	\$160,063,177.84	[NA]	\$37.75
PA	\$399,120,482.00	[NA]	\$30.77
RI	\$7,565,150.09	[NA]	\$6.92
SC	unknown	The state manages and distributes the wireless 911 funds. Wireline 911 funds are handled at the local level. The state does not have a mechanism in place to determine the total amount of 911/E911 expenditures at the local level.	[NA]
SD	\$36,508,354.00	[NA]	\$40.13
TN	Unknown	Tennessee emergency communications districts ('ECDs') operate and report on a fiscal year basis from July 1 through June 30. Audits reflect annual costs that are recorded in ECD's books, but expenditures made for 911 service by contributing local governments are not included. A study performed by the Tennessee Comptroller of the Treasury determined an	[NA]

State	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911/E911 Service	Explanation of Reported Figure or Why Estimation Could Not Be Provided	Annual Per Capita Expenditures
		amount of \$191,610,768 as the total cost of operating the 911 service for FY2019, which was composed of \$118,779,979 in ECD cost and \$72,830,789 in local government cost. An estimated total cost for providing 911 service in Tennessee can be derived by multiplying the 2019 percentage times FY2021 audited ECD annual cost (1.62% times \$122,238,259 yielding an estimate of \$198,025,980).	
TX	\$319,457,001.00	[NA]	\$10.64
UT	\$84 Million	[NA]	\$24.85
VA	Unknown	For the annual period ending December [sic] 31, 2022, PSC Staff only sees funds [sic] that are collected by the Virginia Department [sic] of Taxation as part of the Wireless E9-1-1 Fund. We do not collect information [sic] any other costs.	[NA]
VT	\$4,587,898.00	[NA]	\$7.09
WA	\$410,496,002.00	[NA]	\$52.72
WI	Unknown	In Wisconsin for the reporting period, county and municipal governments operate and administer the 911 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 911 services, or a statistical summary of the 911 service provided. Each county in Wisconsin has entered into a contract with participating local exchange carriers to provide its 911 telecommunications network. These 911 contracts specify in detail the design of the telecommunications network supporting the local 911 service, authorizes a 911 surcharge on landlines based on population to pay for expenses related to the network, and identifies the obligations of the parties to build, operate, and maintain the 911 telecommunications network. See Wis. Stat. 256.35(3)(b). No portion of the funds collected from the 911 surcharge is shared with any state, county, or municipal agency or department, or any other governmental entity. The 911 surcharge is limited to the recovery of the telecommunications network expenses for providing the 911 service, and is retained in full by the participating local exchange carriers (up to \$0.40 cents per exchange access line per month). County and municipal expenses related to terminating and responding to 911 calls are paid for through the respective county and municipal budgets. The total amount of the 911 surcharge collection is not available. The participating local exchange carriers collect the 911 surcharge. Those local exchange carriers do not report the results of the 911 surcharge collection to any state, county, or municipal office.	[NA]
WV	\$353,259,544.19	[NA]	\$199.00
WY	\$10,657,850.59	[NA]	\$18.33
Other Jurisdictions			
AS	see answer to 3a	Background: No separate budgeted line item for PSAP service. The service is provided by the Department of Public Safety within its regularly budgeted resources. There is a single primary PSAP in the Territory housed in the Department of Public Safety. There is no secondary PSA, although there is a back-up to the primary at the local Emergency Operations Center. There are two full-time and no part-time telecommunicators, although DPS still requires six more full-time employees for this position. The PSAP described below does not include voice recording of calls but can verify caller ID's [sic] and produce	[NA]

State	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911/E911 Service	Explanation of Reported Figure or Why Estimation Could Not Be Provided	Annual Per Capita Expenditures
		<p>transcriptions [sic] of the conversations. PSAP Overview 9-1-1 SYSTEM VENDOR: INTRADO POSITION VIPER: VIPER is a Next generation 9-1-1 system renowned for its reliability and ability to address specific public safety needs. It is a premier 9-1-1 Voice over Internet Protocol [sic] (VoIP) controller of choice for PSAPs. VIPER has the ability to deploy in a variety of local, host and remote configurations; it is scalable, fault tolerance and a small footprint. It has caller ID function and is scalable up to 96 9-1-1 trunks. Power 9-1-1 is an integrated Intelligence Workstation (IWS) that provides call takers with on screen controls of both landlines and wireless calls in a wide variety of telephony [sic] environment. In layman’s terms, all telephone calls are answered via a computer screen with several options of call routing, patching or forwarding. This Intelligent Workstation is integrated with Caller ID (Automatic Number), TTY/TDD & call recording ability for incident review. It is scalable for future enhancement features such as Automatic Vehicle Locate. The current system is non-operational at this time but awaiting an upgrade. However, basic backup 911 services are still in place at this time.</p>	
DC	\$52,370,384.00	[NA]	\$77.95
Guam	\$4,115,037.00	[NA]	\$23.96
NMI	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]
PR	\$24,756,536.00	[NA]	\$7.68
USVI	\$2,973,341.00	[NA]	\$28.21
Total	\$5,850,583,386.36	Average State Per Capita Expenditure National Per Capita Expenditure	\$27.37 \$16.20

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

16. The questionnaire sought data on the funding mechanisms states use to collect fees. Forty-eight 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.⁶⁶ Of those states that have an established funding mechanism, Table 5 identifies four states that reported enlarging or altering their funding mechanism during calendar year 2022. For example, New York “removed two fiscal years of deposits to the New York State

⁶⁶ American Samoa reports that it has not established a funding mechanism. American Samoa Response at 5-6. In addition, this year Alaska reports at Question C1 that it has not established a funding mechanism. Alaska Response at 5. However, in other entries in this year’s questionnaire, Alaska cites its legal authority for a funding mechanism, and also reports that it did not alter the funding mechanism in 2022. *See, e.g.*, Alaska Response at 5-7 (Questions C1b, C1c, and C3). Moreover, last year Alaska’s Fourteenth Response at Question C1 indicated that Alaska does have a funding mechanism, and last year Alaska cited the same legal authority for its funding mechanism that it cites in this year’s questionnaire. Alaska Fourteenth Response at 5-7 (available at <https://www.fcc.gov/fourteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>).

emergency services revolving loan fund from the Public Safety Communications Surcharge.⁶⁷ Michigan increased its prepaid wireless fee from 5% to 6% per retail transaction beginning March 1, 2022.⁶⁸

Table 5 – States That Amended or Enlarged 911/E911 Funding Mechanism⁶⁹

State	Description
Michigan	The funding mechanism was not amended during the time period; it was amended on December 17, 2021. However, the changes did not take place until March 1, 2022. From the description in C1a above, the sellers of prepaid wireless communications devices are mandated to remit 6% per retail transaction collected from their customer at the point of sale to the Michigan Department of Treasury beginning March 1, 2022. From January 1 to March 1, 2022, the sellers of prepaid wireless communications devices were to remit 5% per retail transaction to the Michigan Department of Treasury. The state of Michigan provided a one time appropriation of \$16,000,000 to help with the NG911 network shortfall. The State 911 Office was notified on August 24, 2022, this appropriation was made.
Montana	COLLECTION OF 9-1-1 FEE ON PREPAID WIRELESS PHONES
New York	Chapter 259 of the 2022 Laws of New York allows Albany County to charge an additional \$0.95 per access line per month for the county’s Enhanced Emergency Telephone System Surcharge and an additional \$0.95 per device or sale for the county’s Wireless Communications Surcharge. Chapter 55 of the 2022 Laws of New York removed two fiscal years of deposits to the New York State emergency services revolving loan fund from the Public Safety Communications Surcharge.
Texas	Although not occurring in CY 2022, the 87th Texas Legislature (2021) created the NG9-1-1 Fund (Tex. Health & Safety Code Ann. § 771.0713) and appropriated \$150 million to the NG9-1-1 Fund out of the Texas award of funds from the Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Fund created by the federal American Rescue Plan Act of 2021. The NG9-1-1 Fund received federal CSFRF funding to provide government services. The 88th Texas Legislature (2023) extended the period for expending the NG9-1-1 Fund from December 31, 2024, to December 31, 2026. During CY 2022, an unspecified but small number of 772 and Municipal ECDs increased their landline/VoIP fee. The Texas Legislature sets by statute the statewide wireless and prepaid wireless fees, and CSEC sets the statewide equalization surcharge--none of which were changed during CY 2022.

17. 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, 26 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. Two states reported that 911 fee collection occurs exclusively at the local level. Twenty 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, Washington reports that “[s]tate and county fees are collected by the carriers and submitted to the state Department of Revenue who then deposits them into the state’s and respective county’s 911 accounts.”⁷⁰ North Dakota reports that “[t]he State collects the prepaid fees and the local authority collects all other fees for landline, wireless and VoIP.”⁷¹

⁶⁷ New York Response at 5.

⁶⁸ Michigan Response at 5.

⁶⁹ Nevada and Ohio provided substantive entries in Addendum Section C1 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/fifteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>. Nevada states, “White Pine County - Cost related to General Fund Dispatch Department is \$535,469.07.” Nevada Response at 6.

⁷⁰ Washington Response at 5.

⁷¹ North Dakota Response at 5.

Table 6 – Authority to Collect 911/E911 Fees⁷²

Type of Collection	Number of States/Jurisdictions	States/Jurisdictions
State	30	Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Indiana, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, U.S. Virgin Islands, Utah, Vermont, Virginia
Local	2	Alaska, Nevada
Hybrid	20	Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Texas, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming

D. Description of State Authority That Determines How 911/E911 Fees Are Spent

18. 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 below, 17 states, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands indicated that only a state entity has authority to approve expenditure of 911 fees.⁷³ Five states indicated that only local entities have authority to approve expenditures. Twenty-six states and the District of Columbia indicated that authority is shared between state and local authorities.⁷⁴

19. The Bureau also sought information on whether states have established a funding mechanism that mandates how collected funds may be used. Forty-eight 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 one state reported it has no such mechanism, and American Samoa did not respond.⁷⁵

⁷² American Samoa, Arkansas, Hawaii, Illinois, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, Ohio, Tennessee, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming provided substantive entries in Addendum Section C2 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/fifteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>. American Samoa, which reports that it has not established a funding mechanism, left all three checkboxes blank and is therefore not included in this table. American Samoa states at Addendum Section C2, “N/A No funds collected.” American Samoa Response at 6. Wisconsin also left all three categories unchecked. Wisconsin states at Addendum Section C2, “None of the above apply. No portion of the funds from the 911 surcharge are collected at the state, county, or municipal level. The participating local exchange carriers collect the 911 surcharge. See B3a response above.” Wisconsin Response at 6.

⁷³ Although American Samoa indicated at Question D1 that the state has the authority to approve the expenditure of funds collected for 911/E911 purposes, American Samoa has reported that it does not collect any 911 phone fees. American Samoa Response at 5-6.

⁷⁴ Some of these 27 jurisdictions checked the “hybrid” box at Question D1, while others checked boxes for both state and local authority (indicating a hybrid of state and local authorities collect fees), but left the “hybrid” box unchecked.

⁷⁵ Alaska reports at Question D2 that it has not established a mechanism mandating how 911 fees may be spent, but provides a substantive response at D2b (if no, describe how your state or jurisdiction decides how collected funds can be used). Alaska Response at 8. As noted, American Samoa reports that it does not collect any 911/E911 phone fees. American Samoa Response at 5-6.

Table 7 – State Authority for Approval of 911 Fee Expenditures⁷⁶

State	State, Local, or Hybrid Authority to Approve Expenditures	State Funding Mechanism Mandating How Funds Can Be Used
AK	Local	No
AL	Hybrid	Yes
AR	Hybrid	Yes
AZ	State	Yes
CA	State	Yes
CO	Local	Yes
CT	State	Yes
DE	[Hybrid] ⁷⁷	Yes
FL	Hybrid	Yes
GA	Hybrid	Yes
HI	State	Yes
IA	Hybrid	Yes
ID	[DNF]	[DNF]
IL	Hybrid	Yes
IN	State	Yes
KS	Hybrid	Yes
KY	Hybrid	Yes
LA	Local	Yes
MA	State	Yes
MD	Hybrid	Yes
ME	State	Yes
MI	Hybrid	Yes
MN	State	Yes
MO	Hybrid	Yes
MS	[Hybrid]	Yes
MT	[Hybrid]	Yes
NC	State	Yes
ND	Hybrid	Yes
NE	Hybrid	Yes
NH	State	Yes
NJ	State	Yes
NM	State	Yes

⁷⁶ Kansas, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, South Carolina, Texas, and Utah provided substantive entries in Addendum Section D1 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/fifteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

⁷⁷ Where “[Hybrid]” appears with square brackets in Table 7, the respondent checked boxes for both state and local authority, indicating a hybrid of state and local authorities, but left the “hybrid” box unchecked.

State	State, Local, or Hybrid Authority to Approve Expenditures	State Funding Mechanism Mandating How Funds Can Be Used
NV	Local	Yes and No ⁷⁸
NY	Hybrid	Yes
OH	Hybrid	Yes
OK	State	Yes
OR	State	Yes
PA	Hybrid	Yes
RI	State	Yes
SC	Hybrid	Yes
SD	State	Yes
TN	Hybrid	Yes
TX	Hybrid	Yes
UT	[Hybrid]	Yes
VA	Hybrid	Yes
VT	State	Yes
WA	Hybrid	Yes
WI	[No Response]	Yes
WV	Hybrid	Yes
WY	Local	Yes
Other Jurisdictions		
AS	State ⁷⁹	[No Response]
DC	[Hybrid]	Yes
Guam	State	Yes
NMI	[DNF]	[DNF]
PR	State	Yes
USVI	State	Yes
Totals	State Only	21
	Local Only	5
	Hybrid	27
	Has Funding Mechanism Mandating How Funds Can Be Used	52

E. Description of Uses of Collected 911/E911 Fees

20. 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,

⁷⁸ Nevada reports both Yes and No answers for Question D2. For purposes of calculating how many states have funding mechanisms mandating how funds can be used, we have counted Nevada’s response as a Yes.

⁷⁹ Although American Samoa indicated at Question D1 that the state has the authority to approve the expenditure of funds collected for 911/E911 purposes, American Samoa has reported that it does not collect any 911 phone fees. American Samoa Response at 5-6.

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.”⁸⁰ As illustrated in Table 8 below, forty-five states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands responded to this question.

Table 8 – Statements Describing Uses of Collected 911/E911 Fees

State	Statement Describing Use of Funds
AK	<p>See above...⁸¹</p> <p>(j) If a city in an enhanced 911 service area established by a borough incurs costs described under (i) of this section for the enhanced 911 system, before the borough may use revenue from an enhanced 911 surcharge, the borough and city must execute an agreement addressing the duties and responsibilities of each for the enhanced 911 system and establishing priorities for the use of the surcharge revenue. If the Department of Public Safety also provides services as part of the enhanced 911 system or uses the enhanced 911 system in that enhanced 911 service area, the department must be a party to the agreement.</p> <p>(k) For purposes of (i) of this section, ‘call taker’ means a person employed in a primary or secondary answering point whose duties include the initial answering of 911 or enhanced 911 calls and routing the calls to the agency or dispatch center responsible for dispatching appropriate emergency services and a person in a primary or secondary answering point whose duties include receiving a 911 or enhanced 911 call either directly or routed from another answering point and dispatching appropriate emergency services in response to the call; the term ‘call taker’ is synonymous with the term ‘dispatcher’ in that it is inclusive of the functions of both answering the 911 or enhanced 911 calls and dispatching emergency services in response to the calls.</p>
AL	<p>Funds collected for 911 or E911 have been received by the 85 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. (See the complete list below.)</p> <p>List of ECDs</p> <p>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 (Municipality); Dallas County; DeKalb County; Elmore County; Enterprise (Municipality); Escambia County; Etowah County; 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 (Municipality); Jackson</p>

⁸⁰ FCC Questionnaire at 7 (E1).

⁸¹ Alaska’s statement in E1 to “See above” appears to refer to its entry at Question D2b. At D2b, Alaska states, “Alaska Stat. § 29.35.131. : Alaska Statutes - Section 29.35.131.: 911 surcharge.

Section:(i) A municipality may only use the enhanced 911 surcharge revenue for those costs of the enhanced 911 system that are authorized in this subsection. The surcharge revenue may not be used for any capital or operational costs for emergency responses that occur after the call is dispatched to the emergency responder. The surcharge revenue may not be used for constructing buildings, leasing buildings, maintaining buildings, or renovating buildings, except for the modification of an existing building to the extent that is necessary to maintain the security and environmental integrity of the public safety answering point and equipment rooms. The surcharge revenue may be used for the following costs to the extent the costs are directly attributable to the establishment, maintenance, and operation of an enhanced 911 system:

- (1) the acquisition, implementation, and maintenance of public safety answering point equipment and 911 service features;
- (2) the acquisition, installation, and maintenance of other equipment, including call answering equipment, call transfer equipment, automatic number identification controllers and displays, automatic location identification controllers and displays, station instruments, 911 telecommunications systems, teleprinters, logging recorders, instant playback recorders, telephone devices for the deaf, public safety answering point backup power systems, consoles, automatic call distributors, and hardware and software interfaces for computer-aided dispatch systems;
- (3) the salaries and associated expenses for 911 call takers for that portion of time spent taking and transferring 911 calls;
- (4) training costs for public safety answering point call takers in the proper methods and techniques used in taking and transferring 911 calls;
- (5) expenses required to develop and maintain all information necessary to properly inform call takers as to location address, type of emergency, and other information directly relevant to the 911 call-taking and transferring function, including automatic location identification and automatic number identification databases.” Alaska Response at 8.

State	Statement Describing Use of Funds
	<p>County; Jefferson County; Lamar County; Lauderdale County; Lawrence County; Lee County; Limestone County, Lowndes County; Macon County; Madison County; Marengo County; Marion County; Marshall County; Midfield (Municipality); Mobile County; Monroe County; Montgomery (Municipality); 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 Hills (Municipality); Walker County; Washington County; Wilcox County; Winston County</p>
AR	<p>1) The AR 911 Board distributed 83.75% of the public safety fee collected (wireless post-paid, VoIP, and prepaid) to each county and/or PSAP as established by each local jurisdiction for use at the discretion of each local jurisdiction according to A.C.A. § 12-10-323.</p> <p>2) The AR 911 Board reimbursed each county and/or PSAP as established by each local jurisdiction a portion of the annual maintenance cost on call handling equipment. The allowable reimbursement amount for each jurisdiction is determined based on the wireless and VoIP call percentage for each jurisdiction.</p> <p>3) The AR 911 Board reimbursed equipment upgrade costs to counties/PSAPs (if funds have not previously been expended by the county/PSAP) based on the wireless call percentage for the respective county/PSAP. (Note: During the 2009 legislative session, existing code was amended to increase the quarterly PSAP distribution amount to 83.5% of the total amount remitted to the AR ETS Board. As a result of this change, funding for reimbursement of 911 equipment costs would no longer be available. At the time of the 2009 legislative change, a snapshot of the funds available for reimbursement was taken, and the AR ETS Board agreed that to ensure that the funds held were distributed fairly and equitably between the PSAPs the fund would be divided between the counties/PSAPs based on population. A database file was established reflecting the amount that was available for each county/PSAP, and that file has been updated and maintained as each county/PSAP has submitted requests for reimbursement as 911 equipment upgrades have been completed.)</p> <p>4) ACT 442 of the 2013 Legislative Session created the Arkansas 911 Rural Enhancement Program Fund to assist in the advancement of goals for universal 911 service throughout the state. The Arkansas Calling Plan Fund was to receive a maximum of four million five hundred thousand dollars (\$4,500,000) per year to assist in funding the provision of calling plans in telephone exchanges in the state. Also there was created an AHCF allocation from the Arkansas Call Plan Fund to be known as the 'Arkansas 911 Rural Enhancement Program Fund'. The Arkansas 911 Rural Enhancement Program Fund received a maximum of three million dollars (\$3,000,000) per year to:</p> <p>(A) Advance the goals of universal service and help ensure that rural areas within the State of Arkansas had access to 911 services as comparable to 911 services in urban areas within the state; and</p> <p>(B) Provide funding to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The statewide Smart911 system established in Acts 2012, No. 213; (2) The SmartPrepare System; and (3) 911 administrative systems for emergency management under the Arkansas Emergency Services Act of 1973, § 12-33 75-101 et seq <p>Three million dollars (\$3,000,000) was to be transferred annually from the AHCF to the Arkansas Department of Emergency Management on a quarterly basis for the Arkansas 911 Rural Enhancement Program to fund:</p> <p>(A) The statewide Smart911 system in the amount of six hundred thousand dollars (\$600,000) annually;</p> <p>(B) The SmartPrepare System in the amount of two hundred twenty-five thousand dollars (\$225,000) annually;</p> <p>(C) The 911 administration system for emergency management under the Arkansas Emergency Services Act of 1973, § 12-75-101 et seq., in the amount of one hundred seventy-five thousand dollars \$175,000 annually; and</p> <p>(D) Arkansas counties for 911 public safety answering points in the amount of two million dollars (\$2,000,000) annually.</p> <p>The \$2,000,000 for the counties was to be distributed based on county population as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The twenty-five (25) least-populated counties received equal portions of fifty percent of the available funds; (2) The next twenty-five (25) least-populated counties received equal portions of thirty-five percent (35%) of the available funds; and (3) The remaining twenty-five (25) counties shall receive equal portions of fifteen percent (15%) of the available funds. <p>County population was calculated based on current data from the Geography Division of the United States Bureau of the Census</p>
AZ	[No Response]
CA	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A basic system, defined as 911 systems, including, but not limited to, Next Generation 911, and the subsequent technologies, and interfaces needed to deliver 911 voice and data information from the 911 caller to the emergency responder and the subsequent technologies, and interfaces needed to send information, including, but not limited to, alerts and warnings, to potential 911 callers. <p>To pay refunds authorized by this part.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Network costs • Customer Premise Equipment (CPE) Costs • Database Costs (ALI) • Training costs for PSAPs, Max \$10,000 per PSAP per fiscal year • Review and analysis of new technology (NG9-1-1 etc.) • Deployment of Next Generation 9-1-1 • Foreign language emergency interpretation services • Geographic Information System

State	Statement Describing Use of Funds
CO	<p>We are unable to provide a full list of activities, programs, and organizations that receive funding from each of Colorado’s 58 local 9-1-1 governing bodies, which have the authority to direct spending as they see fit, provided the spending is in compliance with § 29-11-104, C.R.S. No 9-1-1 funds are expended by the state, other than to pay the administrative costs of administering [sic] the state 9-1-1 surcharge and wireless prepaid 9-1-1 charge.</p>
CT	<p>Funds collected for E911 purposes are used for the following services, activities and programs: NG 911 System: Includes 911 hardware, software, maintenance, database management, network management and monitoring. Rapid Deploy added in 2022 for enhanced [sic] call data and reports. Geographic Information Services (GIS): Geographic [sic]Information Systems is a critical component of NG911. Data for NG911 is used in PSAPs for map displays, call routing and addresss [sic] verification. 911 street centerline and address data must be updated and reconciled with existing ALI and Master Street Address Guide (MSAG) records. Statewide Emergency Notification System: CT Alert is a statewide emergency notification system (ENS), also referred to as reverse 911. The system provides critical information to residents during emergencies and dangerous situations. It has two main components: 1. Allows authorized users in public safety answering points to quickly send out emergency alerts to residents in an affected area. 2. Allows PSAPs to send messages to emergency response personnel. Division Salaries and Operating Expenses Subsidies: Subsidies provide funding for emergency telecommunications directly supporting 911 for the following: 1. 23 cities with populations over 40,000 2. 5 regional PSAPs (3 of more municipalities) 3. 9 multi-town PSAPs (two municipalities) 4. Connecticut State Police (CSP) PSAPs. Eight primary PSAPs located in CSP troops, are responsible for the receipt and dispatch of over 362,923 calls annually (approximately 22% of the total 911 calls) 5. Coordinated Medical Emergency Direction (CMED) which provides mutual aid and ambulance to hospital communications. Transition Grants to enable PSAP consolidation. Connecticut currently has 107 PSAPs serving 169 municipalities. Like other states, CT strongly supports the concept of reducing the number of stand-alone PSAPs in order to improve efficiency and overall safety of the public and first responders. In an effort to incentivize regionalization and provide some financial support of significant upfront costs, municipalities may apply for transition grants. Capital Expense Grants. Regional PSAPs and the 23 funded municipalities are eligible for Capital Expense Grant funding. Funding requires a 50% match and must be used directly for 911 expenses e.g. computer aided dispatch, records management systems, consoles, and services and labor needed for new equipment. Funding for the Department of Public Health (DPH). Funding provided is used by DPH’s Office of Emergency Medical Services for data collection, enhanced software and equipment to track and analyze 911 calls and dispatch times, medical response and transport times, call volume and incident types. State 911 Training and Certification. Connecticut requires that anyone who is employed as a public safety telecommunicator must be trained and certified by the State. Training includes all elements or the Recommended Minimum Training Guidelines established by a workgroup led by the National 911 Program. Emergency Medical Dispatch Training (EMD). EMD is an essential component of medical dispatch, the dispatcher can quickly determine the nature, priority and appropriate medical response. Connecticut requires that all PSAPs provide emergency medical dispatch to 911 callers, and provide pre-arrival instruction when appropriate. Funding of EMD includes training and certification of 911 telecommunicators. Public Education. Public Education efforts have been used for a number of 911 services, including appropriate use of 911 for children. Most recently the State developed a comprehensive public education campaign (radio, television and social media) for Text-to-911. Based on documented ‘saves’ and overall public awareness of this critical service, this initiative was highly successful. Fiber Optic Safety Data Network (PSDN). The Public Safety Data Network (PSDN) is an ultra-high speed fiber optic data network that is maintained by the State of Connecticut. It serves as the base NG911 transport infrastructure and interconnectivity pathway connecting each of the PSAPs in the state. Public Safety Answering Point Training Funds. PSAPs are eligible for reimbursement of 911 emergency telecommunications training and related costs. Examples of appropriate use are: memberships to professional organizations, conference registration and travel for professional organizations such as the National Emergency Number Association (NENA) and the Association of Public Safety Communications Organization (APCO), and for advanced training for specific call types such as active shooter, suicidal callers and domestic violence. P-25 Switch. The P-25 Switch connects every PSAP and provides disaster recovery functionality, specifically, critical communications, interoperability and connectivity in the event of a PSAP failure. Language Interpretation Services. The State of Connecticut provides interpretation services to each PSAP for non-English speaking callers. It’s estimated that 25% of CT residents use English as their second language. The services are restricted to 911 callers (the service is not intended to be used for police investigations).</p>
DE	<p>Per Delaware Code Title 16 Chapter 101 Subsection 10104. Disbursements from the Fund. (a) Disbursements from the Fund shall be made for the following purposes.</p>

State	Statement Describing Use of Funds
	<p>(1) Nonrecurring costs, including but not limited to costs for purchasing and installing the customer premises terminal equipment ("CPE") required to establish or upgrade public safety answering points, purchasing E-911 network equipment or upgrading equipment as required to ensure proper functioning of the E-911 service and related software, developing wireless data bases, and initial training in the use of CPE equipment.</p> <p>(2) Recurring costs, including but not limited to costs for network access fees and other telephone charges, software, equipment, data base management, maintenance and improvement, public education, language translation services, ongoing training in the use of CPE equipment, and network and equipment maintenance.</p> <p>(3) Expenses of the Board and the Department of Safety and Homeland Security incurred under this chapter for the purposes of administering the Fund and expenses incurred in connection with the Board's responsibilities under Chapter 100 of this title.</p> <p>(b) Each county shall receive an amount from the Fund equal to \$0.50 per month, less the costs identified in § 10103(g) of this title, 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. Disbursements from the Fund shall be made to the counties by the fifteenth day of the month following the month in which the wireline residential surcharges are deposited into the Fund by the provider. The amount disbursed to a county for any calendar year shall be subject to a true up at the end of the such year to reflect the amount received by the county in calendar year 2000 from E-911 surcharges but only in the event that such amount is greater than the amount disbursed from the Fund to the county in the current calendar year. 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	<p>Florida Statutes establish and implement a comprehensive statewide emergency telecommunications number system that provides telecommunications users dialing 911 within the state with rapid, direct access to public safety agencies. Pursuant to Florida Statutes, the State E911 Plan and administrative rules provide for the allocation of E911 fee revenue to counties. Counties may use the fee revenue to contract 911 services. The allocated fee revenue pays certain costs for county and local jurisdiction public safety answering points, NG911, E911, and 911 systems. E911 service includes 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. The State E911 Plan, including individual county 911 plans and E911 functions, ensures 911 systems are operational and maintained in counties statewide. The E911 Board receives funds for the operating costs and expenses of managing, administrating, overseeing receipts and E911 Trust Fund disbursements, and for other activities as defined in section 365.172(6), Florida Statutes. Based on sworn invoices, E911 funds reimburse wireless service providers for their actual costs of providing E911 service. Reimbursement includes the costs of complying with FCC orders and costs and expenses to design, purchase, lease, program, install, test, upgrade, operate, and maintain all necessary data, hardware, and software required to provide E911 service.</p>
GA	<p>(f) (1) In addition to cost recovery as provided in subsection (e) of this Code section, money from the Emergency Telephone System Fund shall be used only to pay for:</p> <p>(A) The lease, purchase, or maintenance of emergency telephone equipment, including necessary computer hardware, software, and data base provisioning; addressing; and nonrecurring costs of establishing a 9-1-1 system;</p> <p>(B) The rates associated with the service supplier's 9-1-1 service and other service supplier's recurring charges;</p> <p>(C) The actual cost, according to generally accepted accounting principles, of salaries and employee benefits incurred by the local government for employees hired by the local government solely for the operation and maintenance of the emergency 9-1-1 system and employees who work as directors as that term is defined in Code Section 46-5-138.2, whether such employee benefits are purchased directly from a third-party insurance carrier, funded by the local government's self-funding risk program, or funded by the local government's participation in a group self-insurance fund. As used in this paragraph, the term 'employee benefits' means health benefits, disability benefits, death benefits, accidental death and dismemberment benefits, pension benefits, retirement benefits, workers' compensation, and such other benefits as the local government may provide. Said term shall also include any post-employment benefits the local government may provide;</p> <p>(D) The actual cost, according to generally accepted accounting principles, of training employees hired by the local government solely for the operation and maintenance of the emergency 9-1-1 system and employees who work as directors as that term is defined in Code Section 46-5-138.2;</p> <p>(E) Office supplies of the public safety answering points used directly in providing emergency 9-1-1 system services;</p> <p>(F) The cost of leasing or purchasing a building used as a public safety answering point. Moneys from the fund shall not be used for the construction or lease of an emergency 9-1-1 system building until the local government has completed its street addressing plan;</p> <p>(G) The lease, purchase, or maintenance of computer hardware and software used at a public safety answering point, including computer-assisted dispatch systems and automatic vehicle location systems;</p> <p>(H) Supplies directly related to providing emergency 9-1-1 system services, including the cost of printing emergency 9-1-1 system public education materials; and</p> <p>(I) The lease, purchase, or maintenance of logging recorders used at a public safety answering point to record telephone and radio traffic.</p> <p>(2) (A) In addition to cost recovery as provided in subsection (e) of this Code section, money from the Emergency Telephone System Fund may be used to pay for those purposes set forth in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, if:</p> <p>(i) The local government's 9-1-1 system provides enhanced 9-1-1 service;</p> <p>(ii) The revenues from the 9-1-1 charges or wireless enhanced 9-1-1 charges in the local government's Emergency Telephone System Fund at the end of any fiscal year shall be projected to exceed the cost of providing enhanced 9- 1-1 services as authorized in subparagraphs (A) through (I) of paragraph (1) of this subsection and the cost of providing enhanced 9-1-1 services as authorized in subparagraphs (A) through (I) of paragraph (1) of this subsection includes a reserve amount equal to at least 10 percent of the previous year's expenditures; and</p> <p>(iii) Funds for such purposes are distributed pursuant to an intergovernmental agreement between the local governments whose citizens are served by the emergency 9-1-1 system proportionately by population as determined by the most recent decennial census</p>

State	Statement Describing Use of Funds
	<p>published by the United States Bureau of the Census at the time such agreement is entered into.</p> <p>(B) Pursuant to subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, the Emergency Telephone System Fund may be used to pay for:</p> <p>(i) The actual cost, according to generally accepted accounting principles, of insurance purchased by the local government to insure against the risks and liability in the operation and maintenance of the emergency 9-1-1 system on behalf of the local government or on behalf of employees hired by the local government solely for the operation and maintenance of the emergency 9-1-1 system and employees who work as directors as that term is defined in Code Section 46-5-138.2, whether such insurance is purchased directly from a third-party insurance carrier, funded by the local government's self-funding risk program, or funded by the local government's participation in a group self-insurance fund. As used in this division, the term 'cost of insurance' shall include, but shall not be limited to, any insurance premiums, unit fees, and broker fees paid for insurance obtained by the local government;</p> <p>(ii) The lease, purchase, or maintenance of a mobile communications vehicle and equipment, if the primary purpose and designation of such vehicle is to function as a backup 9-1-1 system center;</p> <p>(iii) The allocation of indirect costs associated with supporting the 9-1-1 system center and operations as identified and outlined in an indirect cost allocation plan approved by the local governing authority that is consistent with the costs allocated within the local government to both governmental and business-type activities;</p> <p>(iv) The lease, purchase, or maintenance of mobile public safety voice and data equipment, geo-targeted text messaging alert systems, or towers necessary to carry out the function of 9-1-1 system operations; and</p> <p>(v) The lease, purchase, or maintenance of public safety voice and data communications systems located in the 9-1-1 system facility that further the legislative intent of providing the highest level of emergency response service on a local, regional, and state-wide basis, including equipment and associated hardware and software that support the use of public safety wireless voice and data communication systems.</p>
HI	<p>For Calendar Year 2022, The State of Hawaii Enhanced 911 Board has not funded any activities, programs, and organizations that would be in violation of Chapter 138 of Hawaii Revised Statutes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Purchase and maintenance of all necessary computer hardware and software to provide technical functionality for Enhanced 911 Services. - Maintenance and Telecommunications Expenses. - Training of personnel for any New and Emerging Technologies related to Enhanced 911 Services. - Enhanced 911 Communications Service cost allowed to be reimbursed in relation to Chapter 138 Hawaii Revised Statutes Section 138-4. - Enhanced 911 Board Administrative costs including travel, consulting, and telecommunications.
IA	<p>The State collects wireless and prepaid surcharge remittances 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 Boards directly collect Wireline Surcharge.</p> <p>In all cases, 911 surcharge is to be used for the receipt and disposition of a 911 call.</p> <p>The State also pays recurring costs for transport costs between legacy selective routers and PSAPs. The State pays for ALI database information on a quarterly basis. The state reimburses wireless carriers for up to 10% of the surcharge generated to recover their actual costs associated with Phase 1 delivery. This will sunset in 2026 per Iowa Code.</p> <p>The State has a contract with Comtech Telecommunications System for Next-Gen Core Services to the PSAPs, ESInet monitoring and management of NG911 in Iowa. This includes two call logic centers.</p> <p>The State utilizes the Iowa Communications Network for the ESInet.</p> <p>The State has also entered into a contract with GeoComm to provide end-to-end GIS services as part of Next Gen upgrades. County 911 Service Boards submit their data to the statewide portal as needed as part of the overall GIS project.</p> <p>The State has a contract with Zetron to provide Customer Premise Equipment (CPE) at little to no charge to PSAPs wishing to opt into a host/remote call-taking environment. However, local jurisdictions are able to select vendors for their internal PSAP systems (CAD, CPE, recorder etc.)</p> <p>HSEMD offered local jurisdictions GIS grants for the purpose of NG911 GIS data creation, remediation, and maintenance. The total available to counties was \$12,000 per PSAP once data accuracy benchmarks were reached.</p> <p>There is also \$100,000 statewide allocated to 911 Council member travel, Public Education, and telecommunicator training. Any unused State funds are passed through to the PSAPs for expenses associated with the receipt and disposition of 911 calls.</p>
ID	[DNF]
IL	<p>The State's 9-1-1 fees support all 9-1-1 related activities throughout the State. The majority of the fees collected are passed through from the State to local, inter-governmental and county 9-1-1 Authorities to support their 9-1-1 operation. These funds may be used for 9-1-1 expenditures as legislatively defined and can include Telecommunicator salaries, 9-1-1 equipment costs, lease expenses, radio system infrastructure and mapping expenses, etc. The State pays 9-1-1 System Providers directly for 9-1-1 network expenses incurred by the local and county 9-1-1 Systems.</p>
IN	<p>The Statewide 911 Board expended funds as follows: 1. To pay the board's expenses in administering [sic] this chapter and 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 calls 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.</p>
KS	<p>Collected 911 fees were utilized by the PSAPs for purchases totaling \$23,494,356 in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of 911 services – 4.0% of total expenditures • Purchase of 911 equipment and upgrades – 21.5% of total expenditures • Maintenance and license fees for 911 equipment – 25.9% of total

State	Statement Describing Use of Funds
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • expenditures • Training of PSAP personnel – 2.0% of total expenditures • Monthly recurring charges billed by service suppliers – 44.2% of total expenditures • Installation, service establishment and nonrecurring start-up charges billed by the service supplier – 0.3% of total expenditures • Charges for capital improvements and equipment or other physical enhancements to the 911 system – 2.2% of total expenditures • The original acquisition and installation of road signs designed to aid in the delivery of emergency service – 0.0% of total expenditures <p>Additionally, the Council expended \$7,792,383, in state operation funds on the following statewide projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statewide NG911 System – 85.05% • Council Admin and other expenses – 2.31% • NG911 Program Support Services – 8.23% • GIS and program technical support – 4.40%
KY	<p>The expenditure of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes by the Kentucky 911 Services Board is controlled by a statutory formula. The organizations that 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. 85% of the \$30 million collected annually is sent directly to PSAPs through a statutory formula 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, which currently stands at 116, including all 16 state police 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 and 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>5% of wireless funds expended by the Board go to restricted Next Generation 911 Technology fund for Board-funded, statewide NG911 projects and services.</p> <p>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 travel expenses. This fund 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	<p>Within Louisiana Revised Statutes 33:9101 through 33:9129, parish governing bodies were granted the authority to create Communications Districts by ordinance. Once created, Communications Districts became political subdivisions of the state. By statute, these districts were created for the express purpose of implementing and maintaining the 9-1-1 emergency reporting systems. It also gave districts the authority to provide for other communication enhancements, which will enable law enforcement and public safety agencies to decrease response time and improve effectiveness, when citizens call for help in an emergency. Furthermore, provisions of the statutes allow for the funding of Next Generation 9-1-1, Enhanced 9-1-1, 9-1-1 call taking, dispatch, and telecommunication systems for first responders and for other lawful purposes of communications districts.</p> <p>As outlined within the existing statutes, LA R. S. 33:9105 the 9-1-1 emergency telephone systems in the state shall be designed to have the capability of utilizing at least one of the following four methods in response to emergency calls:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) 'Direct dispatch method', that is a telephone service to a centralized dispatch center providing for the dispatch of an appropriate emergency service unit upon receipt of a telephone request for such services and a decision as to the proper action to be taken. (2) 'Relay method', that is a telephone service whereby pertinent information is noted by the recipient of a telephone request for emergency services, and is relayed to appropriate public safety agencies or other providers of emergency services for dispatch of an emergency service unit. (3) 'Transfer method', that is a telephone service that receives telephone requests for emergency services and directly transfers such requests to an appropriate public safety agency or other provider of emergency services. (4) 'Referral method', that is a telephone service that, upon the receipt of a telephone request for emergency services, provides the requesting party with the telephone number of the appropriate public safety agency or other provider of emergency services. <p>The governing authority of the district shall select the method that it determines to be the most feasible for the parish. The enactment of Act 550 of 1983 confirmed that Louisiana had elected to implement its 9-1-1 systems on a parish-by-parish basis. Furthermore, the incorporation of four general methods of operation was a recognition that the needs and abilities of the parishes varied.</p> <p>Funding of 9-1-1 systems in Louisiana is primarily through the imposition of an emergency telephone service fee on each telephone subscriber. The fee is reflected on the subscriber's phone bill and is collected by the service provider, who remits the surcharge fee to the Communications District. As a political subdivision of the state of Louisiana, Communications Districts have the authority to also levy property tax or sales tax when so authorized by a vote of a majority of the persons voting within the district in accordance with law. In order to provide additional funding for the district, the governing authority may receive federal, state, parish, or municipal funds, as well as funds from private sources and may expend such funds for the purposes as outlined within the statute.</p>
MA	<p>Funds collected have been made available for the following activities, programs, and communities in Massachusetts for network, database and CPE; PSAP personnel; PSAP facilities; PSAP CAD and technology; dispatcher training; training materials and PSAP equipment. These funds have been made available to the communities by the Department directly purchasing, installing and maintaining next generation 911 customer premises equipment used by communities at local and regional PSAPs and through the Department developing and administering grant programs to assist PSAPs and regional emergency communications centers in providing next generation 911 service and fostering the development of regional PSAPs, regional secondary PSAPs and regional</p>

State	Statement Describing Use of Funds
	emergency communications centers. Funds collected have also been expended for the Department’s training and public education programs, for Department’s disability access programs, and for administrative costs required to support all programs. These activities and programs support 911 and next generation 911 services by providing funding for PSAPs to meet the minimum training and certification requirements for E911 telecommunicators, including emergency medical dispatch requirements, and are used for the support of 911.
MD	<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, cybersecurity, mapping, furniture, system amintenance [sic], recurring network charges 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 9-1-1 Board. The Maryland 9-1-1 Board is defined under Maryland Public Safety Article §1-305 and §1-306.</p> <p>County 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	<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. In 2020, the system went through a total refresh. The Emergency Services Communication Bureau administers the program, which includes a contract for NG911Services. 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 24 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.</p> <p>For calendar year 2022, funds were expended or obligated for the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative expenses of the Emergency Services Communication Bureau • Statewide Contract for NG911 Services • Quality Assurance Program • Consulting Services for 911 crisis response protocol and procedures planning, and NG911 planning • Community Addressing and Mapping Support • Training and related expenses 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 • Grants to support consolidation of dispatch only emergency communications centers (secondary PSAPs) into Primary PSAPs
MI	<p>Under MCL 484.1408(4) Statutory distribution of the state 911 fee is distributed as follows: 65% goes to counties to fund 911 operations. 25.56% is used to pay the 911 service providers for the delivery of calls to the PSAPs under Michigan Public Service Commission (MPSC) Docket U-14000 and for IP-based 911 (NG911) under MPSC docket U-20146. 5.5% is for PSAP training funds. 1.5% funds the Michigan State Police PSAPs. 2.44% funds the State 911 Office.</p> <p>MCL 484.1406(1) Further states, ‘The funds collected and expended under this act must be expended exclusively for 911 services and in compliance with the rules promulgated under section 413.’</p> <p>MCL 484.1408(4)(a) also authorizes the State 911 Committee to require repayment of the use of funds considered unreasonable or unnecessary, ‘...A county shall use money received by the county under this subdivision for 911 services as allowed under this act. A county shall repay to the fund any money expended under this subdivision for a purpose considered unnecessary or unreasonable by the committee or the auditor general.’</p>
MN	<p>Funds may be used by PSAPs to maintain and enhance public safety for public safety responders and citizens of Minnesota as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lease, purchase, lease-purchase, or maintain enhanced 911 telephone equipment • Lease, purchase, lease-purchase, or maintain enhanced 911 recording equipment • Lease, purchase, lease-purchase, or maintain enhanced 911 computer hardware • Computer hardware/software for database provisioning, addressing, mapping and any other software necessary for automatic phone and location identification • Trunk lines • Master Street Address Guide and Statewide geospatial dataset creation/aggregation/standardization • Dispatcher operational skills and equipment proficiency training • Equipment in the PSAP for community alert systems • Equipment necessary in the PSAP used to notify and communicate with emergency services requested by the 911
MO	Missouri 911 Service Board funds a Grant and Loan program for PSAPs in the State that apply to enhance 911 service in their area.
MS	[No Response]
MT	WIRELESS PROVIDER E9-1-1 COST RECOVERY AND LOCAL AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS PSAP OPERATIONAL EXPENDTURES
NC	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 the calendar year 2022 to: 114 primary PSAPs and 11 secondary PSAPs for the costs of providing E911 services in their jurisdictions; two CMRS providers for cost recovery of providing E911; 16 PSAP grants for the enhancement of their 911 systems; five Statewide grants to benefit all PSAPs in North Carolina; and 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

State	Statement Describing Use of Funds
	define that the expenditures must be in support of providing E911 services. Those expenditures are reviewed and approved by the 911 Board staff and reviewed by the North Carolina State Auditor.
ND	[No Response]
NE	<p>911 surcharge revenues collected on landline and VoIP service funds are utilized under the discretion of the local authority for the purchase, installation, maintenance, and operation of telecommunications equipment and telecommunications-related services required for the provision of 911 service. The Public Service Commission does not have access to information regarding specific local expenditures.</p> <p>The Nebraska Public Service Commission utilizes 911 surcharge revenues collected on wireless service to (1) provide direct funding to 68 public safety answering points to pay costs incurred to provide 911 service across the state; (2) reimburse wireless service providers to implement enhanced 911 service in the State of Nebraska; (3) pay the cost to establish and maintain Text-to-911 service; (4) pay the costs for a statewide ESInet and NG 911 Core Services, (5) pay the cost of selective routing and database management services provided to PSAPs by local exchange carriers, (6) pay the cost of developing statewide GIS data to enhance 911 call routing and location accuracy, (7) pay consulting costs associated with the transition to next-generation 911 ('NG911'), (8) pay for a statewide MIS reporting service available to all Nebraska PSAPs, and (9) pay administrative costs</p>
NH	<p>The Division of Emergency Services and Communications operates New Hampshire's Enhanced 911 System, along with affiliated mapping, technical, administrative, and radio communications maintenance roles.</p> <p>The mission of the Division of Emergency Services and Communications is 'to locate, communicate, and connect people in an emergency with the help they need'.</p> <p>The Division of Emergency Services and Communications provides instant access to police, fire and emergency medical assistance from any wired, cellular or VoIP telephone in the state. The Division provides all network connections, equipment and training on its use at the local dispatch centers. For those local dispatch centers that choose to use it, the Division provides CAD software or interfaces with software for call handling.</p> <p>The Division also provides mapping and addressing services to the cities and towns, including all roads, streets, highways, and interstates as well as building addresses. The New Hampshire E911 System provides a nationally-accredited, state-of-the-art emergency service response to residents and visitors to the state.</p>
NJ	<p>9-1-1 SYSTEM AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE FEE (thousands)</p> <p>The estimated revenue from the mobile telecommunications service and telephone exchange service fee in fiscal year 2023 totals \$129.6 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</p> <p>Emergency Operations Center and Hamilton TechPlex Maintenance..... \$ 3,473</p> <p>Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness..... 14,542</p> <p>Rural Section Policing..... 87,002</p> <p>Urban Search and Rescue..... 1,000</p> <p>Division of State Police - Remaining Operating Budget..... 328,287</p> <p>Department of Military and Veterans' Affairs</p> <p>Military Services - National Guard Support Services..... 4,617</p> <p>Department of the Treasury</p> <p>Office of Emergency Telecommunication Services (OETS)..... 4,000</p> <p>Statewide 9-1-1 Emergency Telecommunication System..... 13,822</p> <p>Public Safety Answering Point Upgrades and Consolidation..... 10,000</p> <p>Total, State Appropriations..... \$ 466,743</p>
NM	<p>The E-911 Program provides funding for the purchase, lease, installation and maintenance of E911 equipment, telecommunicator training, database preparation, database updates, compliance with federal communications commission (FCC) requirements for phase I and phase II wireless E911 service, and E911 network costs as necessary for an E911 system. The E-911 Bureau establishes grant agreements with 42 PSAP's (Public Service Answering Points) through their fiscal agent. 42 PSAPs include municipally [sic] and county operated PSAPs, tribal PSAPs, and State Police PSAPs.</p>
NV	<p>Mineral County - Use E911 funds to upgrade 911 equipment. Also use funds for officers body worn cameras, and pay monthly 911 phone bills.</p> <p>Consolidated Municipality of Carson City NV- AT&T 911 System monthly charges, Smart 911 Services, Computer Aided dispatch maintenance and upgrades, law enforcement body cameras, law enforcement vehicle cameras, electrical upgrade for 911 communications center, Bryx fire toning system implementation and replacement, fire RMS implementation and replacement.</p> <p>Douglas County - The Douglas County 9-1-1 Emergency Services Department has collected all revenue from the 75 cent per month surcharge on wireless and wireline telephones. All funds that were collected have been used to support the provision of E9-1-1 call taking [sic] and dispatching services to the public safety agencies (including law enforcement, fire, and Emergency Medical Services) based in Douglas County, NV.</p> <p>Lyon County - Has expended surcharge funds for leasing a dispatch phone system, phone lines into dispatch, mobile data computers and associated hotspots to communicate with the CAD system, and mobile radios to communicate with Dispatch.</p> <p>White Pine County - Current plan is to obtain upgrades and maintenance of system.</p>
NY	<p>The Enhanced Emergency Telephone System Surcharge and Wireless Emergency Communications Surcharge are managed entirely within the local unit of government. OIEC does not have the authority to require reporting by local governments and therefore cannot identify with specificity all activities, programs, and organizations supported by the county surcharges.</p>
OH	<p>State collected funds from the 25 cent cell phone surcharge are used as follows:</p> <p>1% kept by Department of Taxation to process fund collection and disbursement</p> <p>2% to fund ESInet Steering Committee and DAS Ohio 9-1-1 Program Office</p>

State	Statement Describing Use of Funds
	97% Disbursed to county by formula originally developed by the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio. These funds are used for 9-1-1 equipment, training, personnel, etc. *Local funding (levies, sales tax, general funds, etc.) make up the bulk of funding for local 9-1-1 operations.
OK	Both Wireline and Wireless fees can be used for services, equipment and operations of the 9-1-1 Emergency Telephone System. The fee can be used for equipment and services needed to connect the voice call to the 9-1-1 center and provide accurate location data to the Emergency Telecommunicator. This includes connections fees, trunk lines, 9-1-1 equipment, GIS services, etc. The fee can also be used for operations of the 9-1-1 Emergency Telephone system which can include ancillary systems to manage the emergency telephone call and the salary and benefits of the 9-1-1 call takers, technical or administrative staff. A Public Safety Answering Point must meet four Statutory requirements in order to receive wireless funding (§63-2864.4). They include; providing Phase II wireless services; meet NENA standards for call taking and caller location services; comply with reports and audits; comply with the requirements of the 9-1-1 Management Authority Act or procedures established by the Authority.
OR	The 9-1-1 tax collected by the Department of Revenue which funds the 0.6%, 2.4%, 35%, and 60% (remaining) described in section C, question number 3, 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	Per 35 Pa.C.S. § 5304, each county is to ensure the provision of a 911 system in the county’s respective jurisdiction. Pennsylvania counties are the primary recipients and beneficiaries of funds collected for 911 purposes. A county may provide a 911 system to the county’s jurisdiction through participation in a regional 911 system. Of the 911 revenue collected, at least eighty-three (83) percent is directed to Pennsylvania counties via quarterly formula based payments. Fifteen (15) percent shall be used to establish, enhance, operate or maintain statewide interconnectivity of 911 systems including next generation 911 service in Pennsylvania. Up to two (2) percent of revenue collections may be retained by the PA Emergency Management Agency to pay for agency expenses directly related to administering the provisions of the 911 legislation. All 911 surcharge revenue is restricted to 911 use only for 911 system operations, systems, and services.
RI	As noted in question 2, monthly surcharges on devices with connectivity to the Rhode Island E-911 Uniform Emergency Telephone System are authorized in accordance with state law, to wit: RIGL §39- 21.1-14, RIGL §39-21.2-4. Effective October 1, 2019 all surcharge revenue is deposited into a restricted receipt account as the exclusive revenue source of the Rhode Island E-911 agency. The expenditure of funds is authorized by the Rhode Island State Legislature, State of Rhode Island Budget Office, and the Rhode Island Department of Public Safety. Statutory language provides that 100% of funds allocated to RI E-911 collected are deposited into a restricted receipt account. RIGL §39-21.1-14(d). The FY 2022 budget running from July 1, 2021 thru June 30, 2022 was \$8,663,087. Personnel costs accounted for 71.2% of our budget amounting to \$6,171,455 and operating costs accounting for 28.8% amounting to \$2,491,632. The FY 2023 budget running from July 1, 2022 thru June 30, 2023 is \$8,413,240 with personnel costs amounting to \$6,339,305 and operating costs amounting to \$2,073,935. Due to the fact that Rhode Island is unique, (strictly a transfer agency), the nodes of our state funded network extend into the local PSAP’s [sic] for real time call information for proper dispatching.
SC	[No Response]
SD	Local PSAPs are allowed to expend 911 surcharge funds on personnel costs, CPE, CAD, radio, mapping, recorders, workstation equipment, training, consoles, HVAC, building rental maintenance, 911 trunks, and uniforms. Most any costs within the walls of the PSAP or directly related to operating 911 are allowable. The purchase, upkeep and utilization of this equipment allows the PSAPs to provide efficient and effective handling of 911 related needs.
TN	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 .
TX	ACTIVITIES STATEWIDE 9-1-1 SERVICE: Planning, developing, provisioning, and/or enhancement of 9 1-1 service. POISON CONTROL SERVICES: Maintain high quality telephone poison referral and related service, including community programs and assistance, in Texas. 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. 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. EMERGENCY MEDICAL DISPATCH: Support the regional emergency medical dispatch resource center program. (Overseen by CSEC.)

State	Statement Describing Use of Funds
	<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>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 (4) standards-based system operations and procedures.</p> <p>For the CSEC state 9-1-1 Program, CSEC is developing and implementing a separate and distinct Next Generation 9-1-1 Program to establish standards and rules for the participating RPCs; including establishing standards for interconnectivity and interoperability with other NG9-1-1 systems. Additionally, CSEC is revising its existing RPC monitoring program as NG9-1-1 evolves to include: Programmatic Financial Audits; RPC 9-1-1 Information Security (InfoSec) Compliance; and NG9-1-1 Data Quality. (Target completion date for both is 2023.)</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> <p>NEXT GENERATION 9-1-1: Utilizing the NG9-1-1 Fund, funded with federal funds, support the deployment and reliable operation of next generation 9-1-1 service, including the costs of equipment, operations, and administration. Money in the fund may be distributed to CSEC and ECDs and must be used in accordance with federal law. (NG9-1-1 Fund expires on December 31, 2028.)</p> <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>The Texas Legislature enacted the statewide poison control program in 1993. Per the enabling statute (Texas Health and Safety Code Chapter 777), specifically § 777.002, each PSAP in the state must ‘have direct telephone access to at least one poison control center’ and ‘shall be available through all 9-1-1 services in the region.’ To implement, each Texas PSAP has the ability to ‘one-button’ conference in an RPCC as appropriate on a 9-1-1 call. The toll-free poison hotline helps to reduce the number of non-emergency calls to 9-1-1. One-button transfer helps to ensure the appropriate response to a 9-1-1 call involving a potential poisoning—including overdoses caused by opiates and other licit or illicit drugs or chemicals (e.g., Tide-pods). State funding of the statewide poison control program is provided solely from the statewide equalization surcharge (Health and Safety Code § 771.072) and the program is administered by CSEC.</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. (Tex. Health & Safety Code Ann. § 771.102) PSAPs subscribe to emergency medical dispatch services provided by the resource center. (CSEC oversees the program.)</p> <p>The Texas Legislature enacted the statewide emergency medical dispatch program in 2001 in which:</p> <p>[E]mergency medical dispatchers located in regional emergency medical dispatch resource centers are used to provide life-saving and other emergency medical instructions to persons who need guidance while awaiting the arrival of emergency medical personnel. The purpose of a regional emergency medical dispatch resource center is not to dispatch personnel or equipment resources but 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 (emphasis added).</p> <p>In order to participate, a public safety answering point (PSAP) must agree to participate in any required training and to provide regular reports required by CSEC for the program; and must:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) have a fully functional quality assurance program that measures each emergency medical dispatcher ‘s compliance with the medical protocol; (2) have dispatch personnel who meet the requirements for emergency medical dispatcher certification or the equivalent as determined by the Department of State Health Services; (3) use emergency medical dispatch protocols approved by a physician medical director knowledgeable in emergency medical dispatch; (4) have sufficient experience in providing pre-arrival instructions; and (5) have sufficient resources to handle the additional workload and responsibilities of the program. <p>CSEC, with the assistance of an advisory council, defines the criteria establishing the need for emergency medical dispatch intervention to be used by participating PSAPs to determine which calls are to be transferred to the regional emergency medical dispatch resource center for emergency medical dispatch intervention.</p>

State	Statement Describing Use of Funds
	<p>CSEC contracts with the Montgomery County Hospital District (MCHD) as the sole emergency medical dispatch resource center at a cost of less than \$110,000 for each Texas biennium. (For CY 2019, MCHD provided emergency medical dispatch to seven 9-1-1 Entities -- a total of 25 PSAPs -- on 4,332 9-1-1 calls.</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. (Tex. Health & Safety Code Ann. § 773.122(a) – (c))</p> <p>The Texas Legislature enacted the statewide Emergency Services Health Care Act in 1989 (the Act). In 1999, the Legislature amended the Act and Health and Safety Code § 771.072 to authorize the appropriation of equalization surcharge to fund ‘county and regional emergency medical services, designated trauma facilities, and trauma care systems.’</p> <p>The Texas Department of State Health Services (DSHS) implements the over \$250 million per biennium Emergency Medical Services (EMS)/Trauma program. For the 2022-2023 fiscal biennium ending on August 31, 2023, just over \$3.6 million in equalization surcharge was appropriated by the Texas Legislature to DSHS. (No other 9-1-1 related funding is provided to DSHS to implement the state EMS/Trauma program.)</p> <p>Subchapter F of the Act, Medical Information Provided by Certain Emergency Medical Services Call Takers, authorizes an ‘emergency medical services call taker’ to ‘provide medical information to a member of the public during an emergency call. The Act defines emergency medical services call taker to mean a ‘person who, as a volunteer or employee of a public agency, as that term is defined by Section 771.001, receives emergency calls.’* ‘Emergency call’ means a telephone call or other similar communication from a member of the public, as part of a 9-1-1 system or otherwise, made to obtain emergency medical services.’ (* Section 771.001 is the definitions section to Health and Safety Code Chapter 771, State Administration of Emergency Communications. This state law is CSEC’s enabling statute and one of two primary statutes governing the providing of 9-1-1 service; the other being Health and Safety Code Chapter 772 applicable to statutory Emergency Communication Districts.)</p> <p>Per the Act, only a qualified person that has successfully completed an emergency medical services call taker training program and holds a certificate is authorized to provide medical information to the public during an emergency call; and the information provided must substantially conform to the protocol for delivery of the information adopted by DSHS in a rule. The Act extends to EMS call takers the same state liability protection covering 9-1-1 call takers/telecommunicators under Civil Practices and Remedies Code § 101.032, 9-1-1 Emergency Service.</p> <p>DSHS adopted rules to implement the emergency medical services call taker training and certification program; specifically, Title 1, Part 1 Tex. Admin. Code Chapter 157, Subch. D § 157.49. The rule provides in part that a person who completes a department-approved training program, or whose credentials issued by an emergency medical dispatch certification agency, organization, or by another state as being equivalent to DSHS’ program may be certified as an EMS information operator for four years. (The terms ‘EMS information operator,’ ‘EMS operator,’ and ‘emergency medical services call taker’ are used interchangeably by DSHS.)</p> <p>Recertification requires the operator to maintain current CPR certification and complete a minimum of 12 hours of continuing education. (DSHS’ rule also includes requirements for EMS information operator instructor certification and training.)</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>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 CSEC state 9-1-1 Program in which 9-1-1 service is provided by 20 Regional Planning Commissions (RPCs). CSEC is directly involved in the RPCs’ 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 required to contract for the provision of 9-1-1 service. RPCs use state appropriated funds via grants from CSEC to purchase goods and services used to provide provision 9-1-1 service by PSAPs. By state law, use of 9-1-1 fees by an RPC for administration expenses of the CSEC state 9-1-1 Program is capped at \$10,000,000 for the biennium.</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 § 773.122(a) – (c).)</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,</p>

State	Statement Describing Use of Funds
	<p>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 consolidated PSAPs/emergency communications centers), 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 are often only a minor part of the funding needed to provide 9-1-1 service or operate an emergency communications center.</p> <p>9-1-1 Entities Generally (Application of the following varies by 9-1-1 entity, including each entity's determination as to whether telecommunicators/dispatchers are part of the costs of providing 9-1-1 service. E.g., for the CSEC state 9-1-1 Program, and most 772 ECDs, telecommunicators/dispatchers salaries/benefits and dispatch costs are not considered costs of providing 9-1-1 service. CSEC and the 772 ECDs do use 9-1-1 funds to pay for telecommunicator training.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operating Costs, Personnel Costs, Administrative Costs, Dispatch Costs • 911 Employees' salaries/benefits, training • Lease/Purchase, installation, operation, and maintenance of PSAP CPE • CAD system, mapping, radios, 911 PR activities, 9-1-1 furniture and equipment. Training, Administrative Assistant (assists with operational functions), IT positions (maintain, install, troubleshoot, and document all 911 technologies). Purchase, installation, operation, maintenance, and upgrade expenses of the 9-1-1 emergency services. • 911 public education program • Maintenance and support of the Emergency Callworks E911 Phone system • City's GIS department to maintain accurate CAD and 911 maps for call and responder routing • Monthly recurring expenses for phone/truck lines for 911 service • Quality assurance associated expenses as relates to 911 service <p>The City of Dallas uses the collected fees to operate and maintain the operations of the Primary and Secondary 911 Emergency Call Center (PSAPs) for the Dallas Police and Fire Rescue Departments. This includes all telephone circuits, computers and computer accessories, call processing and CAD hardware and software, call recording hardware and software, agent and call statistic reporting software, call and agent statistical dashboards, managed services and the salaries of the staff.</p> <p>City of Denison [sic] uses 9-1-1 fees for employees' salaries, training, equipment maintenance.</p> <p>Town of Highland Park uses all funds and fees directly to supporting 9-1-1. Examples include: maintenance for our phone system and recording system; cyber security; and very limited compensation for personnel.</p> <p>The City of Plano PSC expends funds only for the City of Plano PSC in support of providing E9-1-1 services and NG9-1-1 services. (Salaries, educational supplies and curriculum, travel expenses for 911 educational events, expenses for 911 related training ans [sic] associated travel expenses, computer equipment and software purchases/maintenance for 911, monthly recurring expenses for phone/trunk lines for 911, quality assurance associated expenses)</p> <p>City of Sherman 911 fees collected are used for the operation and maintenance of the emergency telephone/call handling system for public safety in the City of Sherman. The primary activities include personnel, supplies, maintenance and repairs to the 911 system, training, lease and service fees.</p> <p>City of Richardson 911 fees are used to pay for the 911 PSAP equipment, maintenance, support, and telecommunicator salaries.</p> <p>City of Longview E911 fees fund the operation of Public Safety Communications Admin and training teams, cover maintenance and operational fees on our 911 Calltaking system, professional development for all 911 calltakers, and our public education program.</p> <p>City of Wylie reported that per city ordinance, 9-1-1 service fees shall be utilized to provide for the purchase, installation, operation, and maintenance expenses of 9-1-1 services, including required personnel. The 9-1-1 service fee may only be imposed upon service users' local exchange access lines and equivalent local exchange access lines as defined in rulemaking by the Commission on State Emergency Communications. All 9-1-1 funds have been made available or used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism, or otherwise used for the implementation or support of 9-1-1.</p>
UT	<p>Regulations covering the oversight of the Unified Statewide 911 Emergency Service Account are found in Utah Code Ann. § 63H-7a-301, et. seq. Utah Communications Authority receives \$.25 per line for the purpose of Next Generation 9-1-1 planning, implementation, and maintenance.</p> <p>The E911 fee that UCA received paid for the following activities, programs, and organizations to support 911 and E911 services or enhancements of such services in 2022:</p> <p>Utah's NG911 project was underway throughout 2022. UCA paid for any non recurring [sic] charges, as well as monthly recurring [sic] charges for all PSAPs on the UCA Statewide NG911 contract throughout 2022.</p> <p>UCA also maintained the legacy 911 system through 3/31/2022, when the legacy statewide contract expired.</p> <p>UCA also maintained the legacy RFAI ESInet for 26 of 30 Utah PSAPs connections up to 3/31/2022, when the statewide contract expired.</p> <p>UCA maintained the legacy Selective Routers in Utah that analog PSAPs and RFAI PSAPs connected to in 2022, up to 3/31/2022, when the statewide contract expired.</p> <p>Text to 911 Services for 30 of 30 Utah PSAPs,</p> <p>ECaTS for Analytics purposes for all 30 Utah PSAPs, this contract was absorbed through the statewide NG911 project, and paid for in the monthly recurring [sic] charge to the NG911 provider.</p> <p>Consulting Services for NG9-1-1 Implementation of the contracted statewide i3 ESInet, NG Core Services and statewide Call Handling Solution for 2022.</p> <p>Reimbursements to PSAPs for any legacy CPE or legacy maintenance up to the expiration of the statewide contract 3/31/2022.</p>

State	Statement Describing Use of Funds
VA ⁸²	<p>The Wireless E-911 Fund provides funding for the Virginia Department of Emergency Management’s 9-1-1 and Geospatial Services Bureau (NGS). The NGS is a consolidated, centralized program for delivery of services to local government public safety and geospatial services. The NGS’s responsibilities fall into two primary categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 E9-1-1 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. <p>The NGS’s strategy is to focus on the following key components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>The services offered by the NGS fall into one of three categories:</p> <p>Consultative Services – Providing professional, unbiased technical assistance and consultation to customers.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
VT	<p>The Enhanced 911 Board has statutory responsibility for the design, installation, and operation of Vermont’s statewide 911 system. Our primary mission is to connect citizens with the appropriate emergency responders, including police, fire, and emergency medical service agencies, in order to help ensure citizens receive quick and effective assistance in the event of an emergency.</p>
WA	<p>RCW 38.52.520 specifies the duties of the State of Washington 911 Coordination Office. These duties include: Coordinating and facilitating the implementation and operation of 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 911 funding may be expended, efforts to modernize their (counties) existing 911 emergency communications systems; and 911 operational costs. RCW 38.52.540 further specifies that ‘Moneys in the (state 911 fund) account must be used only to support the statewide coordination and management of the 911 system, for the implementation of wireless 911 statewide, for the modernization of 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 911 service and reimbursement of radio communications service companies for costs incurred in providing wireless 911 service pursuant to negotiated contracts between the counties or their agents and the radio communications service companies’. Additionally, ‘the state 911 coordinator, with the advice and assistance of the 911 advisory committee, is authorized to enter into statewide agreements to improve the efficiency of 911 services for all counties and shall specify by rule the additional purposes for which moneys, if available, may be expended from this account’.</p> <p>During calendar year 2022, the State of Washington expended funds to maintain the current statewide NG911 Emergency Services IP Network (ESInet) and Next Generation 911 Core Services (NGCS), county 911 operational and equipment replacement/modernization costs, statewide training programs for telecommunicators, as well as statewide 911 planning and collaboration.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Statewide training programs include: Telecommunicator training (basic and advanced), Public [sic] Safety Communications Center Supervisor (PSCCS), Telecommunicator Emergency Response Team (TERT), and Communications training officer (CTO) program; Funding to counties to support local telecommunicator training programs, county 911 coordinator training and national conference participation, and CTO trainer salary reimbursement.</p>
WI	<p>Each county in Wisconsin have entered into a contract with participating local exchange carriers to provide its 911 telecommunications network. These 911 contracts specify in detail the design of the telecommunications network supporting the local 911 service, authorizes a 911 surcharge on landlines based on population 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 911 network expenses are pooled and all landline telephone subscribers in a county pay the same amount for the 911 surcharge. The 911 contract identifies how much expense each participating local exchange carrier has incurred to provide and maintain the 911 telecommunications network, and in turn specifies how much money each participating carrier may take as compensation from the pooled 911 surcharge collection.</p>

⁸² In addition to wireless E911 surcharges, Virginia also collects a landline E911 tax and a Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) E911 tax. Virginia Response at 6, 9-10; *see generally* Virginia Tax, Communications Taxes, <https://www.tax.virginia.gov/communications-taxes> (last visited Dec. 15, 2023). Virginia indicates that it is unable to provide data on these fees or their use. Virginia Response at 6. Based on the materials currently available, the Bureau has insufficient information to make any finding regarding fee diversion for these landline and VoIP E911 taxes. The Bureau again requests that, in the future, Virginia provide clearer information about the collection, tracking, and expenditure of these landline and VoIP E911 taxes, particularly at the local level. In addition, based on the statements Virginia has made in this year’s response, Virginia should consider stronger controls over expenditure of these funds once they are distributed to localities. Virginia Response at 3, 6.

State	Statement Describing Use of Funds												
	Some counties have elected to purchase a separate telecommunications network for its wireless 911 service. The counties that have elected to purchase a separate wireless 911 network pay for that second network through the county and municipal budget. No portion of the funds collected from the 911 surcharge is shared with any state, county, or municipal agency or department, or any other governmental entity. The 911 surcharge is limited to the recovery of the telecommunications network expense for providing the 911 service by the participating local exchange carriers. County and municipal expenses related to terminating and responding to 911 calls is paid for through the respective county and municipal budgets.												
WV	These funds, when remitted to the WV-PSC for distribution to the County Commissions of the State, are remitted in accordance with the provisions of W.Va. Code §2-6-6b(b) and (c). The WV-PSC passes through all money it collects. The WV-PSC does not charge an administrative fee or otherwise retain any portion of the money. The telecommunications service providers retain a three-percent (3%) billing and collection fee before remitting the fees collected to the WV-PSC. 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 WV-PSC is statutorily restricted. W. Va. Code 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. Each county receives a quarterly disbursement of the funds collected by the WV-PSC. See Answer in question D.2a for allowable expenditures.												
WY	Funds collected from the 911 emergency tax imposed pursuant to this chapter 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: 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 database of the public safety answering point.												
Other Jurisdictions													
AS	[No Response]												
DC	The Fund was used to pay for personnel, technology hardware, software and software maintenance, contractual support, outreach, training, supplies, and equipment costs necessary to provide the 911 and 311 systems.												
Guam	The Guam Fire Department (GFD), an agency of the Government of Guam has obligated and expended funds collected for E911 purposes. Through Public Law 23-77, §84121, (c), GFD was designated as the lead agency with the authority and responsibility to administer and operate the emergency 911 telephone communications system (E911). Thus, the E911 Division/Bureau was created within the Guam Fire Department. Furthermore, GFD is required, as part of its proposed annual budget, to submit personnel, supplies, equipment and other needs, to efficiently operate and maintain the E911 System. The funding needs are provided from the E911 Emergency System Reporting Funds. There are no other activities, programs, organizations or government agency that has obligated or expended funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes other than the Guam Fire Department.												
NMI	[DNF]												
PR	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Operating Expenses:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Payroll Expenses</td> <td>\$8,543,199.91</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Enhanced 9-1-1</td> <td>\$7,659,405.55</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Distribution to 9-1-1 Response Agencies and Municipalities</td> <td>\$5,389,675.62</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9-1-1 Administrative Fees (Due to Telephone Companies)</td> <td>\$66,743.81</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other Operating Expenses</td> <td>\$3,097,510.82</td> </tr> </table> <p>All disbursement made by the agency during the period from January 1 to December 31, 2022 were used for the operational purpose of our Bureau.</p>	Operating Expenses:		Payroll Expenses	\$8,543,199.91	Enhanced 9-1-1	\$7,659,405.55	Distribution to 9-1-1 Response Agencies and Municipalities	\$5,389,675.62	9-1-1 Administrative Fees (Due to Telephone Companies)	\$66,743.81	Other Operating Expenses	\$3,097,510.82
Operating Expenses:													
Payroll Expenses	\$8,543,199.91												
Enhanced 9-1-1	\$7,659,405.55												
Distribution to 9-1-1 Response Agencies and Municipalities	\$5,389,675.62												
9-1-1 Administrative Fees (Due to Telephone Companies)	\$66,743.81												
Other Operating Expenses	\$3,097,510.82												
USVI	As indicated in section C.1a, the VI Code allocates 40% of the monthly \$2.00 total Emergency Service Fund fee collected to VITEMA which is the Territorial agency responsible for operating and maintaining the two (2) primary PSAP 9-1-1 locations. For this reporting period the 9-1-1 service fee allocation represents \$570,568 dollars. The utilization by VITEMA for the breakdown of the funds are as follows: (67.3%) \$384,029 dollars for the two (2) primary PSAP telecommunications lines (voice and data) to service providers AT&T, Viya, SmartNet, and ancillary services. (32.7%) \$186,539 dollars for software upgrades, equipment, repairs, and maintenance to the two (2) primary PSAP telecommunications systems. One Hundred Percent (100%) of the monies expended during this period were for Operating Costs to support the two (2) primary PSAPs, as indicated in section E.2.												

21. The Bureau also requested that states identify whether their 911 fee collections were used for specific expenditure categories, including (1) PSAP operating costs for customer premises equipment (CPE), computer aided dispatch (CAD) equipment, buildings and facilities, and NG911, cybersecurity, pre-arrival instructions, and emergency notification systems (ENS); (2) PSAP personnel costs (telecommunicator salaries and training); (3) PSAP administrative costs associated with program administration and travel expenses; and (4) costs for integration and interoperability of 911 systems and public safety/first responder radio systems, including lease, purchase, maintenance, and upgrade of CAD

hardware and software to support integrated 911 and public safety dispatch operations. Cumulative responses are provided in Table 9, and individual state responses are provided in Table 10.

Table 9 – Summary of State Responses Regarding Uses of Collected Fees

Use of Fees		Total States/ Jurisdictions
Operating Costs	CPE	52
	CAD	47
	Buildings and Facilities	33
	NG911, Cybersecurity, Pre-Arrival Instructions, ENS	49
Personnel Costs	Telecommunicators' Salaries	37
	Training of Telecommunicators	48
Administrative Costs	Program Administration	45
	Travel Expenses	45
Costs for integration and interoperability of 911 systems and public safety/first responder radio systems	Lease, purchase, maintenance, and upgrade of CAD hardware and software to support integrated 911 and public safety dispatch operations	47
	Providing for interoperability of 911 systems with one another and with public safety/first responder radio systems	39

Table 10 – Uses of Collected Fees⁸³

State	PSAP Operating Costs, Including Technological Innovation That Supports 911				PSAP Personnel Costs		PSAP Administrative Costs		Costs for Integration and Interoperability of 911 and Public Safety/First Responder Radio Systems	
	CPE	CAD	PSAP Building/Facility	NG911, Cybersecurity, Pre-Arrival Instructions, and ENS	Salaries	Training	Program Administration	Travel Expenses	CAD to Support Integrated 911 and Dispatch	Providing for Interoperability
AK	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AL	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AR	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AZ	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
CA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
CO	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
CT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
DE	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	[No Response]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
FL	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
GA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
HI	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
IA	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ID	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]
IL	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
IN	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
KS	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
KY	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

⁸³ American Samoa, California, District of Columbia, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Missouri, Nevada, and Virginia provided substantive entries in Addendum Section E2 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/fifteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>. At Addendum Section E2, American Samoa reported, “N/A No funds collected.” American Samoa Response at 8.

	PSAP Operating Costs, Including Technological Innovation That Supports 911				PSAP Personnel Costs		PSAP Administrative Costs		Costs for Integration and Interoperability of 911 and Public Safety/First Responder Radio Systems	
State	CPE	CAD	PSAP Building/Facility	NG911, Cybersecurity, Pre-Arrival Instructions, and ENS	Salaries	Training	Program Administration	Travel Expenses	CAD to Support Integrated 911 and Dispatch	Providing for Interoperability
LA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MD	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
ME	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
MI	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MN	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
MO	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
MS	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
NC	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
ND	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
NE	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
NH	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
NJ	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
NM	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
NV	Yes and No ⁸⁴	Yes and No	Yes and No	Yes and No	No	No	No	No	Yes and No	Yes and No
NY	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
OH	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
OK	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
OR	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
PA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

⁸⁴ Nevada checked both Yes and No boxes. For calculation purposes in Table 9 above, we counted Nevada's responses as a Yes.

	PSAP Operating Costs, Including Technological Innovation That Supports 911				PSAP Personnel Costs		PSAP Administrative Costs		Costs for Integration and Interoperability of 911 and Public Safety/First Responder Radio Systems	
State	CPE	CAD	PSAP Building/Facility	NG911, Cybersecurity, Pre-Arrival Instructions, and ENS	Salaries	Training	Program Administration	Travel Expenses	CAD to Support Integrated 911 and Dispatch	Providing for Interoperability
RI	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
SC	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes and No ⁸⁵	No
SD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
TN	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
TX	Yes	Yes and No ⁸⁶	Yes and No	Yes and No	Yes and No	Yes and No	Yes	Yes and No	Yes and No	Yes and No
UT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
VA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
VT	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
WA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
WI	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
WV	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
WY	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Other Jurisdictions										
AS	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
DC	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Guam	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
NMI	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]
PR	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
USVI	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No

⁸⁵ South Carolina checked both Yes and No boxes. For calculation purposes in Table 9 above, we counted South Carolina's response as a Yes.

⁸⁶ Texas checked both Yes and No boxes. For calculation purposes in Table 9 above, we counted Texas' responses as a Yes.

22. The Bureau requested information on grants that each state or jurisdiction paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees in 2022 and the purpose of the grant. Twenty-three states reported that they paid for grants through the use of collected 911/E911 fees.⁸⁷ Table 11 provides states' descriptions of their grants.

Table 11 – State Grants or Grant Programs

State	Grant Programs	Description and Purpose of Grants Paid for Through the Use of Collected 911/E911 Fees in 2022
AK	No	[No Response]
AL	Yes	A total of \$922,141.56 was granted to 14 individual districts based on the demonstration of need for purchase of direct IP call delivery migration, hosted CPE services and premise CPE systems, GIS-related services, computer aided dispatch systems, and NG9-1-1 recorders. These grant funds were made available from the state office's administrative one percent.
AR	No	[No Response]
AZ	No	[No Response]
CA	No	N/A
CO	No	[No Response]
CT	Yes	Capital expense grants for funded municipalities and regional emergency [sic] communications centers (RECCs). Transitional Grants for eligible municipalities to offset the costs to consolidate 9-1-1 emergency telecommunications to an existing RECC.
DE	No	n/a
FL	Yes	The E911 Board awarded a total of 79 grants in 2022. Collected funds were used for the State Grant Program to fund \$17,125,834 supporting county E911 equipment and NG911 upgrades. Additionally, \$2,537,871 in funds were used to support the Rural County Grant Program to assist rural counties in maintaining and upgrading their E911 systems.
GA	No	[No Response]
HI	No	Wireline Fees are collected by the LEC (Local Exchange Carrier).
IA	Yes	The State offers local jurisdictions GIS grants for the purpose of NG911 GIS data creation, remediation, and maintenance. The total available to counties was \$12,000 per PSAP.
ID	[DNF]	[DNF]
IL	Yes	During calendar year 2022, the State awarded \$552,554 in grants to local 9-1-1 authorities to defer costs associated with PSAP consolidations and \$3,666,003 for Next Generation 9-1-1 Expenses.
IN	[No Response]	[No Response]
KS	Yes	None during CY 2022
KY	Yes	The state paid \$2,648,166.57. Grants were for Next Generation 911 PSAP equipment, cyber-security, and GIS-related projects.
LA	No	[No Response]
MA	Yes	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

⁸⁷ However, Kansas, which checked Yes to Question E2 on grant programs, states at Question E2a, "None during CY 2022." The remainder of states and jurisdictions checked No for Question E2's Grant Programs category, except that Indiana, Maryland, Mississippi, and Washington did not respond to this question.

State	Grant Programs	Description and Purpose of Grants Paid for Through the Use of Collected 911/E911 Fees in 2022
		and Regional Secondary PSAP and Regional Emergency Communications Center Development Grant ('Development Grant'). See MG.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 MG.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	[No Response]	9-1-1 Trust Fund monies are distributed for enhancements to county 9-1-1 service as outlined in question E-1.
ME	Yes	Though PSAP consolidation grants are allowable by law, no grants were authorized or paid in 2022.
MI	Yes	<p>The NG911 grant the State of Michigan obtained from NTIA and NHTSA. A portion of this grant was subgranted to local agencies. In the subgrant, the local agencies potentially would have used the state and local surcharge funding they receive to pay for the expenses that contributed to their local match.</p> <p>The state funds match that was utilized for this grant were in-kind match funds from NG911 costs paid towards the network and GIS Repository projects that were completed.</p> <p>Under MCL 484.1404(4) Statutory distribution of the state 911 fee: 25.56% is used to pay the 911 service providers for the delivery of calls to the PSAPs under MPSC Docket U-14000 and for IP-based 911 (NG911) under MSPC docket U-20146.</p>
MN	Yes	<p>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 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:</p> <p>(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</p> <p>(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.</p> <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 entity 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 purposes 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> <p>Also \$1M is appropriated annually to the Statewide Emergency Communications Board for interoperability initiatives and grants to local units of government.</p>

State	Grant Programs	Description and Purpose of Grants Paid for Through the Use of Collected 911/E911 Fees in 2022
MO	Yes	Missouri 911 Service Board funds a Grant and Loan program for PSAPs in the State that apply to enhance 911 service in their area. The Board also has funds budgeted to expend on GIS projects throughout the state to examine the data and data quality that is available for advancement to NG911.
MS	[No Response]	N/A
MT	Yes	WIRELESS PROVIDER E9-1-1 COST RECOVERY AND LOCAL AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS PSAP OPERATIONAL EXPENDTURES
NC	Yes	Greene County - Greene Co 911 Facility Relocation Currituck County - Public Safety Building Project Franklin County - Emergency Comm New Center Cumberland County - Relocation of Cumberland Co 911 Comm. Ctr Bladen County - End of Life Equipment Chatham County - Radio System Upgrade Clay County - New Facility Project Sampson County - Regional 911 Center Union county - Communications 911 Technology Project Watauga County - Console and subscriber unit replacement Burke County - CAD Acquisition and Implementation Pasquotank-Camden County Radio Upgrade Robeson County - Radio Replacement for Backup Center Onslow County/Jacksonville PD - Onslow Co-Jacksonville PD CAD Update & Interoperoperability [sic] Polk County – E-911 Renovation & Relocation Project Wilson County - Replacement of EOL Radio Consolettes PSAP Call Data Collection Interpretive Services Contract Orthography Image 21 Orthography Image 22 CRM Statewide
ND	Yes	During the period ending December 31, 2022 ND made use of the NHTSA/NTIA 2018 911 Grant in the area of GIS Data Maintenance and Aggregation, a statewide Shared Recorder/Logger and a new IP Point of Ingress for telecommunications companies. 911 fee revenues were used to support the match requirement for these projects.
NE	No	[No Response]
NH	No	N/A
NJ	Yes	The FY-2023 State Budget included a \$12M appropriation to create a grant opportunity to assist in the upgrading of PSAP equipment and create incentives for consolidation of PSAPs.
NM	Yes	See response to E1. Purpose of grants issued through E-911 program is to fund E-911 system. The State pays for 911 expenses on behalf of local governments through this funding mechanism.
NV	No	[No Response]
NY	Yes	The New York State Public Safety Answering Points Operations Grant Program, funded by Tax Law § 186-f(6)(g), allows counties to receive State support for eligible public safety call-taking and dispatching expenses.
OH	No	None
OK	Yes	The Oklahoma 9-1-1 Management Authority grant program was established for the purpose of assisting Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) with funding for: (1) consolidation of facilities or services; (2) deployment of Phase II or successor technology; and (3) development of NG911 regional emergency service networks. Funding for the State 9-1-1 grant program is provided by 911/E911 wireless fees collected by the Oklahoma Tax Commission.

State	Grant Programs	Description and Purpose of Grants Paid for Through the Use of Collected 911/E911 Fees in 2022
		In 2022, local Oklahoma primary PSAPs received a total of \$3,523,996 in state and federal grant funds. Total state grant funds of \$2,281,576 were used to provide: support for local call center creation and/or consolidation efforts; upgraded call taking equipment and technology; telecommunicator training and certification; and provide matching funds for the federal NHTSA-NTIA-911-Grant Program-2018. Total federal grant funds of \$1,242,420 were used to: develop a statewide 9-1-1 GIS repository; complete an NG911 Strategic Plan & Cost Estimate; and provide GIS training, GIS improvements and NG911 i3 compatible software and hardware upgrades for local PSAPs. The federal funding also helped to improve services in three Oklahoma counties that had not deployed Enhanced 9-1-1.
OR	No	N/A
PA	Yes	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. In 2022, Pennsylvania used \$18.8 million of these funds to help implement NG911 service. In addition, PEMA awarded PSAPs \$12.4 million in grants to support regional ESInets along with shared phone, CAD and radio systems. These grants also supported NG911 GIS data development and PSAP migration costs for NG911 service.
RI	No	None
SC	No	The wireless 911 fees are distributed back to the PSAPs by a quarterly distribution based on total wireless 911 call volume and through a reimbursement process. PSAPs purchase certain eligible 911 equipment/services/maintenance and seek reimbursement through the state.
SD	Yes	Funding was approved for a variety of hardware, software, equipment upgrades and other allowable PSAP expenditures. The purpose was to assist local entities with enhancements and funding they may not have had budget dollars for.
TN	No	[No Response]
TX	Yes	The CSEC state 9-1-1 Program provides grants of legislatively appropriated 9-1-1 and equalization surcharge funds to 20 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 to fund county and regional emergency medical services and trauma care.)
UT	No	N/A
VA	Yes	[No Response]
VT	No	[No Response]
WA	[No Response]	[No Response]
WI	No	N/A
WV	No	[No Response]
WY	No	None
Other Jurisdictions		
AS	No	N/A No funds collected
DC	No	[No Response]
Guam	No	[No Response]
NMI	[DNF]	[DNF]
PR	No	*****[IMPORTANTE***** DETERMINAR COMO SE CLASIFICARAN LAS DISTRIBUCIONES A LOS MUNICIPIOS [sic]
USVI	No	[No Response]

F. Description of 911/E911 Fees Collected

23. In order 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 12 provides an overview of the number of states and localities that levy a fee on each service type.

Table 12 – Summary of State and Local Authorities That Levy 911 Fees

Service Type	State Only	Local Only	Both	No Response or No Fee
Wireline	27	18	6	3
Wireless	36	8	8	2
Prepaid Wireless	37	3	7	7
VoIP	29	11	5	9
Other	6	3	1	44

24. Table 13 details the average fee by type of service.⁸⁸ Based on responding states’ information, the average wireline 911 fee is \$1.02 per line per month; the average wireless 911 fee is \$1.04 per line per month; the average prepaid wireless percentage of retail transaction 911 fee is 3.21%; the average prepaid wireless flat 911 fee per transaction is \$0.95; and the average VoIP service 911 fee is \$1.04 per line per month.⁸⁹ Four states, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that they had no prepaid wireless service 911 fee or did not respond to the question. Five states, American Samoa, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that they had no VoIP service 911 fee or did not respond to the question.⁹⁰

⁸⁸ See *infra* Appendix C for a detailed description of fees and charges that each reporting state and jurisdiction levied on wireline, wireless, prepaid wireless, VoIP, and other services during calendar year 2022.

⁸⁹ A few jurisdictions reported imposing a percentage fee or reported other information on wireline, wireless, and VoIP service rates. For example, Louisiana lists its wireline fee/charge as “[u]p to 5% of Tariff Rate on Exchange.” Louisiana Response at 9. See *infra* Appendix C for additional examples. Table 13 provides separate rows within each service type for percentage-based responses.

⁹⁰ For example, Missouri did not provide an amount entry for any of its 911 fee categories at F1 except prepaid wireless services, and thus is included in the count of states that did not report a VoIP service fee. Missouri Response at 9-10. American Samoa is one of the jurisdictions reporting that it has no prepaid wireless or VoIP service 911 fee. American Samoa reports that it has not established a funding mechanism. American Samoa Response at 5-6, 8-9.

Table 13 – 911 Fee Highlights by Service Type⁹¹

Service Type	Fee Type	Average 911/E911 Fee	State With Lowest Average Associated Fee	State With Highest Average Associated Fee	States/Jurisdictions With No Response or Associated Service Fee ⁹²
Wireline	Flat Fee per line per month	\$1.02	Arizona \$0.20	West Virginia ⁹³ \$3.50	American Samoa, Missouri
	Percentage	6.23%	Vermont 2.4%	Oklahoma 3% - 15% of the base tariff rate	
Wireless	Flat Fee per line per month	\$1.04	Arizona \$0.20	West Virginia \$3.47	American Samoa, Missouri, Wisconsin
	Percentage	2.4%	Vermont 2.4%	Vermont 2.4%	
Prepaid Wireless	Flat Fee per Retail Transaction	\$0.95	California \$0.30	Alabama \$1.86	Alaska, American Samoa, Hawaii, New Jersey, U.S. Virgin Islands, Wisconsin
	Percentage of Retail Transaction	3.21%	Ohio 0.5%	Arkansas 10.00%	
VoIP	Flat Fee per line per month	\$1.04	Arizona \$0.20	West Virginia \$3.50	Alaska, American Samoa, Guam, Missouri, Montana, Ohio, U.S. Virgin Islands, Wisconsin
	Percentage	2.4%	Vermont 2.4%	Vermont 2.4%	

25. 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 14 shows that, in total, states and other jurisdictions reported collecting \$3,850,866,702.58 in 911/E911 fees or related charges for calendar year 2022. Table 14 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.⁹⁴

⁹¹ American Samoa, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Kansas, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Nevada, New York, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming provided substantive entries in Addendum Section F1 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/fifteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

⁹² See *supra* note 90.

⁹³ In Addendum Section F1, West Virginia provided wireline and VoIP fees by county. West Virginia Response at 12-13. We computed West Virginia’s average wireline and VoIP fees for this table.

⁹⁴ As noted above at Table 3, per capita calculations are based on United States Census data and, where those data are unavailable, on World Bank data.

Table 14 – Total Amount Collected in 911/E911 Fees by Service Type⁹⁵

State	Wireline	Wireless	Prepaid	VoIP	Other	Total Fees Collected	Total Estimated Cost	Fees as a Percentage of Cost ⁹⁶	Estimated Amount Collected Annually Per Capita
AK	\$1,319,383.56	\$12,993,920.07	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$14,313,303.63	\$14,313,303.63	100%	\$19.51
AL	\$8,068,804.62	\$82,779,897.06	\$27,322,886.14	\$13,972,057.74	[No Response]	\$132,143,645.56	\$134,395,660.33	98%	\$26.04
AR	\$4,427,137.38	\$36,499,657.31	\$21,455,437.74	N/A - Included in Wireless	[No Response]	\$62,382,232.43	\$70,191,250.97	89%	\$20.48
AZ	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$19,303,922.64	\$17,900,564.00	108%	\$2.62
CA	See Note ⁹⁷	See Note	See Note	See Note	See Note	\$179,471,000.00	\$188,704,000.00	95%	\$4.60
CO	\$586,043.00	\$5,104,606.00	\$14,827,804.00	\$1,252,791.00	\$91,021,203.00 ⁹⁸	\$112,792,447.00	\$86,898,443.69	130%	\$19.31
CT	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$35,198,214.00	\$34,291,825.00	103%	\$9.71
DE	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$9,656,734.12	\$9,656,734.12	100%	\$9.48
FL	\$5,626,085.00	\$82,216,642.00	\$24,079,069.00	\$17,286,822.00	[No Response]	\$129,208,618.00	\$264,729,365.00	49%	\$5.81
GA	Unknown	Unknown	\$46,275,246.22	Unknown	\$195,982,548.47	\$242,257,794.69	Unknown	[No Value]	\$22.20
HI	\$0.00	\$10,066,779.00	\$0.00	\$1,231,119.00	\$0.00	\$11,297,898.00	N/A	[No Value]	\$7.84
IA	\$9,402,011.44	\$29,906,237.25	\$2,257,978.52	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$41,566,227.21	\$167,388,143.00	25%	\$12.99
ID	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]
IL	\$14,182,992.93	\$155,552,455.26	\$9,062,005.08	\$33,855,507.84	Other Local	\$212,652,961.11	Local 9-1-1	112%	\$18.58

⁹⁵ Alaska, American Samoa, Arkansas, Colorado, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Nevada, New York, Texas, and the U.S. Virgin Islands provided substantive entries in Addendum Section F2 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/fifteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

⁹⁶ The Bureau calculated the percentages in this column based on the information provided by respondents in the annual questionnaire.

⁹⁷ At Question F2a, California states, “The total amount of fees collected in 2022 was not broken down into individual categories but remitted as a total based on the current surcharge rate applied.” California Response at 10.

⁹⁸ At Addendum Section F2, Colorado states, “‘Other’ is the total amount of emergency telephone charge revenue reported by Colorado’s local 9-1-1 governing bodies. Many of them do not track whether the funds were received from wireless, wireline, or VoIP customers, so they are provided in a combined fashion. Not all governing bodies responded to our data request, so the actual total may be higher. The amounts provided for the ‘wireline,’ ‘wireless,’ and ‘VoIP’ fields were the revenues generated by the state 9-1-1 surcharge.” Colorado Response at 10.

State	Wireline	Wireless	Prepaid	VoIP	Other	Total Fees Collected	Total Estimated Cost	Fees as a Percentage of Cost ⁹⁶	Estimated Amount Collected Annually Per Capita
					Government Resources \$21,075,675.24 + State Penalties \$75,533.60 = \$21,151,208.84	from Surcharge + \$21,151,208.84 from Other = \$233,804,169.95	Authorities reported \$196,441,148.45 in 911 Expenses and the State paid \$12,892,593.59 for 911 network costs [;] Total cost to provide 911/E911 is \$209,333,742.04		
IN	\$7,662,852.45	\$58,986,585.48	\$15,566,180.75	\$10,739,000.49	\$9,362.43	\$92,963,981.60	\$230,675,002.37	40%	\$13.61
KS	Included in Wireless Amount	\$32,623,396.00	\$2,424,462.00	Included in Wireless Amount	\$0.00	\$35,047,858.00	\$120,614,547.00	29%	\$11.93
KY	[No Response]	\$26,492,465.00	\$10,041,069.00	[No Response]	\$89,657,334.54 ⁹⁹	[No Response]	\$156,293,058.00	0%	\$0.00
LA	\$16,498,704.18	\$47,017,684.35	\$9,625,977.91	[No Response]	\$21,794,411.29	\$95,910,119.47	\$93,319,006.86	103%	\$20.89
MA	\$12,217,971.35	\$105,998,930.73	\$14,837,242.36	\$31,827,199.35	[No Response]	\$164,881,343.79	The estimated amount to provide 911 Service is: \$51,745,295 This estimated amount includes the costs associated with the Next Generation 911 service provider contract, MassGIS, Radio, and the mobile PSAP. This estimated amount does not include costs associated with grant programs, training programs, disability access programs, public education, administrative costs, or other costs for the	319%	\$23.62

⁹⁹ At Question F2a, Kentucky states, “VOIP and Wireline included in Other as reported by PSAPs to the KY 911 Services Board.” Kentucky Response at 10.

State	Wireline	Wireless	Prepaid	VoIP	Other	Total Fees Collected	Total Estimated Cost	Fees as a Percentage of Cost ⁹⁶	Estimated Amount Collected Annually Per Capita
							administration and programs of the State 911 Department.		
MD	\$29,873,109.80	\$85,812,433.50	\$1,876,384.13	N/A	\$1,051,227.59	\$118,613,227.02	\$177,429,053.00	67%	\$19.24
ME	\$936,800	\$4,309,279	\$914,143	\$999,253	[No Response]	\$7,159,475	\$7,006,439	102%	\$5.17
MI	\$129,351,081.04	Included in wireline above	\$15,791,839.45	Included in wireline above	N/A	\$145,142,920.49	\$323,583,726.38	45%	\$14.46
MN	\$14,151,344.28	\$45,880,266.07	\$6,452,472.39	\$1,464,097.27	\$0.00	\$67,948,180.01	\$43,601,378.00	156%	\$11.88
MO	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$4,258,446.40	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$201,950,326.00	0%	\$0.00
MS	N/A	\$17,371,350.77	\$6,066,352.90	N/A	N/A	\$23,437,703.60	\$59,190,113.45	40%	\$7.97
MT	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$14M	\$47M	30%	\$12.47
NC	\$7,649,405.00	\$61,284,974.00	\$15,656,272.00	\$15,155,400.00	[No Response]	\$99,746,051.00	\$197,535,864.00	50%	\$9.32
ND	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$1,200,197.00	[No Response]	\$18,531,939.00	[No Response]	\$30,100,000.00	0%	\$0.00
NE	\$3,873,298 Estimate	\$11,051,197.00	\$765,286.00	Included in Wireline	\$0.00	\$15,689,781.00	\$62,821,713.00	25%	\$7.97
NH	\$1,333,455.00	\$10,403,470.00	\$1,714,252.00	\$2,908,141.00	\$0.00	\$16,359,317.00	\$18,335,158.00	89%	\$11.73
NJ	Not Available	Not Available	N/A	Not Available	N/A	\$127,124,000.00	Unknown	[No Value]	\$13.73
NM	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$13,046,173.00	\$13,706,572.00	95%	\$6.17
NV	\$40,921.09	\$510,952.25	[No Response]	\$35,858.67	\$87,710.81	\$2,891,425.85 ¹⁰⁰	\$25,207,281.90	11%	\$0.91
NY	\$11,725,218.99	\$283,241,529.69	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$23,728,836.00	\$318,496,668.68 ¹⁰¹	\$576,636,299.00	55%	\$16.19

¹⁰⁰ At Question F2a, Nevada states, “Nye County - Prepaid wireless cannot be provided due to the Nye County Finance Department not receiving payments from carriers specifying if they are prepaid or contract account payments. Clark County - We do not charge a 911 fee in Clark County. Lyon County - A total is provided, but we don't get the information in the detail requested. White Pine County - This is an average, based on one months [sic] wireline, wireless and VoIP information. Storey County - We are self-funded. Storey County Board of Commissioners have elected not to collect 911 fees or surcharges.” Nevada Response at 11. At Addendum Section F2, Nevada states, “Consolidated Municipality of Carson City NV – Unable to report by service [sic] type.” *Id.*

¹⁰¹ As discussed *infra* in Section IV.G.1.a, for our analysis of New York’s 911 fee collection and expenditures, the Bureau used fee revenue data from publicly available New York State tax records, rather than the F2 revenue amount that New York reported in its annual questionnaire. However, for simplicity, in this table and throughout this report we have used the F2 revenue figures that respondents submitted on their annual questionnaires to calculate the total amount of 911/E911 fees collected in calendar year 2022. We have not adjusted the total amount to reflect any external data on fees.

State	Wireline	Wireless	Prepaid	VoIP	Other	Total Fees Collected	Total Estimated Cost	Fees as a Percentage of Cost ⁹⁶	Estimated Amount Collected Annually Per Capita
OH	[No Response]	\$27,842,726.57	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$27,842,726.57	\$216,192,217.90	13%	\$2.37
OK	\$6,907,488.16	\$32,510,436.25	Inc. in Wireless	Inc. in Wireless	\$0.00	\$39,417,924.41	\$129,906,546.01	30%	\$9.81
OR	\$7,203,613.57	\$65,279,842.83	Unknown	\$5,444,293.93	\$1,228,520.12	\$79,156,270.45	\$160,063,177.84	49%	\$18.67
PA	\$31,065,542.00	\$209,114,491.00	\$31,472,981.00	\$50,593,225.00	[No Response]	\$322,246,239.00	\$399,120,482.00	81%	\$24.84
RI	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$7,980,851.49	\$7,565,150.09	105%	\$7.30
SC	[No Response]	\$29,401,344.74	\$8,897,366.55	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$38,298,711.29	unknown	[No Value]	\$7.25
SD	\$2,755,491.00	\$8,981,208.00	\$1,209,315.00	\$339,611.00	[No Response]	\$13,285,625.00	\$36,508,354.00	36%	\$14.60
TN	Unknown	Unknown	\$29,971,411.14	Unknown	\$119,202,951.02	\$149,174,362.16	Unknown	[No Value]	\$21.16
TX	\$67,017,627.00	\$139,062,670.00	\$14,675,293.00	[No Response]	\$22,803,442.00	\$243,559,032.00	\$319,457,001.00	76%	\$8.11
UT	\$17,441,511.00	\$22,492,726.00	\$2,118,214.00	See F2 ¹⁰²	[No Response]	\$42,052,450.00	\$84 Million	50%	\$12.44
VA	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$74,806,311.22 ¹⁰³	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$74,806,311.22	Unknown	[No Value]	\$8.61
VT	\$1,929,917.91	\$1,145,350.52	\$724,128.98	\$91,884.32	\$158,783.29	\$4,050,065.02	\$4,587,898.00	88%	\$6.26
WA	State Revenue: \$ 2,080,135.68 County Revenue: \$5,603,580.50 Total Revenue: \$7,683,716.18	State Revenue: \$19,232,938.05 County Revenue: \$54,931,433.55 Total Revenue: \$74,164,371.60	State Revenue: \$ 1,864,058.19 County Revenue: \$ 8,606,995.48 Total Revenue: \$14,405,517.82	State Revenue: \$ 3,749,915.31 County Revenue: \$10,655,602.51 Total Revenue: \$14,405,517.82	[No Response]	Total State Revenue: \$26,927,047.23 Total County Revenue: \$79,797,612.04 Total Combined Revenue: \$106,724,659.27	\$410,496,002.00	26%	\$13.71
WI	Unknown	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	Unknown	Unknown	[No Value]	\$0.00
WV	\$17,108,180.76	\$46,629,145.86	\$2,071,147.73	\$7,148,102.76	\$2,131,457.89	\$75,088,035.00	\$353,259,544.19	21%	\$42.30
WY	\$3,333,522.45	\$3,688,152.49	\$531,132.94	[No Response]	\$70,926.01	\$7,623,733.89	10657850.59	72%	\$13.11
Other Jurisdictions									
AS	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	see answer to 3a	[No Value]	\$0.00

¹⁰² At Question F2a, Utah states, “VoIP is included in the wireline and wireless figures and can't be segregate[d].” Utah Response at 12.

¹⁰³ At Question F2a, Virginia states, “9-1-1 fees are collected by the Virginia Department of Taxation and departmental staff is only able to provide a combined figure of \$74,806,311.22 for pre-paid and post-paid wireless revenue.” Virginia Response at 11.

State	Wireline	Wireless	Prepaid	VoIP	Other	Total Fees Collected	Total Estimated Cost	Fees as a Percentage of Cost ⁹⁶	Estimated Amount Collected Annually Per Capita
DC	\$1,067,859.82	\$7,582,661.57	[No Response]	\$2,860,430.16	Centrex - \$601,433.48 PBX Trunk - \$283,538.40	\$12,395,923.43	\$52,370,384.00	24%	\$18.45
Guam	EXPLAINED IN F2a ¹⁰⁴	EXPLAINED IN F2a	EXPLAINED IN F2a	EXPLAINED IN F2a	[No Response]	\$2,090,912.00	\$4,115,037.00	51%	\$12.17
NMI	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]
PR	\$2,575,974.23	\$10,566,401.97	\$1,665,505.85	\$7,631,175.59	\$3.00	\$22,439,060.64	\$24,756,536.00	91%	\$6.96
USVI	See F2a ¹⁰⁵	See F2a	See F2a	See F2a	See F2a	\$779,377.00	\$2,973,341.00	26%	\$7.39
Total Estimated Fees Collected¹⁰⁶							\$3,850,866,702.58		
Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911							\$5,850,583,386.36		
Total Estimated Fees as a Percentage of Total Estimated Cost							66%		
Average State Amount Collected Per Capita							\$11.50		
National Amount Collected Per Capita							\$11.43		

¹⁰⁴ At Question F2a, Guam states, “When Commercial Mobile Radio Service (CMRS) providers collect the surcharge from their subscribers and remit the amounts collected, the remittance does not detail collections for each service type, but rather the total amount collected from subscribers.” Guam Response at 10.

¹⁰⁵ At Addendum Section F2, the U.S. Virgin Islands states, “The present call receiving [sic] system does not allow for the breakdown as to the type of service calls. The Virgin Islands is currently in the process of integrating and testing the final components [sic] to enable call type differentiation [sic]. This capability is expected to be fully functional by December 2023.” U.S. Virgin Islands Response at 10.

¹⁰⁶ This figure is based on the sum of the amounts respondents reported as “Total” fees collected at Question F2. Some states did not break down collected fees by service type and only provided their totals. Other states provided service category data but not the total. Several states submitted service type fees that do not add up to their reported totals. Therefore, the reported total estimated fees collected figure of \$3,850,866,702.58 is \$257,525,747.86 more than the sum of the individual wireline, wireless, prepaid wireless, VoIP, and Other fees reported by respondents.

26. 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 54 responding jurisdictions listed in Table 15 below, 29 states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported combining collected fees with other funds or grants to support 911 services, while 20 states, American Samoa,¹⁰⁷ Guam, and Puerto Rico reported they did not.

Table 15 – States Reporting Whether 911 Fees Are Combined with Federal, State, or Local Funds, Grants, Special Collections, or General Budget Appropriations¹⁰⁸

Responses Regarding Combination of Collected Fees with Any Federal, State, or Local Funds, Grants, Special Collections, or General Budget Appropriations That Were Designated 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		The 911 surcharge is used to ‘supplement’ not fully support the local 911 call center. The balance of the funding comes from General Revenue taxes at the Borough or Municipal level.
AL	X		Some local emergency communication districts receive a variety of funding from county/municipal appropriations, federal/state grants, dispatch fees, various service contracts, and donations. Self-reported data from 75 of our 85 Districts for the fiscal period of October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2022 indicates that Districts received additional funding to support their 911 services totaling \$17,472,109.68 over and above the 911 fees collected. The State Board Office also received federal grant funding totaling \$2,284,360.00 during CY2022.
AR		X	[NA]
AZ		X	[NA]
CA		X	N/A
CO	X		As stated in the answer to question 3, above, it takes a combination of 9-1-1 surcharge funds, local general funds, and to some small extent dedicated sales taxes to pay for the operations of Colorado’s PSAPs. Additionally, Colorado was the recipient of federal 911 grant funds, which have been used for the migration of Colorado’s PSAPs to an ESInet.
CT	X		National Highway Traffic Administration and National Telecommunications and Information Administration 911 Grant Program grant award of \$1,081,603. Used to build multi-functional backup NG 911 emergency communications and training center.
DE		X	n/a
FL	X		Local governments expenditures for 911 operations amounted to \$143,064,273.
GA		X	[NA]
HI		X	[NA]
IA	X		20% 911 Surcharge 30% County General Fund 21% Sheriff’s Fund 29% Miscellaneous Other Sources
ID			[DNF]
IL		X	[NA]

¹⁰⁷ American Samoa reports that it has not established a funding mechanism. American Samoa Response at 5-6.

¹⁰⁸ Nevada, Ohio, U.S. Virgin Islands, and Wyoming provided substantive entries in Addendum Section F4 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/fifteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

Responses Regarding Combination of Collected Fees with Any Federal, State, or Local Funds, Grants, Special Collections, or General Budget Appropriations That Were Designated to Support 911/E911/NG911 Services

State	Yes	No	If Yes, Description of Federal, State, or Local Funds Combined with 911/E911 Fees																																																								
IN	X		<table border="0"> <tr> <td>County</td> <td>Actual Project Total</td> <td>Federal Grant</td> <td>Local Match</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Boone</td> <td>\$ 42,860.000</td> <td>\$ 25,716.000</td> <td>\$ 17,144.000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brown</td> <td>\$ 35,615.000</td> <td>\$ 21,369.000</td> <td>\$ 14,246.000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Montgomery</td> <td>\$ 28,560.000</td> <td>\$ 17,136.000</td> <td>\$ 11,424.000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Benton</td> <td>\$ 25,660.000</td> <td>\$ 15,396.000</td> <td>\$ 10,264.000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Franklin</td> <td>\$ 28,160.000</td> <td>\$ 16,896.000</td> <td>\$ 11,264.000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fulton</td> <td>\$ 9,100.000</td> <td>\$ 5,460.000</td> <td>\$ 3,640.000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Parke</td> <td>\$ 24,750.000</td> <td>\$ 14,850.000</td> <td>\$ 9,900.000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jackson</td> <td>\$ 33,850.000</td> <td>\$ 20,309.110</td> <td>\$ 13,540.890</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Union</td> <td>\$ 19,680.000</td> <td>\$ 11,808.000</td> <td>\$ 7,872.000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Spencer</td> <td>\$ 33,110.000</td> <td>\$ 19,866.000</td> <td>\$ 13,244.000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Union</td> <td>\$ 42,036.730</td> <td>\$ 25,222.038</td> <td>\$ 16,814.692</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Statewide 911 Board</td> <td>\$ 461.690</td> <td>\$ 267.010</td> <td>\$ 194.680</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTALS</td> <td>\$323,843.420</td> <td>\$194,295.158</td> <td>\$129,548.262</td> </tr> </table>	County	Actual Project Total	Federal Grant	Local Match	Boone	\$ 42,860.000	\$ 25,716.000	\$ 17,144.000	Brown	\$ 35,615.000	\$ 21,369.000	\$ 14,246.000	Montgomery	\$ 28,560.000	\$ 17,136.000	\$ 11,424.000	Benton	\$ 25,660.000	\$ 15,396.000	\$ 10,264.000	Franklin	\$ 28,160.000	\$ 16,896.000	\$ 11,264.000	Fulton	\$ 9,100.000	\$ 5,460.000	\$ 3,640.000	Parke	\$ 24,750.000	\$ 14,850.000	\$ 9,900.000	Jackson	\$ 33,850.000	\$ 20,309.110	\$ 13,540.890	Union	\$ 19,680.000	\$ 11,808.000	\$ 7,872.000	Spencer	\$ 33,110.000	\$ 19,866.000	\$ 13,244.000	Union	\$ 42,036.730	\$ 25,222.038	\$ 16,814.692	Statewide 911 Board	\$ 461.690	\$ 267.010	\$ 194.680	TOTALS	\$323,843.420	\$194,295.158	\$129,548.262
		County	Actual Project Total	Federal Grant	Local Match																																																						
		Boone	\$ 42,860.000	\$ 25,716.000	\$ 17,144.000																																																						
		Brown	\$ 35,615.000	\$ 21,369.000	\$ 14,246.000																																																						
		Montgomery	\$ 28,560.000	\$ 17,136.000	\$ 11,424.000																																																						
		Benton	\$ 25,660.000	\$ 15,396.000	\$ 10,264.000																																																						
		Franklin	\$ 28,160.000	\$ 16,896.000	\$ 11,264.000																																																						
		Fulton	\$ 9,100.000	\$ 5,460.000	\$ 3,640.000																																																						
		Parke	\$ 24,750.000	\$ 14,850.000	\$ 9,900.000																																																						
		Jackson	\$ 33,850.000	\$ 20,309.110	\$ 13,540.890																																																						
		Union	\$ 19,680.000	\$ 11,808.000	\$ 7,872.000																																																						
		Spencer	\$ 33,110.000	\$ 19,866.000	\$ 13,244.000																																																						
		Union	\$ 42,036.730	\$ 25,222.038	\$ 16,814.692																																																						
		Statewide 911 Board	\$ 461.690	\$ 267.010	\$ 194.680																																																						
TOTALS	\$323,843.420	\$194,295.158	\$129,548.262																																																								
KS	X		Local general fund monies are used extensively to fund 911 in Kansas. These funds are derived from property taxes and account for approximately 76% of total funding in CY 2022.																																																								
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 Kentucky State Police.)																																																								
LA		X	[NA]																																																								
MA		X	[NA]																																																								
MD	X		The NHTSA/NTIA grant was used to fund 60 percent of certain NG911 and GIS projects, with the 40 percent match coming from the 9-1-1 Trust Fund. The difference between County 9-1-1 Fee revenues and operational costs for each county is made up by county general funds.																																																								
ME	X		\$120,968																																																								
MI	X		In addition to the state and local funds reported above: County Millages: \$58,836,212.15 Local/County General Funds: \$65,432,886.40 Other Receipts: \$46,806,616.90 (grants, tower rentals, contract for service, etc)																																																								
MN	X		The State of Minnesota was awarded a grant (60% federal/40% state match) from NTIA/NHTSA for the implementation of next generation 9-1-1. Funds in CY22 were primarily used for GIS data preparation.																																																								
MO	X		ARPA funds were used by the Board as a subawardee from the Missouri Department of Public Safety for statewide GIS and NG911 projects across MO.																																																								
MS	X		Local budgets must supplement funds received from wireline fees collected to cover operation costs and a grant was awarded from the National Transportation Safety Administration to the state in 2020.																																																								
MT		X	[NA]																																																								
NC	X		E911 funds were combined with general fund allocations from each of the 114 primary PSAPs and 11 secondary PSAPs to pay for expenses not allowed by NC General Statutes governing the 911 Board and 911 Fund to provide for E911 services. Examples of expenses not allowed from collected 911 fees are telecommunicator salaries, facility																																																								

Responses Regarding Combination of Collected Fees with Any Federal, State, or Local Funds, Grants, Special Collections, or General Budget Appropriations That Were Designated to Support 911/E911/NG911 Services			
State	Yes	No	If Yes, Description of Federal, State, or Local Funds Combined with 911/E911 Fees
			maintenance, and radio network infrastructure. In addition, federal funds along with E911 service fees were allocated for the migration to NG 911 for eight (8) PSAPs in the State.
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. Also, in 2022, \$186,132 in 911 fees collected were used as the state's 40% match requirement for the NHTSA/NTIA 2018 911 Grant.
NE	X		Wireless 911 Surcharge funds are allocated to local governments to assist with local 911 operations. Local PSAPs use Wireless 911 Surcharge funds to supplement, locally collected Wireline 911 surcharge funds and local general funds to support PSAP operations. Federal grant dollars were used to support a statewide MIS system and for Cyber Security Assessments. Reimbursements of \$744,549 in Federal Funds were received during calendar year 2022.
NH	X		Federal ARPA grant funds in the amount of \$159,960.00 were provided to the Division of Emergency Services and Communications from the New Hampshire Department of Justice in order to procure six new Ver-Mac Variable Message Board trailers to replace our original sign board trailers from 2007. These variable message board trailers are used to depoy [sic] in emergency situations in order to get emergency messaging out to citizens. Such as road closures due to flooding; or avoiding the area due to law enforcement situations, etc.
NJ		X	[NA]
NM		X	No funding was combined with E911 fees for eligible expenses within the State's definition of E-911 system. However, federal, state, and local funding was use for PSAP operations, buildings, CAD, and radio in support of 911 services.
NV	X ¹⁰⁹	X	Consolidated Municipality of Carson City NV - 911 surcharge funds are held separately in a Special Revenue Fund and are not co-mingled with City funds, Carson City general funds also used to support 911 services. Nye County – 9-1-1 fee's from county property tax initiative and funds from the Nye County General Fund. Lyon County - General Fund revenues were used to pay for salaries, benefits, and services and supplises [sic] cost for Dispatch. Telephone Surcharge fundes [sic] were used for: mobile data, mobile computers, and radios for first responders; a recording system for call; and 911 phone lines into Dispatch.
NY	X		Counties may combine their collected local surcharge funds with their State-awarded grant funds and state-distributed local surcharges. These combinations occur within county and local budgets and the amounts are not reported to the State. Accounting rules applicable to each funding source must nonetheless be observed.
OH	X		Local levies and taxes provide the bulk of 9-1-1 funding in Ohio.
OK	X		Federal grant funds for FY22 was \$1,242,420.35; State funding from, 9-1-1 fees that were combined with federal funding was \$414,140.00. Local funding from 9-1-1 fees that were combined with federal and state funding was \$414,140.00. The total grant funding distributed including federal funding was \$2,070,700.00.
OR		X	[NA]
PA	X		Any 911 related expenses not covered by 911 fees are covered by the General fund or

¹⁰⁹ Nevada reports both Yes and No answers for Question F4. For calculation purposes, we have counted Nevada's responses as a Yes.

Responses Regarding Combination of Collected Fees with Any Federal, State, or Local Funds, Grants, Special Collections, or General Budget Appropriations That Were Designated to Support 911/E911/NG911 Services			
State	Yes	No	If Yes, Description of Federal, State, or Local Funds Combined with 911/E911 Fees
			other revenue sources of the respective county.
RI		X	[NA]
SC		X	[NA]
SD	X		Federal grant funds in the amount of \$144,299 combined with 911/E911 fees were used for NG9-1-1 implementation in 2022.
TN	X		Local government contributions of cash to emergency communications districts are generally about 25% of the total revenues reported by the emergency communications districts. Unidentified amounts of additional support are provided by local governments, but are not reflected in the financial records of the emergency communications districts. Federal grant funds of \$642,695 amount were received in calendar year 2022 to offset expenditures for NG911 Statewide ESInet and NGCS Transition; Management Services; Cybersecurity Preparedness; NG911 Consulting Services; and GIS Spatial Interface Data Preparation.
TX	X		<p>CSEC issued reimbursements totaling \$5,685,326 out of the NG9-1-1 Fund in CY 2022. The NG9-1-1 Fund consists of \$150 million from Texas’s federal ARPA - CSFRF award appropriated by the Texas Legislature to the NG9-1-1 Fund administered by CSEC. Whether a Texas 9-1-1 Entity combined other funds (primarily local general revenues) with 911/E911 fees to support 9-1-1 service depends, in part, on the Entity’s determination of what costs are attributable to 9-1-1 service. The Commission’s adoption of ‘911 Fee Diversion Rules’ (47 C.F.R. § 9.23) in June 2021 clarified the eligible uses of 9-1-1 fees and also addressed multi-purpose fees (e.g., Texas statewide equalization surcharge). Utilizing non-911 local funds is specifically applicable to Municipal ECDs who, unlike the CSEC state 9-1-1 Program and 772 ECDs, are responsible for all costs directly associated with 9-1-1 service, in addition to the costs of emergency response/dispatch, law enforcement, fire, EMS. A Municipal ECD’s distinguishing between costs of 9-1-1 service and emergency response is relevant only with respect to restrictions placed on the use of 9-1-1 fees. Which is not to say that Texas 9-1-1 Entities do not recognize the importance of and adhere to such restrictions or divert 9-1-1 fees. A majority of Texas 9-1-1 Entities do not include telecommunicator/dispatcher or dispatch costs in the costs of providing 9-1-1 service. For the CSEC state 9-1-1 Program, RPCs are precluded from paying such costs; there’s a limited exception applicable to the largest county in an RPC’s service area. Similarly, a majority of statutory 772 ECDs do not expend 9-1-1 fees for telecommunicator/dispatcher compensation and related costs; or only provide a portion of the funds needed for such costs. Many if not most Municipal ECDs consider telecommunicator/dispatcher costs to be a fundamental part of 9-1-1 service.</p> <p>By way of example, see below from several Municipal ECDs. (NOTE: The following examples were in response to FCC Questions F.4. and F.5. CSEC included with question F.5. a note instructing Texas 9-1-1 Entities to include costs listed in FCC Question E.2., ‘but not the costs of providing emergency response--law enforcement, fire, or EMS.’)</p> <p>Dallas reported \$36,290,791 in local city funds were used to provide 9-1-1 service. Plano 9-1-1 fees were used to offset compensation costs for our call takers, public educator and three of our training coordinators (inclusive of quality assurance). These funds were re-allocated to the general fund, as all City of Plano salaries are paid from the general fund. Additional general fund monies were expended for materials and supplies, travel and training, and sundry items (i.e., awards/recognitions, associations, etc.) Longview reported that in addition to its \$651,064 E911 Account, Longview Public Safety Communications is funded by an annual appropriation of funds from the City of Longview General Fund. Our FY22 budget allocation from the City of Longview was</p>

Responses Regarding Combination of Collected Fees with Any Federal, State, or Local Funds, Grants, Special Collections, or General Budget Appropriations That Were Designated to Support 911/E911/NG911 Services			
State	Yes	No	If Yes, Description of Federal, State, or Local Funds Combined with 911/E911 Fees
			\$2,963,403. Portland did not report a specific amount but identified its municipal general fund as a source of funds for 9-1-1 service.
UT	X		UCA was awarded a Federal 911 Grant from the National 911 office, a portion of that grant funding was used and reimbursed in 2022 for a total of \$400,000.
VA		X	[NA]
VT	X		The Enhanced 911 Special Fund received a state General Fund transfer of \$1.3M for FY23.
WA		X	[NA]
WI		X	[NA]
WV		X	[NA]
WY		X	[NA]
Other Jurisdictions			
AS		X	N/A No funding collected
DC	X		Local Funds - \$29,262,000.00 Grants - \$169,000
Guam		X	[NA]
NMI			[DNF]
PR		X	[NA]
USVI	X		[No Response]
Total	31	23	

27. 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 16 below, eight states, as well as Guam and Puerto Rico, reported that state 911 fees were the sole source of revenue funding 911 services; eleven states indicated that 50 to 90% of funding came from state 911 fees; four states reported that 50 to 90% of funding came from local 911 fees; one state reported that the source of funding was split evenly between state and local jurisdictions' 911 fee collection; and one state reported that local fees were the sole source of funding.¹¹⁰ Ten states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that state or local General Fund revenues accounted for 50 to 90% of 911 funding. American Samoa reported that 100% of funding toward the cost to support 911 came from the state General Fund.¹¹¹

¹¹⁰ Although states and jurisdictions reported certain percentages at Question F5, tallied in this summary, their responses sometimes appear internally inconsistent. For example, Minnesota reported that 100% of its 911 support came from state 911 fees, but also reported that "PSAPs receive general funds from the county/municipality in which they operate to augment the annual distribution they receive from the state through 911 fees." Minnesota Response at 12. See *infra* note 112 for more examples, including a list of states that provided funding source contribution percentages that do not total 100%.

¹¹¹ American Samoa Response at 11. American Samoa reports that it has not established a funding mechanism. American Samoa Response at 5-6.

Table 16 – State Estimates of Proportional Contributions from Each Funding Source¹¹²

State	State 911/E911 Fees	Local 911/E911 Fees	General Fund - State	General Fund - County	Federal Grants	State Grants
AK	[No Response]	100% ¹¹³	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
AL	87.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.9% ¹¹⁴	1.5%	0.6%
AR	70%	5%	0%	25%	0%	0%
AZ	100%	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
CA	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
CO	6%	94%	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
CT	100%	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
DE	100%	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
FL	44%	[No Response]	[No Response]	50%	[No Response]	6%
GA	55%	[No Response]	[No Response]	45%	[No Response]	[No Response]
HI	-	-	-	-	-	-
IA	20%	[No Response]	[No Response]	30%	[No Response]	[No Response]
ID	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]
IL	92.60%	0%	0%	7.40%	0%	0%
IN	45%	12%	0%	43%	[No Response]	0%
KS	24%	[No Response]	[No Response]	76%	[No Response]	[No Response]
KY	26%	34%	0%	36%	1%	3%
LA	10%	90%	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
MA	100%	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]

¹¹² Alabama, Colorado, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Wisconsin, and Wyoming provided substantive entries in Addendum Section F5 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/fifteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>. Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, and South Dakota provided funding source contribution percentages that do not total 100%. Iowa states, “We do not track expenditures through the above specific categories. The way we track our 911 funding breaks down as follows: 20% 911 Surcharge[;] 30% County General Fund[;] 21% Sheriff’s Fund[;] 29% Miscellaneous Other Sources[.]” Iowa Response at 11-12. Michigan states, “Local millages make up 16.94% and other receipts make up 16.37% as described above. In addition, \$863,829.27 was spent in Federal grant money from the 2019 NG911 Federal Grant Program. This amount does not include the State Funds match, only the Federal grant dollars used. Of this, \$0 was administrative costs, \$20,009.64 was associated with consulting services for the GIS repository upgrade, \$432,959.21 was associated with consulting services for the Address Point Gap Fill project, and \$410,860.42 was spent on upgrading call processing equipment. The details of the project are described in Section 14.” Michigan Response at 12-13. Nevada states, “White Pine County - Cost related to General Fund dispatch Department \$535,469.07. Storey County - Self-funded. Storey County Board of Commissioners have elected not to collect 911 fees or surcharges.” Nevada Response at 13.

¹¹³ But see Alaska Response to Question F4a, where Alaska states, “The 911 surcharge is used to ‘supplement’ not fully support the local 911 call center. The balance of the funding comes from General Revenue taxes at the Borough or Municipal level.” Alaska Response at 12.

¹¹⁴ At Addendum Section F5, Alabama states, “The General Fund-County percentage is based on self-reported funding data by the local districts for the fiscal period of October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2022; 75 of the 85 districts reported.” Alabama response at 12.

State	State 911/E911 Fees	Local 911/E911 Fees	General Fund - State	General Fund - County	Federal Grants	State Grants
MD	26%	31%	0%	43%	0%	0%
ME	98%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%
MI	11.25%	30.24%	0%	24.93%	0.27%	0%
MN	100%	0%	0%	PSAPs receive general funds from the county/municipality in which they operate to augment the annual distribution they receive from the state through 911 fees	1%	0%
MO	0.021%	94.979%	[No Response]	5%	[No Response]	[No Response]
MS	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
MT	30%	[No Response]	[No Response]	70%	[No Response]	[No Response]
NC	44%	[No Response]	[No Response]	48%	[No Response]	8%
ND	4%	58%	0%	37.5%	0.5%	[No Response]
NE	10%	10%	0%	80%	[No Response]	[No Response]
NH	99%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
NJ	Unknown	Unknown	0%	Unknown	0%	0%
NM	100%	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
NV	[No Response]	37% - 100% dependent on County	[No Response]	44% - 100% dependent on County	[No Response]	[No Response]
NY	[No Response]	11.1%	[No Response]	87.1%	[No Response]	1.8%
OH	35.9%	15.2%	[No Response]	48.9%	[No Response]	[No Response]
OK	30.74%	6.06%	0%	62.11%	1.09%	[No Response]
OR	30%	70%	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
PA	77.6%	[No Response]	[No Response]	22.4%	[No Response]	[No Response]
RI	Effective October 1, 2019 100% ¹¹⁵	[No Response]	Effective, up until October 1, 2019 100%	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
SC	83%	17%	0%	???	[No Response]	[No Response]
SD	43.6%	[No Response]	[No Response]	50.8%	[No Response]	5.7%
TN	71.1%	2.3%	0%	26.1%	0.5%	0%
TX	55.0%	21%	[No Response]	22%	2.0%	[No Response]
UT	44.00%	N/A	5.00%	49.95%	1.00%	0.05%
VA	50%	50%	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
VT	72%	[No Response]	28%	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
WA	9%	23%	[No Response]	~34% user agency fees ~34% other local funds	[No Response]	[No Response]
WI	0%	15%	5%	75%	5%	0%
WV	64%	36%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
WY	66.54%	[No Response]	[No Response]	33.46%	[No Response]	[No Response]
Other Jurisdictions						
AS	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%

¹¹⁵ For calculation purposes, we assume that from October 1, 2019 onward, including calendar year 2022, 100% of Rhode Island's 911 funding comes from State 911/E911 fees.

State	State 911/E911 Fees	Local 911/E911 Fees	General Fund - State	General Fund - County	Federal Grants	State Grants
DC	[No Response]	44%	56%	[No Response]	0%	[No Response]
Guam	100%	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
NMI	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]
PR	100%	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
USVI	19%	[No Response]	81%	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]

28. On a related note, the FCC Questionnaire at F3 also asked respondents to identify any other sources of 911/E911 funding, beyond 911/E911 fees.¹¹⁶ Most states and jurisdictions responded with specific information on the sources for their 911/E911 funding.¹¹⁷

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

29. As previously noted, “[t]o 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,” in 2008, Congress directed the Commission to annually submit a report detailing the status in each State of the collection and distribution of such fees or charges.¹¹⁸ On December 27, 2020, Congress enacted section 902, which directed the Commission to adopt rules “designating purposes and functions for which the obligation or expenditure of 9-1-1 fees or charges, by any State or taxing jurisdiction authorized to impose such a fee or charge, is acceptable.”¹¹⁹ Section 902 also amended 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(2) to replace the statutory language that the Commission’s annual report should include findings on the amount of revenues obligated or expended for “any purpose other than the purpose for which any such fees or charges are specified,”¹²⁰ with the language “any purpose or function other than the purposes and functions designated in the final rules issued [by the Commission] . . . as purposes and functions for which the obligation or expenditure of any such fees or charges is acceptable.”¹²¹

30. On June 25, 2021, the Commission issued the *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order* adopting rules that define which expenditures of 911 fees or charges by states and jurisdictions are “acceptable” and which constitute fee diversion for purposes of section 902 and the Commission’s rules.¹²² The rules also provide an elective safe harbor for states and taxing jurisdictions that designate multi-purpose fees or charges for “public safety,” “emergency services,” or other similar purposes, where a portion of those fees or charges supports 911 services.¹²³ The rules adopted in the *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order* went into effect on October 18, 2021.¹²⁴ As required by section 902, the Commission

¹¹⁶ FCC Questionnaire at 10 (Question F3).

¹¹⁷ State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/fifteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

¹¹⁸ 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(2).

¹¹⁹ Section 902(c)(1)(C) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(3)(A) (as amended)).

¹²⁰ NET 911 Act at § 6(f)(2) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(2)) (prior version, in effect until December 27, 2020).

¹²¹ Section 902(c)(1)(B) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(2) (as amended)).

¹²² *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*. The rules adopted in the *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order* may be found at 47 CFR § 9.21 *et seq.*

¹²³ 47 CFR § 9.23(d).

¹²⁴ *Effective Date of 911 Fee Diversion Rules Public Notice*, 36 FCC Rcd 12629.

has applied these rules in this year's Fifteenth Report to Congress.¹²⁵

31. Section 902 also required the Commission to establish the "Ending 9-1-1 Fee Diversion Now Strike Force" (911 Strike Force) to study "how the Federal Government can most expeditiously end diversion" by states and taxing jurisdictions.¹²⁶ The Commission referred several issues to the Strike Force, including seeking recommendations on the "precise dividing line" between acceptable and unacceptable expenditures of 911 fees on public safety radio expenditures, and developing additional specific examples of the allowable use of 911 fees for public safety radio systems.¹²⁷ On September 23, 2021, the 911 Strike Force submitted its final report with recommendations and findings to Congress.¹²⁸

32. 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 [911/E911] fees or charges."¹²⁹ Last year, the Bureau revised the annual data-gathering questionnaire to help effectuate the Commission's new rules under section 902. The questionnaire changes included a revision to Question G1, which now asks states and jurisdictions whether funds collected for 911/E911 purposes were obligated or expended solely for "acceptable purposes and functions" as provided under the Commission's new rule at 47 CFR § 9.23.¹³⁰ Similarly, revised Question G1a now asks respondents to identify what amount of funds collected for 911/E911 purposes was obligated or expended for purposes or functions other than those designated as acceptable under 47 CFR § 9.23, including any funds transferred, loaned, or otherwise used for the state's General Fund.¹³¹ Last year's revised questionnaire also added Questions G2 and G3, requesting information on public safety radio spending and multi-purpose fees, respectively.¹³²

33. Pursuant to the rules adopted in the *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*, in calendar year 2022, three reporting states diverted or transferred fees. As described in Table 17 below, Nevada appears to have self-identified in its questionnaire response that it, or local jurisdictions within the state,

¹²⁵ See sections 902(d)(2) and 902(f)(4) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1 Statutory Notes (as amended)).

¹²⁶ Section 902(d)(3)(A) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1 Statutory Notes (as amended)).

¹²⁷ See, e.g., *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*, 36 FCC Rcd at 10827, 10829, paras. 50, 55 (referring to the Strike Force for further guidance the issue of applying the standard for acceptable 911 expenditures to public safety radio equipment).

¹²⁸ *911 Strike Force Report and Recommendations*. The 911 Strike Force report included the following recommendation for the allowable use of 911 fees to support public safety radio systems: "[t]he allowable use of 911 fees should include the ability for local agencies and states to fund any communication system, technology or support activity that directly provides the ability to deliver 911 voice and data information between the 'entry point' to the 911 system and the first responder." *911 Strike Force Report and Recommendations* at 10 (citations omitted).

¹²⁹ NET 911 Act at § 6(f)(2) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(2)).

¹³⁰ FCC Fifteenth Questionnaire at 11; see similarly FCC Fourteenth Questionnaire at 10-11. The prior version of the questionnaire (e.g., FCC Thirteenth Questionnaire) at G1 and G1a reflected the version of 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(2) previously in effect, before the section 902 amendments. NET 911 Act at § 6(f)(2) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(2)) (prior version, in effect until December 27, 2020) (stating Commission's annual report should include "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").

¹³¹ FCC Fifteenth Questionnaire at 11; see similarly FCC Fourteenth Questionnaire at 11.

¹³² FCC Fifteenth Questionnaire at 12-14; see similarly FCC Fourteenth Questionnaire at 11-14. In addition, this year for the Fifteenth Report, some minor, non-substantive revisions were made to last year's questionnaire to help clarify instructions and questions. See, e.g., FCC Fifteenth Questionnaire at 13 (Question G3 & n.5).

diverted funds.¹³³ New Jersey and New York did not self-identify in their questionnaire responses as diverting funds, but, consistent with previous reports, the Bureau has determined based on review of the information provided that these states diverted funds for non-911 related purposes within the meaning of the NET 911 Act. The three jurisdictions listed in Table 17 diverted an aggregate amount of \$205,401,927.93 or approximately 5.33% of all 911/E911 funds reported to have been collected by all responding states and jurisdictions in 2022.

34. 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.

¹³³ In its Response at Question G1, which asks whether 911/E911 funds were obligated or expended “solely for acceptable purposes and functions as provided under 47 CFR § 9.23,” Nevada checked both the Yes and No boxes. Nevada Response at 13. It appears Nevada may be indicating that some of its counties reported they had diverted 911 fees, while others reported they had not. In any event, because the Nevada Response indicated with its Yes answer that some diversion had taken place within the state during calendar year 2022, Nevada is counted as having self-identified as a diverter for the Fifteenth Report. In addition, as discussed below, the Bureau does not find that Nevada diverted fees at the state level in calendar year 2022, but concludes that two local jurisdictions, Carson City and Mineral County, diverted 911 fees in 2022 under authority granted by a state statute.

Table 17 – Total Funds Diverted or Otherwise Transferred from 911 Uses¹³⁴

State/Territory	Total Funds Collected (Year End 2022)	Total Funds Used for Other Purposes	Percentage Diverted	Type of Transfer
States/Jurisdictions Self-Identifying as Diverting/Transferring Funds				
Nevada	\$2,891,425.85	[Unknown]	[Unknown]	Public Safety
States/Jurisdictions Identified by Bureau as Diverting/Transferring Funds				
New Jersey	\$127,124,000	\$99,302,000	78.1%	Public Safety and Unrelated
New York	\$254,436,278 ¹³⁵	\$106,099,927.93	41.7%	Public Safety and Unrelated
Total	\$384,451,703.85	\$205,401,927.93	53.43%	
<i>Percent Diverted From Total Funds Collected by All States</i>				
Total	\$3,850,866,702.58¹³⁶	5.33%		

¹³⁴ As noted, New Jersey and New York self-declared as non-diverters in their responses for Question G1, while Nevada checked both Yes and No for Question G1. Nevada added narrative comment at Addendum Section G1 of its response, stating: “White Pine County - Cost related to General Fund Dispatch \$535,469.07, road funding, assessor tech funding & recorders mining map funding expected to help fund above list. Storey County - NO funds were collected[.]” Nevada Response at 14. In addition, Colorado and Georgia self-declared as non-diverters in their responses at G1, but added narrative comment at Addendum Section G1. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/fifteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

¹³⁵ See *infra* note 164.

¹³⁶ This figure reflects the combined total amount of 911/E911 fee revenue that all responding states and jurisdictions reported for calendar year 2022 in the FCC Questionnaire at F2. As discussed below, for our analysis of New York’s 911 fee collection and expenditures, the Bureau used fee revenue data from publicly available New York State tax records, rather than the F2 revenue amount that New York reported in its questionnaire. For simplicity, throughout this report we have used respondents’ submitted F2 figures to calculate the total amount of 911/E911 fees collected in calendar year 2022, and have not adjusted the total amount to reflect any external data on fees.

1. Diversion Analysis

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

35. *Nevada.* Nevada’s response this year indicates that at least two local jurisdictions diverted a portion of their 911/E911 funds in 2022, based on a state statute authorizing such diversion. In its response for the Tenth Report, Nevada reported that in 2017, the state legislature “added an allowance to increase the E911 fee to help pay for body cameras for officers.”¹³⁷ Nevada also reported that the state legislature increased the maximum surcharge and expanded permissible uses for the surcharge to allow “purchase and maintenance of portable event recording devices and vehicular recording devices.”¹³⁸ The Bureau found in the Tenth, Eleventh, Twelfth, Thirteenth, and Fourteenth Reports that the expenditure of 911/E911 fees on police body cameras and vehicular recording devices constituted diversion of 911/E911 fees for non-911 public safety uses.¹³⁹ We make the same finding in this report. In this year’s filing covering 2022, Nevada has not submitted any information indicating that the state has revised its statute or otherwise prohibited local jurisdictions from using 911 fees for body cameras and vehicular recording devices.¹⁴⁰ In addition, Nevada’s response this year reports that both Carson City and Mineral County, Nevada, spent 911 fees on law enforcement body and/or vehicular cameras, although the amount of the expenditures is not specified.¹⁴¹ Accordingly, we find that at least two local jurisdictions in Nevada diverted a portion of the 911/E911 fees they collected in 2022 to a non-911 public safety use.

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

36. *New Jersey.* The Bureau has identified New Jersey’s statutory framework as resulting in diversion of 911 fees as far back as the Sixth Report.¹⁴² This year, New Jersey again reports that it did not

¹³⁷ See FCC, Tenth Annual Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges at 45-46, para. 34 (2018), https://www.fcc.gov/sites/default/files/10th_annual_911_fee_report_to_congress.pdf (Tenth Report) (quoting Churchill County, Nevada Tenth Response at 4).

¹³⁸ See Tenth Report at 45-46, para. 34 (quoting Washoe County, Nevada Tenth Response at 4).

¹³⁹ Tenth Report at 45-46, para. 34; FCC, Eleventh Annual Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges at 41, para. 30 (2019), https://www.fcc.gov/sites/default/files/11th_annual_911_fee_report_2019.pdf; FCC, Twelfth Annual Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges at 51, para. 29 (2020), <https://www.fcc.gov/sites/default/files/12thannual911feereport2020.pdf> (Twelfth Report); FCC, Thirteenth Annual Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges at 51, para. 38 (2021), <https://www.fcc.gov/sites/default/files/13th-annual-911-fee-report-2021.pdf> (Thirteenth Report); Fourteenth Report at 64-65, para. 37.

¹⁴⁰ Nevada Response at 5 (reporting “No” for whether the state amended, enlarged, or in any way altered the funding mechanism). Nev. Rev. Stat. § 244A.7645, which permits certain entities in Nevada counties to spend 911 fees on portable and vehicular event recording devices, was in effect and not revised during calendar year 2022.

¹⁴¹ Nevada Response at 8 (reporting Carson City’s “law enforcement body cameras, law enforcement vehicle cameras”; Mineral County officers’ “body worn cameras”). As noted, in Nevada’s Response at Question G1, which asks whether 911/E911 funds were obligated or expended “solely for acceptable purposes and functions as provided under 47 CFR § 9.23,” Nevada checked both the Yes and No boxes. Nevada Response at 13. It appears Nevada may be acknowledging that some of its counties reported they had diverted 911 fees, while others reported they had not.

¹⁴² See FCC, Sixth Annual Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges at 12-13, paras. 15, 18 (2014), https://transition.fcc.gov/pshs/911/Net%20911/NET911_Act_6thReport_to_Congress_123014.pdf.

divert or transfer any collected funds.¹⁴³ However, in response to Question E1 in this year’s filing, New Jersey again states that in accordance with New Jersey statute (P.L.2004, c.48), all fees collected are “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.”¹⁴⁴ Specifically, New Jersey reports that the \$127,124,000 it collected in 911 fees in calendar year 2022 was deposited into the 9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Trust Fund account and applied to offset a portion of the cost of programs within the Departments of Law and Public Safety, Military and Veterans’ Affairs, and Treasury.¹⁴⁵ New Jersey reports that from this total, it appropriated \$13,822,000 for the Statewide 9-1-1 Emergency Telecommunication System and \$4,000,000 for the Office of Emergency Telecommunication Services.¹⁴⁶ As in prior years, we find these expenditures to be 911-related.¹⁴⁷ In addition, this year New Jersey reports that it spent \$10,000,000 on PSAP Upgrades and Consolidation,¹⁴⁸ which we also find to be a 911-related expenditure. New Jersey reports that the remaining balance of \$99,302,000 was allocated to programs such as the Division of State Police, National Guard Support Services, Urban Search and Rescue, and Rural Section Policing.¹⁴⁹ As in previous years, the state has not supplied documentation that would support a conclusion that these latter programs are 911 related. Therefore, consistent with previous reports, the Bureau concludes that New Jersey diverted the \$99,302,000 spent on these programs.¹⁵⁰

37. New Jersey asserts that its “9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Fee” is a multi-purpose fee that falls within the FCC’s voluntary safe harbor provisions.¹⁵¹ We do not agree with this assertion. This is the same fee that New Jersey has collected for a number of years, and New Jersey acknowledges that there was no change to the relevant state law in calendar year 2022.¹⁵² Moreover, the New Jersey fee does not meet two of the three requirements for the FCC’s voluntary safe harbor for multi-purpose fees.¹⁵³ First, although New Jersey asserts that the 911 portion of its 9-1-1 System and

¹⁴³ New Jersey Response at 11.

¹⁴⁴ *Id.* at 7.

¹⁴⁵ *Id.* at 7, 10.

¹⁴⁶ *Id.* at 7. At Question G2b, New Jersey indicates that the amount for the Office of Emergency Telecommunication Services includes \$385,663.16 for “repair/replacement of a microwave link,” and appears to indicate in Section G and elsewhere in its questionnaire submission that this microwave link was a 911-related expenditure. *Id.* at 2, 5, 13. Although New Jersey does not provide details, we have accepted this expenditure as 911 related for purposes of calculating New Jersey’s 911-related spending and have not subtracted it from the total dollar amount New Jersey lists as appropriated to the Office of Emergency Telecommunication Services. *Id.* at 7 (E1).

¹⁴⁷ *See, e.g.*, Fourteenth Report at 63, para. 35; Thirteenth Report at 50-51, para. 37; Twelfth Report at 50, para. 28.

¹⁴⁸ New Jersey Response at 7.

¹⁴⁹ New Jersey Response at 7.

¹⁵⁰ In this year’s response, New Jersey has again reported a combination of fiscal year and calendar year data. *See, e.g.*, New Jersey Response at 7, 9-10 (E1 and F2). The Bureau has calculated New Jersey’s diversion amount based on the information New Jersey has made available.

¹⁵¹ New Jersey Response at 13-15 (Section G3). *See also 911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*, FCC Rcd at 10813, para. 20 (explaining the Commission has found that multi-purpose fees that support 911/E911 and other purposes fall within the Commission’s authority under section 6(f)(1) of the NET 911 Act).

¹⁵² New Jersey Response at 5.

¹⁵³ The three requirements to qualify for the FCC’s voluntary safe harbor for multi-purpose fees are set forth at 47 CFR § 9.23(d).

Emergency Response Fee is segregated and not commingled with other funds,¹⁵⁴ New Jersey’s response to another section of the questionnaire indicates that all fee revenue is deposited in a single account.¹⁵⁵ Second, New Jersey has not demonstrated that a fixed dollar amount or percentage of the fee is dedicated to 911 services.¹⁵⁶ Under the relevant New Jersey statute, funds credited to the 9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Trust Fund Account are annually appropriated for a number of listed purposes, both 911 and non-911 related, but the statute does not specify a fixed amount or percentage to be used for 911 purposes.¹⁵⁷ We therefore find that New Jersey has not demonstrated that the 9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Fee is a permissible multi-purpose fee under the FCC’s rules.¹⁵⁸

38. *New York.* The Bureau’s reports have identified New York’s statutory framework as resulting in diversion of 911 fees since the first fee report to Congress in 2009.¹⁵⁹ Under section 186-f of the New York State Consolidated Tax Law, 41.7% of the fees collected by the Public Safety Communications Surcharge is allocated to the state’s General Fund and, after deducting this amount and a small administrative fee for each wireless communications service supplier and prepaid wireless communications seller, the remaining balance is then deposited into the Statewide Public Safety Communications Account.¹⁶⁰ New York also reports collecting two other kinds of fees that contribute to 911 support, an “Enhanced Emergency Telephone System Surcharge” and a “Wireless Communications Surcharge.”¹⁶¹

39. New York continued to operate under this state law framework in calendar year 2022.¹⁶² Consistent with prior reports, we conclude that the 41.7% of the surcharge that is allocated to the state’s General Fund constitutes a diversion of 911 fees.¹⁶³ In the absence of any showing by New York as to

¹⁵⁴ New Jersey Response at 14 (G3b); *see also* 47 CFR § 9.23(d)(2).

¹⁵⁵ New Jersey Response at 7. *See also* N.J. Stat. Ann. § 52:17C-18(c)(1) (West, Westlaw through 2023) (establishing the fee and directing that “the State Treasurer shall credit the fee revenue to the ‘9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Trust Fund Account’”); N.J. Stat. Ann. § 52:17C-19 (West, Westlaw through 2023) (listing the 911 related and non-911 related purposes for which the funds in the 9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Trust Fund Account can be spent).

¹⁵⁶ *See* 47 CFR § 9.23(d)(1).

¹⁵⁷ N.J. Stat. Ann. § 52:17C-19(b) (West, Westlaw through 2023).

¹⁵⁸ The FCC’s multi-purpose fee safe harbor provision is “a voluntary provision that provides a set of criteria for states and taxing jurisdictions with multi-purpose fees to demonstrate that they are not diverting 911 fees or charges.” *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*, 36 FCC Rcd at 10830, para. 57. This elective safe harbor provision with its particular set of criteria is not the only means by which a state may demonstrate that its use of a portion of a multi-purpose fee for non-911 related purposes does not constitute fee diversion. However, New Jersey also has not otherwise demonstrated that its use of the 9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Fee does not constitute diversion.

¹⁵⁹ *See, e.g.*, Fourteenth Report at 65-67, paras. 38-41; FCC, Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges at 11-12, para. 16, Table 4 (2009), <https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/DOC-292216A2.pdf>.

¹⁶⁰ N.Y. Tax Law § 186-f 5(a)-(b) (McKinney). Section 186-f of the New York State Consolidated Tax Law requires the collection of a Public Safety Communications Surcharge. *Id.* at § 186-f 2. The remaining portion of the surcharge, slightly less than 58.3%, is deposited to the Statewide Public Safety Communications Account. *Id.* at § 186-f 5(b).

¹⁶¹ New York Response at 4-7.

¹⁶² *See, e.g.*, New York Response at 5 (indicating that the only changes in the funding mechanism in 2022 were, e.g., an increase in the amount of certain fees).

¹⁶³ *See, e.g.*, Fourteenth Report at 65-66, para. 39; Thirteenth Report at 52-53, para. 40; Twelfth Report at 52, para. 32.

how the funds allocated to the General Fund were spent, we identify the full 41.7%, or \$106,099,927.93, as diverted.¹⁶⁴ In addition, as in past years, New York has not provided sufficient information relating to expenditure of the remaining 58.3% of funds allocated to the Statewide Public Safety Communications Account, and thus has not established that these expenditures in calendar year 2022 were 911 related. The statute identifies a variety of public safety related programs that may receive state grants or allocations funded by this account,¹⁶⁵ only one of which is clearly 911 related.¹⁶⁶ Because we lack information regarding the specific expenditures of public safety grant funds from this account, we do not reach the issue of whether these funds were diverted and do not include them in our calculation of the amount diverted by New York.

40. This year, New York again asserts that its Public Safety Communications Surcharge is a multi-purpose fee that falls within the FCC's voluntary safe harbor provisions, and thus that New York's expenditure of a portion of the fee revenues on non-911 related items does not constitute diversion.¹⁶⁷ We do not agree with this assertion. New York has collected this same surcharge for years and has diverted a significant portion of the revenues to the state General Fund, which we have consistently found to constitute fee diversion. There has been no change to the relevant state law or the nature of New York's fee expenditures to warrant a different conclusion this year with respect to such expenditures.

41. In addition, even the portion of the New York surcharge that is allocated to the Statewide Public Safety Communications Account fails to meet two of the three requirements for the FCC's safe harbor for multi-purpose fees.¹⁶⁸ First, although New York asserts that a portion of the surcharge dedicated to PSAP-related grants is segregated and not commingled with other funds,¹⁶⁹ the relevant state statute states that these funds are deposited into the Statewide Public Safety Communications Account along with other funds that are then paid out for both 911 related and non-911 related purposes listed in the statute.¹⁷⁰ Second, New York has not established that the fee structure includes a fixed amount or

¹⁶⁴ In this year's questionnaire, New York reports data for the total dollar amount of fees collected, but does not break out the dollar amount specifically from the Public Safety Communications Surcharge under § 186-f, as opposed to other fees. New York Response at 9-11. Because New York has not supplied any information on the amount it collected in 2022 through the Public Safety Communications Surcharge, the Bureau has used publicly available fiscal year data for this surcharge in its calculations. State tax records indicate that New York collected \$254,436,278 through its Public Safety Communications Surcharge in fiscal year 2022. *See* New York State, Department of Taxation and Finance, Table 6: Article 9 – Corporation and Utilities Tax Collections, Fiscal Years 1993-2022, https://www.tax.ny.gov/research/stats/statistics/sales_tax/reports/annual-statistical-reports/2021-2022/2021-2022-tables.xls. The New York fiscal year runs from April 1 to March 31. *See* https://www.tax.ny.gov/research/stats/statistics/stat_fy_collections.htm.

¹⁶⁵ For example, the statute allocates \$25.5 million from these surcharge funds to the New York State Police and sets aside additional funds for grants to counties in support of interoperable communications for first responders. N.Y. Tax Law §§ 186-f 6(a), 6(c) (McKinney).

¹⁶⁶ The statute allocates \$10 million for grants to counties for costs related to PSAP operations. *Id.* at § 186-f 6(g). *See also* New York Response at 6-7, 9, 15, 17, 22 (discussing the \$10 million from § 186-f revenue that is allocated to PSAP grants).

¹⁶⁷ New York Response at 14-16 (Section G3).

¹⁶⁸ The three requirements to qualify for the FCC's voluntary safe harbor for multi-purpose fees are set forth at 47 CFR § 9.23(d).

¹⁶⁹ New York Response at 15 (Section G3); *see also* 47 CFR § 9.23(d)(2).

¹⁷⁰ N.Y. Tax Law §§ 186-f 5, 6 (McKinney). In its questionnaire responses, New York states that the PSAP grant funds are "segregated in each year's budget appropriation into a single-purpose budgetary program code 30331," and says that "[f]unding and expenditures from this budget line are not commingled with funding or expenditures for
(continued....)

percentage of expenditures that is dedicated to 911 services.¹⁷¹ New York asserts that \$10 million in revenues from the fee is dedicated to PSAP-related grants under the state statute,¹⁷² but the statute also allows up to \$75 million to be used for “public safety communications systems or networks designed to support statewide interoperable communications for first responders.”¹⁷³ This does not provide the level of transparency or certainty regarding multi-purpose expenditures that the safe harbor requires.¹⁷⁴ We therefore find that New York has not demonstrated that its Public Safety Communications Surcharge meets the safe harbor requirements.

42. In Table 18 below, we compare the number of states and jurisdictions identified as diverting 911/E911 funds in this reporting year to past years.

(Continued from previous page) _____
other purposes.” New York Response at 15. However, New York makes no contentions that the \$10 million is actually placed into a separate account or similarly actually segregated and not commingled with other funds. *Id.*

¹⁷¹ New York Response at 15 (Section G3); *see also* 47 CFR § 9.23(d)(1).

¹⁷² New York Response at 6, 15 (C3, G3); *see also* N.Y. Tax Law §§ 186-f 6(g) (McKinney) (allocating \$10 million annually “for the provision of grants to counties for costs related to the operations of public safety dispatch centers”). As noted above, publicly available state tax records indicate that New York collected \$254,436,278 through its Public Safety Communications Surcharge in fiscal year 2022.

¹⁷³ N.Y. Tax Law §§ 186-f 6(c) (McKinney).

¹⁷⁴ *See, e.g., 911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*, 36 FCC Rcd at 10830, paras. 58, 60.

Table 18 – States/Jurisdictions Identified as Diverting 911/E911 Funds (2009 – 2023)

Report Year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Report	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th	13th	14th	15th
Calendar Year	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
States		AZ	AZ	AZ											
						CA									
		DE													
		GA	GA	GA											
		HI													
		IL	IL	IL	IL	IL	IL	IL	IA						
						KS			IL	¹⁷⁵					
		ME		ME	ME										
			NE												
		MT									MT				
								NH	NH						
								NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ
										NM				NM	
											NV	NV	NV	NV	NV
		NY	NY	NY	NY	NY	NY	NY	NY	NY	NY	NY	NY	NY	NY
		OR	OR	OR											
		RI	RI	RI	RI	RI	RI	RI	RI	RI	RI	RI	RI		
		TN													
							WA		WA						
		WI	WI												
							WV	WV	WV	WV	WV	WV	WV		
Other Jurisdictions						Guam	Guam	Guam	Guam	Guam					
						PR		PR							
										USVI					

¹⁷⁵ Reflects removal of Illinois from the list of diverters for the Ninth Report, effective as of the Fourteenth Report. See Fourteenth Report at 69, Table 18 n.177 (explaining retroactive Illinois removal).

Report Year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Report	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th	13th	14th	15th
Calendar Year	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Total	8	10	7	6	4	8	7	10	6	8	5	5	5	3	3
States and Other Jurisdictions That Did Not File a Fee Report															
States Not Filing A Report					AR										
															ID
			KS												
				LA		LA	LA								
							MO	MO	MO						
									MT						
				NH											
			NJ												
										NY					
		OK							OK						
			RI												
Other Jurisdictions Not Filing A Report					AS	AS									
				DC											
		Guam	Guam		Guam	Guam	Guam	Guam	Guam						
	NMI	NMI	NMI	NMI	NMI	NMI	NMI	NMI	NMI			NMI	NMI	NMI	NMI
									PR						
	USVI			USVI	USVI	USVI	USVI					USVI			
Total	2	2	5	6	5	5	5	3	7	0	0	1	2	1	2

43. 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.¹⁷⁶ On August 9, 2019, the Departments of Commerce and Transportation announced the award of more than \$109 million in grants to thirty-four states and two Tribal Nations as part of the 911 Grant Program.¹⁷⁷ As with last year's report, we remind interested parties that section 6503 of the 2012 Act requires applicants that receive grants under this program to certify that no portion of any designated 911 charges imposed by the state or other taxing jurisdiction within which the applicant is located is being obligated or expended "for any purpose other than the purposes for which such charges are designated or presented."¹⁷⁸

2. Public Safety Radio Expenditures

44. Since the Fourteenth Report, the FCC Questionnaire has included Section G2 to gather data on public safety radio and related spending. The revised questionnaire asked states and jurisdictions to report on whether funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes were obligated or expended for the purchase, maintenance, replacement, or upgrade of public safety radios, networks, equipment, or related infrastructure.¹⁷⁹ Thirty-one states and the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported obligating or expending collected 911 funds on public safety radios and related items in 2022.¹⁸⁰ Question G2b of the questionnaire asked for amounts and descriptions of such obligations or expenditures. Table 19 below shows that, in total, states and jurisdictions reported public safety radio expenditures of \$236,236,211.86, or approximately 6.13% of all 911/E911 fees collected by all states and jurisdictions in 2022. However, not all respondents who reported public safety radio spending actually listed amounts, so the reported dollar total may underestimate the actual total.

45. States and jurisdictions reported spending on a variety of public safety radio uses. California spent collected 911/E911 funds to upgrade its state microwave radio network to deliver 911 calls to PSAPs that do not have adequate commercial IP connectivity.¹⁸¹ Guam, which designates the

¹⁷⁶ See Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012, Pub. L. No. 112-96, 126 Stat. 156, 236, 237-242, §§ 6413(b)(6), 6503; 47 U.S.C. § 942(b). See generally National Telecommunications and Information Administration, *Next Generation 911*, <https://www.ntia.doc.gov/category/next-generation-911> (last visited Nov. 22, 2023).

¹⁷⁷ See Press Release, National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) and National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Departments of Commerce and Transportation Announce \$109 Million in Grants to Modernize 911 Services for States and Tribal Nations (Aug. 9, 2019), <https://www.ntia.doc.gov/press-release/2019/departments-commerce-and-transportation-announce-109-million-grants-modernize>.

¹⁷⁸ 47 U.S.C. § 942(c)(2)-(3).

¹⁷⁹ See FCC Questionnaire (Section G2).

¹⁸⁰ Nevada and Texas responded both Yes and No to Question G2, with other entries in their responses indicating this meant some localities did such spending and some did not. Moreover, most of the 35 states and jurisdictions that reported such spending (except Delaware, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, and Texas) also responded Yes to follow-up Question G2a: "are all of the public safety radios, networks, equipment, or related infrastructure on which [911/E911] funds were obligated or expended used to deliver 911-originated information to emergency responders?" Delaware, Minnesota, and New Hampshire responded No, explaining their responses at G2a(i). Nevada and Texas again responded both Yes and No to Question G2a, with explanatory entries at G2a(i).

¹⁸¹ California Response at 13.

Guam Fire Department as its lead agency to operate the 911 system, reports it spent funds for a radio maintenance contract for all fire station and emergency response base stations, mobile radios, and portable radios that are tied to the 911 system.¹⁸² Kentucky spent funds for radio consoles for several county E911 entities.¹⁸³ North Carolina's expenditures included radio dispatch console equipment and software located within the PSAP.¹⁸⁴ Pennsylvania spent funds on core radio components from dispatch positions to a tower, including hardware, software, licenses, maintenance, and repairs.¹⁸⁵

46. We do not make any finding of fee diversion based on these reported public safety radio expenditures. The Commission's rules provide that expenditure of 911 fees for equipment or infrastructure that does not "directly support providing 911 services" would not be an acceptable use of such fees.¹⁸⁶ In the *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*, the Commission declined to define a bright line test for applying this rule to public safety radio expenditures and referred the issue to the 911 Strike Force for further consideration.¹⁸⁷ In its report, the 911 Strike Force recommended that expenditures be allowed for public safety radio systems that "directly provide[] the ability to deliver 911 voice and data information between the 'entry point' to the 911 system and the first responder."¹⁸⁸ This issue remains under consideration following the issuance of the 911 Strike Force report. In addition, the issue of public safety radio expenditures has been raised in a pending petition for reconsideration of the *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*.¹⁸⁹ Therefore, we believe it would be premature to make any findings in this report that would prejudice these issues.

¹⁸² Guam Response at 7, 13.

¹⁸³ Kentucky Response at 13.

¹⁸⁴ North Carolina Response at 13.

¹⁸⁵ Pennsylvania Response at 13.

¹⁸⁶ 47 CFR § 9.23(c)(3).

¹⁸⁷ *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*, 36 FCC Rcd at 10828-29, paras. 54-55.

¹⁸⁸ *911 Strike Force Report and Recommendations* at 10 (citation omitted).

¹⁸⁹ BRETSA Petition; City of Aurora 911 Authority et al. Petition.

Table 19 – Public Safety Radio Expenditures¹⁹⁰

State	Were Collected 911 Funds Obligated / Expended for Public Safety Radios, etc.?	If Yes, Are All the Radios, etc., Used to Deliver 911- Originated Information to Emergency Responders?	Descriptions of Obligations / Expenditures for Public Safety Radios, Networks, Equipment, or Related Infrastructure	Total Amount of Public Safety Radio, etc., Expenditures of Collected 911 Funds ¹⁹¹
AK	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[NA]
AL	Yes	Yes	[No Response]	[No Response]
AR	Yes	Yes	Annually goes towards upgrades and maintenance for the statewide public safety radio network, Arkansas Wireless Information Network (AWIN)	\$8,000,000.00
AZ	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[NA]
CA	Yes	Yes	Upgrade State Microwave network to MPLS so that it can be used to deliver 9-1-1 calls to PSAPs that do not have adequate, redundant, commercial [sic] IP connectivity.	\$16,086,000.00
CO	Yes	Yes	[No Response]	[No Response]
CT	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[NA]
DE	Yes	No ¹⁹²	[No Response]	[No Response]
FL	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[NA]
GA	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
HI	Yes	Yes	Training[;] Maintenance[;] Administration[;] Telecommunications[;] Non-Recurring ¹⁹³	\$7,998,225.00

¹⁹⁰ Alabama, Colorado, District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, Nevada, New York, North Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Texas provided substantive entries in Addendum Section G2 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. North Carolina states, in part, “N.C.G.S. § 143B-1406(d)(1)d - Funds may be used for ‘Dispatch equipment located exclusively within a building where a PSAP or back-up PSAP is located, excluding the costs of base station transmitters, towers, microwave links, and antennae used to dispatch emergency call information from the PSAP or back-up PSAP.’” North Carolina Response at 13. Tennessee states that “Tenn. Code Ann. § 7-86-102(d) requires that each ECD use funds received from all sources ‘exclusively’ in the operation of the emergency communications district.” Consistent with that mandate, the TECB has 911 Revenue Standards established pursuant to Tenn. Code Ann. § 7-86-306(a)(11), which provide guidance to the ECDs on the Required, Permissible and Prohibited Uses of 911 revenue. In accordance with the 911 Revenue Standards, the expenditures for radio equipment and networks for use in the exclusive operation of a local 911 district is permissible.” Tennessee Response at 14. Some states indicate they have no information on whether local jurisdictions obligated or expended funds on public safety radio items, or on how much may have been obligated or expended. *See, e.g.*, Georgia Response at 15; Kansas Response at 14; Missouri Response at 14. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/fifteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

¹⁹¹ States and jurisdictions that provided amounts also provided descriptions of such obligations and expenditures in response to Question G2b, shown in this table. Some states also used Addendum Section G2 to continue their descriptions of obligations or expenditures. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/fifteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings-0>.

¹⁹² At Question G2a(i), Delaware states, “Delaware Code Title 16 Chapter 101 Subsection 10104. Disbursements from the Fund- (d) Disbursements may not be made for: (4) Two-way radios.” Delaware Response at 13.

¹⁹³ At Addendum Section G2, Hawaii provides additional information: “CAD, Imagerry [sic], Text2911, MSAG, GIS.” Hawaii Response at 13.

State	Were Collected 911 Funds Obligated / Expended for Public Safety Radios, etc.?	If Yes, Are All the Radios, etc., Used to Deliver 911-Originated Information to Emergency Responders?	Descriptions of Obligations / Expenditures for Public Safety Radios, Networks, Equipment, or Related Infrastructure	Total Amount of Public Safety Radio, etc., Expenditures of Collected 911 Funds ¹⁹¹
IA	Yes	Yes	Includes Radio and Radio Components (including but not limited to: radio base station, mobile, portable, repeaters, towers, and maintenance) solely [sic] for public safety and public safety answering points the purposes of the disposition of 911 calls. Any radio expenditures were exclusively purchased by local jurisdictions without State involvement.	\$5,490,292.34
ID	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]
IL	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[NA]
IN	Yes	Yes	[No Response]	[No Response]
KS	Yes	Yes	[No Response] ¹⁹⁴	[No Response]
KY	Yes	Yes	City of Winchester Console Upgrade[;] Fulton County Radio Console [sic] [;] Hancock County Console Upgrade[;] London/Laurel Radio Consoles[;] Menifee County Radio Consoles	\$442,813.00
LA	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
MA	Yes	Yes	CoMIRS interoperable radio network	\$36,915,648.83
MD	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[NA]
ME	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[NA]
MI	Yes	Yes	Contract Costs[;] Equipment[;] Frequency Costs[;] Utilities[;] Insurance ¹⁹⁵	\$52,251,763.36
MN	Yes	No ¹⁹⁶	Maintenance and support of the statewide land mobile radio system	\$10,500,000.00

¹⁹⁴ At Addendum Section G2, Kansas states, “By statute, only PSAP control station radios and radio infrastructure used for radio dispatch of 911 calls are allowable expenditures of 911 funds. Subscriber radios (mobile and portable radios) are not allowed. The Council’s Expenditure Review Committee reviews all expenditures of 911 funds each year and demands confirmation from any PSAP expending money for the purchase or maintenance of radio equipment that the expenditure does not include subscriber radios. The dollar amounts of expenditures for PSAP radios and infrastructure are not readily available.” Kansas Response at 13-14.

¹⁹⁵ In Addendum Section G2, Michigan provides additional information: “Labor/Service Calls \$11,306.13[;] Licensing Fees \$8,182.60[;] Maintenance/Repairs \$764,601.86[;] Network/Infrastructure \$2,697,391.20[;] Payments Bond/Debt \$15,021,687.51[;] Programming Fees \$69,374.43[;] Radios/Pager \$23,506,316.16[;] Reimbursement \$1,160.65[;] Server Room \$6,840.00[;] Service Agreement \$29,242.00[;] Tower Costs \$417,688.16[;] Tower Project \$227,947.22[;] Upgrades \$3,136,821.60[;] Total \$52,251,763.36.” Michigan Response at 15.

¹⁹⁶ At Question G2a(i), Minnesota states, “While a majority of the users on the land mobile radio system are public safety users who communicate with a PSAP, there are also non-public safety entities such as public works vehicles and school busses and metro transit systems who are users. The State of Minnesota is preparing to conduct a comprehensive system wide inventory to determine the exact percentage of public safety v. non public safety users and will ensure the amount of 9-1-1 fees used to support this communication system is proportionate to the number of public safety users on the system.” Minnesota Response at 14.

State	Were Collected 911 Funds Obligated / Expended for Public Safety Radios, etc.?	If Yes, Are All the Radios, etc., Used to Deliver 911-Originated Information to Emergency Responders?	Descriptions of Obligations / Expenditures for Public Safety Radios, Networks, Equipment, or Related Infrastructure	Total Amount of Public Safety Radio, etc., Expenditures of Collected 911 Funds ¹⁹¹
MO	Yes	Yes ¹⁹⁷	[No Response]	[No Response]
MS	Yes	Yes ¹⁹⁸	Phase 1 Carrier Cost Recovery Recurring[;] Phase 2 Carrier Cost Recovery Recurring[;] Phase 1 Carrier Cost Recovery Non-Recuring	\$5,020,264.66
MT	Yes	Yes	NA	NA
NC	Yes	Yes	Radio dispatch console equipment and software located within the PSAP per N.C.G.S. § 143B-1406(d)(1)d[;] Public safety radios, networks, equipment, or related infrastructure funded through the NC 911 Board grant program per N.C.G.S. § 143B-1407(b)	\$4,936,008.00
ND	Yes	Yes	[No Response]	[No Response]
NE	Yes	Yes	In the Next Generation 911 funding model that became effective in 2022, the use of 911 surcharge funds for the purchase and maintenance of radio consoles inside the PSAP became an allowable expense. All other expenses for radio equipment and radio network costs are not allowable. The expenditure of 911 funds for radio consoles inside a PSAP is a local decision using funds available to the PSAP. The amount expended cannot be identified [sic] until the audits for 2022 are complete.	Unknown
NH	Yes	No ¹⁹⁹	AK Associates which provides Call Processing Equipment [;] INdigital which provides our telephony delivery services as well as text-to-911. [;] Motorola which supports backup microwave system	\$1,076,794.63
NJ	Yes	Yes	As identified in Section E1, a portion of the Office of Emergency Telecommunications Services operating budget for repair/replacement of a microwave link was offset by the 9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Fee in 2022.	\$385,663.16

¹⁹⁷ Despite checking Yes on Question G2a, at Question G2a(i) (which only requests an explanation if the respondent checked No on Question G2a), Missouri states, “These upgrades would have been completed at a local level with local 911 fees that may be ‘Public Safety Fees’ to include 911 and equipment such as public safety radios, networks, equipment or related infrastructure.” Missouri Response at 13.

¹⁹⁸ Despite checking Yes on Question G2a, at Question G2a(i) (which only requests an explanation if the respondent checked No on Question G2a), Mississippi states, “County specific due to these items being budgetary county expenditures.” Mississippi Response at 14.

¹⁹⁹ At Question G2a(i), New Hampshire states, “Portions of the public safety radio network system support the 911 system by using the Microwave to route E911 network connectivity as a backup to our PSAPs if the primary fiber lines go down. Some of the funds are used to provide a redundant 911 system and network for the State of New Hampshire’s two PSAPs. This is a crucial redundancy to maintain continuity of the 911 system. The remainder of funds for the radio network and equipment went to maintaining that emergency responder network.” New Hampshire Response at 12.

State	Were Collected 911 Funds Obligated / Expended for Public Safety Radios, etc.?	If Yes, Are All the Radios, etc., Used to Deliver 911- Originated Information to Emergency Responders?	Descriptions of Obligations / Expenditures for Public Safety Radios, Networks, Equipment, or Related Infrastructure	Total Amount of Public Safety Radio, etc., Expenditures of Collected 911 Funds ¹⁹¹
NM	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[NA]
NV	Yes and No	Yes and No ²⁰⁰	Carson City - CAD Maintenance. Lyon County - Mobile radios for first responders.[;] Carson City - Fiber install. [;] Carson City - UPS Replacement[;] Carson City - NICE Maintenance ²⁰¹	\$640,813.07
NY	Yes	Yes	See Addendum G2	Unk[nown]
OH	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[NA]
OK	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[NA]
OR	Yes	Yes	CPE and GIS Equipment[;] Networks/Infrastructure	\$13,747,304.24
PA	Yes	Yes	Hardware/Software - Core radio system components [sic] from the dispatch positions to the tower[;] Maintenance - Core radio system components [sic] from the dispatch positions to the tower[;] Tower Maintenance - FCC license & fees, maintenance, and emergency repairs	\$32,437,308.00
RI	Yes	Yes	E-911 Catalyst Switches & Mounts[;] Next Gen (NG) 911 System Upgrade Phase #1 Milestone[;] Emergency Medical Dispatch[;] Cisco Meraki Appliances & Switches related to NG911	\$325,562.70
SC	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[NA]
SD	Yes	Yes	annual maintenance agreement[;] \$49,203 equipment; \$5,281 repairs and maintenance (R&M)[;] \$51,380 equipment; \$17,790 R&M[;] \$78,402 equipment; \$1,497 R&M[;] equipment ²⁰²	\$1,944,753.00
TN	Yes	Yes	Expenditures for radio equipment and networks are made at the local level by	Unknown

²⁰⁰ At Question G2a(i), Nevada states, “White Pine County - Working on updates, upgrades and maintenance for systems through other funding. Clark County - No fees were collected. Agencies pay for their own portion of radio equipment and related infrastructure. It does not come out of the communications division budget. Eureka County - No funds collected.” Nevada Response at 14-15.

²⁰¹ At Addendum Section G2, Nevada provides additional information: “White Pine County - Cost related to General Fund Dispatch Department is \$55,469.07. Storey County - No Funds were collected.” Nevada Response at 15.

²⁰² At Addendum Section G2, South Dakota provides additional information: “\$6,966 - \$3,648 equipment; 3,318 annual maintenance[;] \$11,101 – equipment[;] \$1,928 – R&M[;] \$29,565 - \$18,216 equipment; \$11,349 R&M[;] \$492,986 - \$477,050 equipment; \$15,936 R&M[;] \$3,576 – R&M [;] \$316,947 - \$299,262 equipment; \$9,362 R&M; \$8,323 radio circuits[;] \$70,252 - \$4,118 equipment; \$40,342 annual maintenance and R&M: \$25,792 radio circuits[;] \$18,868 - \$9,868 equipment; \$9,000 annual maintenance[;] \$317,778 – equipment[;] \$39,272 - \$33,123 equipment; \$6,149 annual maintenance and R&M[;] \$187,956 - \$180,365 equipment; \$576 R&M; \$7,015 circuits[;] \$8,352 - \$410 equipment; \$7,942 R&M[;] \$957 – equipment[;] \$59,687 - \$55,581 equipment; \$4,116 R&M[;] \$27,035 - \$4,116 R&M; \$11,443 circuit costs[;] \$10,148 - \$7,391 equipment; \$2,757 R&M[;] *Note Digital P25 radio upgrades are occurring statewide in 2023 for South Dakota, so radio equipment upgrade expenditures are substantially higher. Total - \$1,994,753 - \$1,732,991 equipment; \$159,189 R&M/annual maintenance; \$52,573 circuit costs.” South Dakota Response at 13-14.

State	Were Collected 911 Funds Obligated / Expended for Public Safety Radios, etc.?	If Yes, Are All the Radios, etc., Used to Deliver 911-Originated Information to Emergency Responders?	Descriptions of Obligations / Expenditures for Public Safety Radios, Networks, Equipment, or Related Infrastructure	Total Amount of Public Safety Radio, etc., Expenditures of Collected 911 Funds ¹⁹¹
			ECDs, generally included as assets on the balance sheet and data is not collected or tracked by TECB in reviewing change in net position.	
TX	Yes and No	Yes and No ²⁰³	[No Response] ²⁰⁴	\$65,000.00
UT	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[NA]
VA	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[NA]
VT	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[NA]
WA	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[NA]
WI	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[NA]
WV	Yes	Yes	[No Response]	[No Response]
WY	Yes	Yes	[No Response]	[No Response]
Other Jurisdictions				
AS	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[NA]
DC	Yes	Yes	Public Safety Radio Equipment[;] Public Safety Radio Infrastructure / Network[;] Public Safety Radio Maintenance[;] Radio Consultants[;] Radio Training	\$30,686,963.12 ²⁰⁵
Guam	Yes	Yes	Contract for Radio Maintenance at all Guam Fire Department [sic] Fire Stations, Emergency Response Units to include base stations, mobile radios and portable radios that are tied in the the [sic] 911 System. Funds were not expended for other radio communications equipment for other Government [sic] of Guam Agencies.	\$15,157.23
NMI	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]
PR	Yes	Yes	Equipment (Hardware or Software Purchases or Upgrades)[;] Network Management Contract [;] Data, Voice Services and Network	\$7,083,337.52
USVI	Yes	Yes	Maintenance[;] Network and Software Support[;] Equipment	\$186,540.00
Total				\$236,236,211.86

²⁰³ At Question G2a(i), Texas states, “A majority of Texas’s 77 9-1-1 Entities did not expend funds on radios, networks, equipment, or related infrastructure. (Texas interpreted G2 and G2a terms ‘networks, equipment, related infrastructure’ as pertaining to public safety radios and therefore distinguishable from the 9-1-1 Networks implemented by the entities to route and receive 9-1-1 calls.)” Texas Response at 21-22.

²⁰⁴ At Addendum Section G2, Texas states, “Few Texas 9-1-1 Entities provided information including costs for public safety radios, networks, equipment, or related infrastructure. The Cities of DeSoto/Cedar Hill/Duncanville reported spending \$37,000 on radio maintenance and \$28,000 on radio tower rental.” Texas Response at 22.

²⁰⁵ At Addendum Section G2, the District of Columbia also reports, “\$27,317,058.09 in capital funding was spent on public safety radio equipment and radio infrastructure modifications.” District of Columbia Response at 13.

3. Multi-Purpose Fees

47. Section 9.23(d) of the Commission’s rules provides an elective safe harbor for states and taxing jurisdictions that collect multi-purpose fees or charges designated for “public safety,” “emergency services,” or other similar purposes where a portion of those fees or charges supports 911 services.²⁰⁶ The rule provides that the obligation or expenditure of such a fee or charge will not constitute diversion if the state or taxing jurisdiction (i) specifies the amount or percentage of such fees or charges that is dedicated to 911 services; (ii) ensures that the 911 portion of such fees or charges is segregated and not commingled with any other funds; and (iii) obligates or expends the 911 portion of such fees or charges for acceptable purposes and functions as defined under the Commission’s rules.²⁰⁷

48. Accordingly, since the Fourteenth Report, the FCC Questionnaire has included Section G3, which seeks information on multi-purpose fees. Specifically, the Bureau requested that states and jurisdictions report whether they collect fees or charges designated for “public safety,” “emergency services,” or other similar purposes where a portion of those fees or charges supports 911 services. In addition, Section G3 asked whether states that collect such multi-purpose fees meet each of the three requirements of the FCC’s voluntary safe harbor provision set forth at 47 CFR 9.23(d).²⁰⁸

49. Twelve states and the U.S. Virgin Islands report that they collected such multi-purpose fees in 2022. Table 20 below shows responses to questions on multi-purpose fees, including amounts or percentages of such fees that are dedicated to 911 services.

Table 20 – Multi-purpose Fees²⁰⁹

State	Does State / Jurisdiction Collect Multi-Purpose Fees Where a Portion Supports 911 Services?	If Yes, Does State / Jurisdiction Specify Amount or Percentage Dedicated to 911 Services?	Amount or Percentage of Fee Dedicated to 911 Services	Does State / Jurisdiction Ensure that 911 Portion of Fee Is Segregated and Not Commingled With Other Funds?	Is the 911 Portion of Such Fees or Charges Used Only for Acceptable Purposes Per 47 CFR § 9.23?
AK	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
AL	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
AR	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
AZ	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
CA	No	[No Response]	N/A	[No Response]	[No Response]
CO	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
CT	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]

²⁰⁶ 47 CFR § 9.23(d).

²⁰⁷ *Id.*

²⁰⁸ As noted, the FCC’s voluntary multi-purpose fee safe harbor provides a set of criteria for states with multi-purpose fees to demonstrate that they are not diverting 911 fees. *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*, 36 FCC Rcd at 10830, para. 57. This elective safe harbor provision with its particular set of criteria is not the only means by which a state may demonstrate that its use of a portion of a multi-purpose fee for non-911 related purposes does not constitute fee diversion.

²⁰⁹ Missouri, Nevada, North Carolina, Texas, and Wisconsin provided substantive entries in Addendum Section G3 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. In addition, several states and jurisdictions that reported they did not collect multi-purpose fees nevertheless answered some of the additional Section G3 questions about the required elements for the multi-purpose fee elective safe harbor. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/fifteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

State	Does State / Jurisdiction Collect Multi-Purpose Fees Where a Portion Supports 911 Services?	If Yes, Does State / Jurisdiction Specify Amount or Percentage Dedicated to 911 Services?	Amount or Percentage of Fee Dedicated to 911 Services	Does State / Jurisdiction Ensure that 911 Portion of Fee Is Segregated and Not Commingled With Other Funds?	Is the 911 Portion of Such Fees or Charges Used Only for Acceptable Purposes Per 47 CFR § 9.23?
DE	Yes	Yes	100%	Yes	Yes
FL	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
GA	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
HI	No	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
IA	Yes	No	100%	Yes	Yes
ID	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]
IL	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
IN	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
KS	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
KY	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
LA	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
MA	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	Yes
MD	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
ME	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
MI	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
MN	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
MO	No	No	[No Response]	No	Yes
MS	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
MT	Yes	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	Yes
NC	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
ND	Yes	Yes	\$1.50 (max)	Yes	Yes
NE	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
NH	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
NJ	Yes ²¹⁰	Yes	\$17,822,000.00	Yes	Yes
NM	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
NV	Yes and No ²¹¹	Yes and No	100%	Yes and No	Yes and No
NY	Yes ²¹²	Yes	\$10,000,000	Yes	Yes
OH	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
OK	No	No	[No Response]	Yes	Yes
OR	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
PA	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
RI	Yes	Yes	\$0.50	Yes	Yes
SC	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	Yes	Yes

²¹⁰ As discussed above, we find that New Jersey has not demonstrated that its 9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Fee meets the FCC’s safe harbor requirements for multi-purpose fees. 47 CFR § 9.23(d).

²¹¹ Nevada reports both Yes and No, with its Section G3 answers indicating this is because certain counties within Nevada have different responses. Nevada Response at 16-17.

²¹² As discussed above, we find that New York has not demonstrated that its Public Safety Communications Surcharge meets the FCC’s safe harbor requirements for multi-purpose fees. 47 CFR § 9.23(d).

State	Does State / Jurisdiction Collect Multi-Purpose Fees Where a Portion Supports 911 Services?	If Yes, Does State / Jurisdiction Specify Amount or Percentage Dedicated to 911 Services?	Amount or Percentage of Fee Dedicated to 911 Services	Does State / Jurisdiction Ensure that 911 Portion of Fee Is Segregated and Not Commingled With Other Funds?	Is the 911 Portion of Such Fees or Charges Used Only for Acceptable Purposes Per 47 CFR § 9.23?
SD	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
TN	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
TX	Yes	Yes	40%	No	Yes
UT	Yes	Yes	\$0.96	Yes	Yes
VA	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
VT	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
WA	Yes	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
WI	Yes ²¹³	Yes	\$12,644,100.00	Yes	Yes
WV	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
WY	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
Other Jurisdictions					
AS	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
DC	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
Guam	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
NMI	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]
PR	No	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
USVI	Yes	Yes	\$0.80	Yes	Yes

H. Oversight and Auditing of 911/E911 Fees

50. To understand the degree to which states and other jurisdictions track the collection and use of 911 fees, the Bureau asked respondents whether they had established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures to determine whether collected funds had been obligated or expended for acceptable purposes and functions as designated under the Commission’s rules. As indicated in Table 21 below, 46 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, and Puerto Rico reported that they have established an oversight or auditing mechanism. Three states, American Samoa,²¹⁴ and the U.S. Virgin Islands stated they have no oversight or auditing mechanism.

51. 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. Forty states, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that they have authority to conduct audits of service providers. Seven states, the District of Columbia, and Guam reported that they do not.²¹⁵ Of the 42 states and jurisdictions indicating they have authority to

²¹³ At Addendum Section G3, Wisconsin states, “The amounts identified in G3a(ii) under the 2021 Wisconsin 911 Fee Report Questionnaire [i.e., Fourteenth Report] was the amount allocated for State Fiscal Year 2022 - July 2021 to June 2022 (\$7,879,600). For Calendar Year 2021, the amount should have been reported as \$3,939,800. This 2022 report for Wisconsin has been revised to only identify the amounts allocated from the state biennial budget in Calendar Year 2022.” Wisconsin Response at 15-16.

²¹⁴ American Samoa reports that it does not collect any 911/E911 phone fees. American Samoa Response at 8-9, 15.

²¹⁵ American Samoa also reports that it lacks authority to audit service providers; the Bureau does not include it in this count of jurisdictions without audit authority because American Samoa reports that it has not established a funding mechanism. American Samoa Response at 5-6, 15.

audit service providers, 11 states²¹⁶ and Puerto Rico indicated they had “conduct[ed] an audit of service providers in connection with such auditing authority” in 2022; 24 states and the U.S. Virgin Islands indicated no such audits were conducted in 2022; and five states responded “N/A” or did not respond.

Table 21 – Description of Oversight and Auditing of Collection and Use of 911/E911 Fees

State	Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures?	If YES, provide a description of: (i) the mechanisms or procedures and (ii) any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2022.	Does your state have authority to audit service providers?	Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2022
AK	No	[No Response]	No	N/A
AL	Yes	Under § 11-98-6 (e), Code of Alabama 1975, ‘beginning with fiscal year 2013, the Department of Examiners of Public Accounts shall audit each district on a biennial basis to ensure compliance with the requirements of this chapter regarding both revenues and expenditures.’	Yes	Yes
AR	Yes	None	Yes	No
AZ	Yes	[No Response]	Yes	No
CA	Yes	California Revenue and Taxation Code Section 41130. Provides, ‘Upon proper notification to the service supplier, the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration or its authorized representative shall have the right to inspect and audit all records and returns of the service supplier at all reasonable times.’	Yes	No
CO	No	[No Response]	Yes	No
CT	Yes	The Division of Statewide Emergency Telecommunications authorizes use of the 911 Funds, and requires quarterly and annual audits for recipients of the E911 subsidy, including funded municipalities, regional emergency communications centers and multi-town PSAPs. Failure to utilize funds for emergency telecommunications or failure to submit expenditure reports can result in the withholding of the funds. No corrective actions were necessary for the period ending 2022. General Statutes [sic] of Connecticut Sec. 28-30a. Enhanced Telecommunications Fund.	Yes	No
DE	Yes	The Delaware Enhanced 911 Emergency Reporting System Service Board employs a full time administrator to oversee day to day operations. The governing statute requires the board to perform an audit of the funds.	Yes	Yes
FL	Yes	To the Governor and Legislature, the E911 Board reports annually the status of E911 service and the purposes and amounts of collections and expenditures . The Auditor General’s Office audits the E911 Trust Fund to ensure that moneys are being managed in accordance with Florida Statutes. The Auditor General’s Office provides a report of the audit to the E911 Board and the Department of Management Services. Counties are required to establish an E911 account fund to be used exclusively for the receipt and expenditure of E911 fee revenues. In each county’s E911 fund, the moneys collected and the interest earned are appropriated by the county commissioners for statutorily defined E911 purposes and are incorporated into the annual county budget. A financial audit of county E911 funds is included within the county audit report, as required by section 218.39, Florida Statutes. County E911 funds have been periodically audited by the Auditor General and the Department of Management Services, Office of Inspector General. In addition, the Florida Single Audit Act establishes state audit and accountability requirements for state financial assistance to counties. The Florida Single Audit Act is codified in section 215.97, Florida Statutes.	No	N/A
GA	Yes	O.C.G.A. 46-5-134(m) (1) Any local government collecting or expending any 9-1-1 charges or wireless enhanced 9-1-1 charges in any fiscal year beginning on or after July 1, 2005, shall	Yes	No

²¹⁶ This figure does not include Hawaii, which reported that there had been a service provider audit but also reported that it had no authority to audit service providers. Hawaii Response at 16 (“Audit was conducted by an independent CPA firm.”).

State	Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures?	If YES, provide a description of: (i) the mechanisms or procedures and (ii) any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2022.	Does your state have authority to audit service providers?	Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2022
		document the amount of funds collected and expended from such charges. Any local government collecting or expending 9-1-1 funds shall certify in its audit, as required under Code Section 36-81-7, that 9-1-1 funds were expended in compliance with the expenditure requirements of this Code section. Any local government which makes expenditures not in compliance with this Code section may be held liable for pro rata reimbursement to telephone and wireless telecommunications subscribers of amounts improperly expended. Such liability may be established in judicial proceedings by any aggrieved party. The noncompliant local government shall be solely financially responsible for the reimbursement and for any costs associated with the reimbursement. Such reimbursement shall be accomplished by the service suppliers abating the imposition of the 9-1-1 charges and wireless enhanced 9-1-1 charges until such abatement equals the total amount of the rebate.		
HI	Yes	The State of Hawaii Enhanced 911 Board authorizes an annual audit of the E911 Fund by an independent [sic] CPA Firm.	No	Yes
IA	Yes	911 Funds are audited by the Iowa State Auditor's Office in three distinct ways for this reporting period. The Iowa Department of Homeland Security and Emergency Management is subject to an annual audit. As such, because the 911 program falls under HSEMD, 911 funds are audited along with other Department financial programs: No findings The 911 Program is subject to an annual standalone audit by the State Auditor's Office: No findings. PSAPs are required to submit all expenses to the 911 Program Manager. These Expense reports are audited biennially by the auditor of the state. No significant findings or issues of misspending during the audit. Local 911 service boards are also subject to audits from the Auditor of the State	Yes and No ²¹⁷	N/A
ID	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]
IL	Yes	Beginning in October of 2014 and every year thereafter, 9-1-1 authorities are legislatively required to file an Annual Financial Report (AFR) to provide revenue and expenditure information for the prior calendar year by January 31st. Additionally, the State's Auditor General has specific requirements for auditing the State's collection and distribution of 9-1-1 funds.	Yes	No
IN	Yes	In IC 36-8-16.7 states (d) Beginning in 2013 the state board of accounts annually shall audit each PSAP that receives distributions under this chapter. In conducting an audit under this subsection, the state board of accounts shall determine, in conjunction [sic] with the board, whether the expenditures made by each PSAP are in compliance [sic] with subsections (s) and (b). The board shall review and further audit any ineligible expenditure identified by the state board of accounts under [sic] this subsection or through any other report. If the board verifies that the expenditure did not comply with this section, the board shall ensure the the [sic] fund is reimbursed in the dollar amount of the noncomplying expenditure from any source of funding, other than [sic] a fund described in subsection (f), that is available to the PSAP or to a unit in which the PSAP is located.	Yes	No
KS	Yes	PSAPs are required to submit annual expenditure reports of 911 fee funds. The Council' Expenditure Review Committee reviews these reports and requests additional information or documentation for any questioned expenditures. If questioned expenditures are deemed to be unallowable under the statute, the PSAP is required to reimburse their 911 fund for these expenditures and provide documentation of the transfer of funds to the Council. Each PSAP is required to submit invoices supporting five randomly selected expenditures reported. If a PSAP reports less than five expenditures for the year, then all reported expenditures require submission of the invoice. Additionally, the statute requires a legislative post audit be conducted every five years to determine (1) Whether the moneys received by PSAPs pursuant to this act are being used appropriately; (2) whether the amount of moneys collected pursuant	Yes	No

²¹⁷ Iowa reports both Yes and No answers for this question. For calculation purposes, we have treated Iowa's response as a Yes.

State	Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures?	If YES, provide a description of: (i) the mechanisms or procedures and (ii) any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2022.	Does your state have authority to audit service providers?	Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2022
		to this act is adequate; and (3) the status of 911 service implementation. The LCPA is required to be audited annually by the statute.		
KY	Yes	KRS 65.7629(13) 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, on a biennial basis.	Yes	Yes
LA	Yes	Louisiana Revised Statutes 33:9101 and other Louisiana state laws and acts regulate approved expenditures. Each district is subject to periodic audits overseen by the Legislative Auditor of the State of Louisiana	Yes	No
MA	Yes	M.G.L. Chapter 6A, Section 18B(f) explicitly authorizes the State 911 Department to disburse funds from the Enhanced 911 Fund for specific E911 purposes (described above). M.G.L. Chapter 6A, Section 18B(b) reserves specific approval authority of grant distribution formulas and major contracts for the State 911 Commission which is made up of eight (8) state public safety and disability agency heads and eleven (11) members appointed by the Governor representing various 911 related constituencies. M.G.L. Chapter 6A, Section 18B(b) states as follows: 'The [State 911] commission shall review and approve by a majority vote of those members present all formulas, percentages, guidelines or other mechanisms used to distribute the grants described in section 18B, and all major contracts that the [State 911] department proposes to enter into for enhanced 911 services.' Additionally, M.G.L. Chapter 6A, Section 18B grants the Department of Telecommunications and Cable certain approval authority over expenditures of 911 related funds by the State 911 Department.	No	N/A
MD	Yes	Awards for enhancements to county 9-1-1 systems are described by the county PSAP director in their application for funding. The County PSAP director makes their presentation to the Board and the Board votes to approve the project provided it meets the statutorily defined eligible expenses, and is a good use of public funds. The Board then pays vendors directly or reimburses the county once the county pays the vendor. In either case, the county must provide documentation demonstrating the funds were used for the intended purpose. County 9-1-1 fees are subject to annual audits provided for by the Maryland Public Safety Article § 1-312(d)(1).	Yes	Yes
ME	Yes	i. The Emergency Services Communication Bureau reports to the Maine Legislature's Joint Standing Committee on Energy, Utilities and Technology annually on planned expenditures for the coming year and expenditures for the previous year (25 M.R.S. ch 352§2927). http://www.mainelegislature.org/legis/statutes/25/title25sec2927.html ii None	Yes	No
MI	Yes	State 911 Fund: In accordance with MCL 484.1407(5), the State Office of the Auditor General performs a biennial audit of the State 911 Fund. The FY2020-2021 began in June 2022 and completed November 18, 2022. Local 911 Fund: Independent local audit and annual reporting process to the SNC as set out in MCL 484.1406(2)-(4). Additionally, counties are subject to a compliance review process established by the SNC. The SNC targets to review approximately 10% of the counties each year, which is the equivalent of eight counties. The compliance reviews consist of at least one on-site and/or virtual meeting, proper 911 fund use (going back through the current year plus the two previous years), may include operational items including evaluation of the PSAPs best practices, policies and procedures, and facility security/readiness. The following Michigan counties were started and still in review process at the end of 2022: Baraga, Gogebic, Houghton, Keeweenaw, Ontonagon, Schoolcraft, Wayne, Manistee, Lake, Clare, Kalkaska, and Saginaw. *The Detroit Service District was started in 2019, and approved by the SNC in 2022. **Arenac and Midland counties were started in 2020, and approved by the SNC in 2022. ***The following counties were started in 2021, and approved by the SNC in 2022: Macomb, Muskegon, Downriver Mutual Aide Service District, Newaygo, Montmorency, Kent, Iron, Huron, Lenawee, Mason/Oceana 911 ****Alcona County was started in 2022, and approved by the SNC in 2022.	Yes	Yes

State	Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures?	If YES, provide a description of: (i) the mechanisms or procedures and (ii) any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2022.	Does your state have authority to audit service providers?	Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2022
MN	Yes	Most funds are remitted directly to our office. If it is found that a carrier is not or has not been remitting the correct fee amount, ECN contacts the carrier and/or preparer contact person(s) listed on the carrier's Minnesota Telephone Fees Remittance Form to determine if corrective action is needed and, if so, how to administer a correction. For prepaid wireless, 911 fees are collected at retail point of sale and remitted to the Minnesota Department of Revenue, less 3% which is retained by the retailer for collection administration. MnDOR then transmits prepaid wireless revenue to ECN on a monthly basis, less 2% retained by MnDOR for collection and distribution administration. Currently, ECN has little to no visibility into the prepaid wireless fee collection and remittance process between MnDOR and Minnesota retailers. There have been multiple discussion over the years concerning information released by MnDOR to the Department of Public Safety, tax payer data privacy, and the limitations of the current statute language. Most recently MnDOR legal has floated the idea of a potential statute update to expand the information that could be provided.	Yes	Yes
MO	Yes	Annual Survey to ask how 911 fees at the local level are being expended.	No	N/A
MS	Yes	No known actions were taken. But the Mississippi State Auditor's office. MISS. CODE ANN. § 7-7-211 (e) (1972) states that one of the powers and duties of the department of audit is: ...to postaudit [sic] and, when deemed necessary, preaudit and investigate separately the financial affairs of (i) the offices, boards and [sic] commissions of county government...	Yes	N/A
MT	Yes	THE STATE MONITORS THE EXPENDITURE OF LOCAL AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENT PSAP OPERATIONAL EXPENDITURES AND STATE PROGRAMS ARE AUDITED BY THE STATE LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR	Yes	N/A
NC	Yes	N.C.G.S. § 143B-1402(b)(5) - The NC 911 Board staff conducts an annual 'Revenue/Expenditure Review' of each PSAP receiving 911 funds. For any expenditures identified as not an eligible 911 expense, the PSAP is required to reimburse the 911 Fund the amount determined ineligible. N.C.G.S. § 143B-1410 - The State Auditor may perform audits of the 911 Board pursuant to Part 5A of Chapter 147 of the General Statutes to ensure that funds in the 911 Fund are being managed in accordance with the provisions of the Board's governing statutes. The State Auditor must perform an audit of the 911 Board at least every two years. The 911 Board must reimburse the State Auditor for the cost of an audit of the 911 Board.	No	N/A
ND	Yes	Each jurisdiction is mandated by 57-40.6-12 to submit a report to the statutory body (ESC3) on the revenues and expenditures related to the 911 fee, and the Committee then reviews the reports against the guidelines and compiles the information for presentation to the Legislature. None, no actions taken.	Yes	N/A
NE	Yes	With respect to landline and VoIP surcharge funds, local governing bodies are subject to audit by the Nebraska State Auditor to ensure that public funds are being spent appropriately. So far as the Public Service Commission is aware, no corrective actions relating to the use of 911 surcharge funds were taken as a result of any such audit during the reporting period. With respect to wireless surcharge funds, the Public Service Commission requires each PSAP to annually complete an audit form, which must be returned with documentation supporting each expenditure of funding. Each audit form is reviewed and double checked by Public Service Commission staff. Any discrepancy identified is required to be explained and remedied. If needed, corrective actions may include replacing monies incorrectly used, paying money back to the 911 Service System Fund, or a reduction in future funding.	Yes	Yes
NH	Yes	Currently, the New Hampshire Department of Revenue Administration audits for our Division when they are out auditing for other tax purposes. Additionally, the Division has one permanent full-time auditor position providing auditing and enforcement services specific to the E911 prepaid surcharge.	Yes	Yes
NJ	No	[No Response]	No	N/A
NM	Yes	Local public bodies are required to have their annual financial statements audited in compliance with the New Mexico Audit Act (Section 12-6-1 et. seq. NMSA 1978). The Department of Finance and Administration (DFA) conducts an annual Agency	Yes	No

State	Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures?	If YES, provide a description of: (i) the mechanisms or procedures and (ii) any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2022.	Does your state have authority to audit service providers?	Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2022
		financial audit. All obligations and payments from the E-911 fund are approved by the E-911 Bureau Chief. Program expenditures are also reported to State Board of Finance during budget review.		
NV	Yes and No ²¹⁸	Storey County - Does not collect.	Yes and No	No and N/A
NY	Yes	To the extent state statutes comport with the Commission's rules, the New York State Office of State Comptroller is authorized to audit counties' and cities' expenditures of local 911 surcharge monies to ensure compliance with the enabling statute.	Yes	No
OH	Yes	Ohio Revised Code Chapter 128 – Oversight and review of use of state Wireless 9-1-1 Government Assistance Fund (WGAF - 25 cent per cell phone per month fee/0.5% pre-paid). WGAF Reconciliation forms submitted and reviewed annually. State auditor also audits all counties and localities for correct fund usage	No	N/A
OK	Yes	The State 9-1-1 Management Authority mandates a report from local agencies on all revenue and expenditures related to the operations of the Emergency 9-1-1 center. The Authority has the authority to audit any agency that does not comply with required reports and escrow wireless funding until the agency falls into compliance.	Yes	No
OR	Yes	The Department of Revenue (DOR) has the authority to adjust returns for misreporting or non-reporting of 9-1-1 tax collected. DOR monitors businesses that should have filed and remitted 9-1-1 tax, sets up estimated returns, and bills based on these estimations if the remitted amount is incorrect	Yes	No
PA	Yes	Every PSAP must report to PEMA how 911 funds were spent annually. Every expenditure line item is reviewed by PEMA staff to determine if the expense was eligible and reported in accordance with PEMA's 911 Program guidelines. In addition, PEMA requires a biennial performance audit of each PSAP's use of the disbursements it has received from the fund, including amounts placed in capital or operating reserve consistent with published guidelines established by PEMA. 35 Pa.C.S. § 5306.1 (i) (2). PEMA has contracted with an independent CPA firm to conduct these audits. No corrective actions were needed for costs funded by the 911 fee.	Yes	No
RI	Yes	All collected funds are subject to allocation under the annual Appropriation Act, which provides the legislative authority for state spending. The State's Bureau of Audits and the General Assembly's Auditor General would be the authorized Auditors of this program.	Yes	No
SC	Yes	South Carolina Code of Laws Section 23-47-50(E) reads: (E)(1) In order to ensure compliance with the provisions of this chapter and with generally accepted accounting standards, the 'emergency telephone system' fund must be included in the annual audit of the local government. The audit must include a review of the accounting controls over the collection, reporting, and disbursement of 911 funds and a supplementary schedule detailing revenue and expenses by category as authorized in this chapter. If the annual audit contains a finding of any inappropriate use of 911 funds, the local government must restore these funds within ninety days of the completion of the audit. (2) The local government must provide the Revenue and Fiscal Affairs Office a copy of the audit report regarding this compliance within sixty days of the completion of the audit. The Revenue and Fiscal Affairs Office shall review these audits on a regular basis and report to the board any findings or concerns. In conducting this review, the Revenue and Fiscal Affairs Office may request additional information from the local government. If a local government fails to provide a copy of the audit or any requested additional information, or correct any findings identified in the audit, the board may withhold funding pursuant to subsection (G)	Yes	No

²¹⁸ Nevada reports both Yes and No answers for Questions H1 and H2, and reports both No and N/A answers for Question H2b. For calculation purposes, we have counted both of Nevada's Yes and No responses at H1 and H2 as a Yes, and we have counted Nevada's No and N/A responses at H2a as a No.

State	Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures?	If YES, provide a description of: (i) the mechanisms or procedures and (ii) any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2022.	Does your state have authority to audit service providers?	Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2022
SD	Yes	<p>https://sdlegislature.gov/Statutes/Codified_Laws/2057866 SDCL 34-45-20 The 911 Coordination board has the authority to collect annual financial data from any entity receiving 911 surcharge funds. The board requires each PSAP and county receiving surcharge funds submit a financial report of their local 911 fund for review by the State 911 Coordinator. The board will develop criteria for implementing performance audits which will be conducted by the Department of Legislative Audit.</p> <p>https://sdlegislature.gov/Statutes/Codified_Laws/2057863. The Department of Revenue Board has the authority to promulgate rules regarding returns, records and audits. However, at this time there is nothing in Statute that gives the board the authority to enforce compliance with the Administrative Rules.</p>	Yes	Yes
TN	Yes	<p>Tenn. Code Ann. § 7-86-102(d) requires that each ECD use funds received from all sources ‘exclusively’ in the operation of the emergency communications district.’ Consistent with that mandate, the TECB has 911 Revenue Standards established pursuant to Tenn. Code Ann. § 7-86-306(a)(11), which provide guidance to the ECDs on the Required, Permissible and Prohibited Uses of 911 revenue. In accordance with the 911 Revenue Standards, the purchase of radios for use in the exclusive operation of a local 911 district is permissible.</p> <p>ECDs are subject to annual audits to assure compliance with the Revenue Standards and generally accepted auditing standards. Audits are submitted to the Comptroller of the Treasury. ECDs are also prohibited from spending 911 revenue except as specifically set forth in their annual budgets.</p>	Yes	No
TX	Yes and No ²¹⁹	<p>The question specifically asks about state established oversight. Only CSEC and its 20 Regional Planning Commissions are subject to oversight/auditing by the Texas State Auditor (or CSEC internal auditor). The remaining 57 ECDs are subject to state single audit requirements only if they receive state funds. Accordingly, as answered, the question includes city/county oversight and auditing. And the answers are a mix of ‘yes’ and ‘no.’</p> <p>No Texas 9-1-1 Entity reported corrective actions for CY 2022.</p> <p>For the CSEC 9-1-1 Program, 9-1-1 service is provided by 20 Regional Planning Commissions and overseen and administered by CSEC. Health and Safety Code Chapter 771 governs the CSEC 9-1-1 program and includes requirements for providing 9-1-1 service and prescribes limits regarding the use of 9-1-1 fees and the equalization surcharge. CSEC rules and policy statements are used to implement 9-1-1 service consistent with statutory requirements. Per these rules/policies, CSEC routinely monitors RPC expenditures of appropriated and allocated 9-1-1 service fees and equalization surcharge for uses consistency with statute. CSEC, in turn, is subject to audit by the Texas State Auditor, Texas Comptroller (e.g., post payment audits), as well as by its internal auditor.</p> <p>The 772 ECDs are statutorily charged to provide 9-1-1 service in their participating jurisdictions’ areas. In addition, the 772 ECDs are required to submit a draft annual budget to their participating jurisdictions for 9-1-1 service and adopt the final annual budget at an open public meeting. As soon as practicable after the end of each ECD fiscal year, the director of the ECD will prepare and present to the board and to all participating public agencies a sworn statement of all money received by the ECD and how the money was disbursed or otherwise disposed of during the preceding fiscal year. The report must show in detail the operations of the ECD for the period covered by the report. The board of managers of the ECD is required to perform an annual independent financial audit.</p> <p>As noted earlier, Municipal ECDs and the one county ECD are required by state law to set annual budgets at public open meetings and perform audits. (As also noted, however, 9-1-1 fees represent a fraction of the overall budgeting and auditing responsibilities of these governing bodies.) Additionally, and by way of example including from past responses:</p>	Yes	Yes

²¹⁹ Texas reports both Yes and No answers for this question. For calculation purposes, we have treated Texas’ response as a Yes.

State	Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures?	If YES, provide a description of: (i) the mechanisms or procedures and (ii) any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2022.	Does your state have authority to audit service providers?	Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2022
		<p>The ECDs have and continue to report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dallas responded that it identifies eligible expenses by categories and periodically audits expense reports from the financial system. Budget requests go through an approval process for new/one-time expenses. • Highland Park has an internal policy established by the Police Chief to ensure 9-1-1 funds are expended only for purposes designated by the funding mechanism. • Coppell's finance department records all 911 fees and expenditures in separate, individual general ledger accounts. • Rowlett's 9-1-1 funds are accounted for separately and placed into a restricted fund, which is audited every year. • Portland conducts an annual audit on all city funds to ensure all monies are spent prudently and according to guidelines established by the City Council, general accounting procedures, and GASB standards. • Cities of Cedar Hill, DeSoto, Duncanville (which combined to establish and operate a single PSAP/ECC) conducts 9-1-1 auditing through the Finance Department of DeSoto. <p>Richardson's financial statements and underlying accounting records are subject to audit by a third-party, independent audit firm. The 911 fees and their use fall within the scope of the audit. Also, Budget and Accounting staff review the use of 911 fees as part of the budget preparation process each year.</p> <p>Longview reported that Funds collected from 911 fees are collected and maintained in a budget separate from the City's general fund. All expenditures made from the E911 account are vetted and approved by the communications manager. Funds are only used for 911, 911 training, and 911 program administration.</p> <p>Richardson: The City's financial statements and underlying accounting records are subject to audit by a third-party, independent audit firm. The 911 fees and their use fall within the scope of the audit. Also, Budget and Accounting staff review the use of 911 fees as part of the budget preparation process each year. No corrective actions have been required as a result of this oversight.</p> <p>Plano: Municipal budgets and audits thereof, are subject to applicable municipal ordinance(s) and/or Texas Local Government Code Chapters 102 (budgets) and 103 (audit of finances). Municipal oversight procedures reflect the normal operations. Our budget is approved by the City Council and oversight is provided by city officials practicing and adhering to state purchasing/procurement procedures, and general accepted accounting principles.</p>		
UT	Yes	<p>In Utah Statute: Effective 7/1/2017 69-2-301. Public safety answering point -- 911 emergency service account -- Permitted uses of funds.</p> <p>(1) A public safety answering point shall maintain in a separate emergency telecommunications service fund any funds dispersed to the public safety answering point from the commission under Section 69-2-302, from proceeds of the 911 emergency services charge levied under Section 69-2-402.</p> <p>(2) A public safety answering point may expend the money in the emergency telecommunications service fund described in Subsection (1) to pay the costs of:</p> <p>(a) establishing, installing, maintaining, and operating a 911 emergency service system;</p> <p>(b) receiving and processing emergency communications from the 911 system or other communications or requests for emergency services;</p> <p>(c) integrating a 911 emergency service system into an established public safety answering point, including contracting with an access line provider or a vendor of appropriate terminal equipment as necessary to implement the 911 emergency services; or</p> <p>(d) indirect costs associated with the maintaining and operating of a 911 emergency services system.</p> <p>(3) A public safety answering point may expend revenue derived from the emergency telecommunications service fund described in Subsection (1) for personnel costs associated with receiving and processing communications and deploying emergency response resources.</p> <p>(4) Any unexpended funds at the end of a fiscal year in a public safety answering point's emergency telecommunications service fund described in Subsection (1) do not lapse.</p>	Yes	No

State	Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures?	If YES, provide a description of: (i) the mechanisms or procedures and (ii) any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2022.	Does your state have authority to audit service providers?	Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2022
		The Utah Legislature has ordered audits performed on UCAs dedicated account, as well as PSAPs, by the Legislative Auditors over the past several years to make sure that city, county, state PSAPs, and UCA are using the 911 monies for 911 services.		
VA	Yes	During this period, 60% of the Wireless E-911 fund, approximately \$36 million, was distributed by the Virginia Department of Taxation directly to PSAPs. The distribution to each PSAP is based on pre-determined percentages calculated using population and call load data.	Yes	[No Response]
VT	Yes	Audit and oversight mechanisms are defined by the State of Vermont in Title 30, Chapter 88 § 7503 (d): The fiscal agent shall be audited annually by a certified public accountant in a manner determined by and under the direction of the Public Service Board.	Yes	No
WA	Yes	The State 911 Coordination Office through its county grant programs, regularly audits the use of county and state 911 excise tax funds, as they are the basis for the award amounts of the grants. Additionally, the Office of the Washington State Auditor conducts routine audits of all state, county or local entities, and these audits include the proper use of 911-dedicated funds.	Yes	Yes
WI	Yes	(i) The Wisconsin 911 statute requires that participating local exchange carriers submit a new 911 contract, or an amendment to an existing 911 contract to the Public Service Commission for review. See Wis. Stat. 256.35(3)(i). The PSC may disapprove a contract or contract amendment if it finds the contract is not compensatory, is excessive, or is not in the public interest. (ii) None	No	N/A
WV	Yes	West Virginia statutory law provides that the books and records of county answering points that benefit for local exchange service fees are subject to annual examination by the state auditor's office. W.Va. Code §7-1-3cc. In addition, the financial activities of the WV-PSC are monitored internally by the State of West Virginia through audits, reviews and studies by the Legislature and externally by an independent private sector auditor in 'single State Audit.'	Yes	No
WY	Yes	State Statutes are very specific to how jurisdictions may use the funds. The state does not have an audit report from the local government on how funds were spent.	Yes	No
Other Jurisdictions				
AS	No	[No Response]	No	N/A
DC	Yes	N / A	No	No
Guam	Yes	NONE	No	N/A
NMI	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]
PR	Yes	<p>There are two offices that conduct audits of all public funds managed by Puerto Rico Executive Branch agencies and instrumentalities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Comptroller of Puerto Rico which is a constitutionally created office charged with carrying out post-audits of the use of public funds in Puerto Rico; and - Office of the Inspector General of the Government of Puerto Rico <p>The Comptroller of Puerto Rico conducted and published the results of an investigation related to 9-1-1 diverted funds in Puerto Rico in a report dated October 21, 2020. The report is published in the following link: https://www.ocpr.gov.pr/informes-de-auditoria-2020-2021/informe-especial-cp-21-03-resultado-de-la-investigacion-relacionada-con-el-desvio-de-los-fondos-recaudados-para-el-sistema-de-emergencias-9-1-1-del-negociado-de-sistemas-de-emergencias-9-1-1/</p> <p>As of the Office of the Inspector General, we do not acknowledge ongoing investigations related to diversion, during 2022.</p> <p>Enforcement or Corrective Actions</p> <p>Act 32-2020 was approved. Act 32 prohibits funds from the 9-1-1 Emergency System Bureau and other telecommunications funds from being diverted in the future for purposes other than ensuring the provision and stability of 9-1-1 and telecommunications services. The legislative intention is to ensure that the use of funds received by the 9-1-1 Emergency System are used in accordance with current federal regulation, guarantee its fiscal independence, and prohibit the use of such funds for purposes contrary to this legislation and the applicable federal regulation. https://www.lexjuris.com/lexlex/Leyes2020/lexl2020032.htm</p>	Yes	Yes

State	Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures?	If YES, provide a description of: (i) the mechanisms or procedures and (ii) any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2022.	Does your state have authority to audit service providers?	Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2022
USVI	No	[No Response]	Yes	No
Yes Totals	49		42	13
No Totals	5		12	25

I. Description of Next Generation 911 Services and Expenditures

52. The Bureau requested that states and other jurisdictions specify whether they classify NG911 expenditures as within the scope of acceptable purposes and functions for the obligation or expenditure of 911 fees, and whether they expended funds on NG911 in calendar year 2022. With respect to classifying NG911 as within the scope of acceptable expenditures, 46 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam indicated that their 911 funding mechanism allows for distribution of 911 funds for the implementation of NG911. Three states, American Samoa,²²⁰ 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. Forty-four states, the District of Columbia, Guam, and Puerto Rico reported expenditures on NG911 programs in 2022.²²¹ Table 22 shows the general categories of NG911 expenditures, although some respondents did not specify NG911 expenditures by category.

Table 22 – Number of States Indicating One or More Areas of NG911 Expenditures

Area of Expenditure	States/Other Jurisdictions	Total
General Project or Not Specified	Arizona, California, Connecticut, Florida, Guam, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming	27
Planning or Consulting Services	Arizona, California, Connecticut, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, West Virginia, Wisconsin	30

²²⁰ American Samoa reports that it does not collect any 911/E911 phone fees, and has not established a funding mechanism. American Samoa Response at 5-6, 8-9.

²²¹ This count includes some states and jurisdictions that do not classify NG911 as within the scope of acceptable 911 fee expenditures, but nevertheless report expenditures to implement and support NG911 in 2022. See, e.g., Hawaii Response at 16-17; Puerto Rico Response at 17-18.

ESInet Construction	Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin	27
NG911 Core Services	Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin	35
Hardware or Software Purchases or Upgrades	Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Guam, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin	39
GIS	Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Guam, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin	41
NG911 Security Planning	Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Guam, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia	28
Training	Alabama, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin	31

53. The Bureau requested that states and jurisdictions report the amount expended on NG911 programs in the annual period ending December 31, 2022. As noted, forty-four states, the District of Columbia, Guam, and Puerto Rico reported expenditures on NG911 programs in 2022.²²² Collectively,

²²² We note that in response to Question I2, five states (Delaware, Indiana, Louisiana, Montana, and Oklahoma) checked Yes to indicate that they spent funds on NG911 in 2022, but they did not provide amounts in response to Question I2a. Louisiana explained at Question I2a that it “does not track the funds expended on NG-911 projects as a separate amount.” Louisiana Response at 17. Two other states (Nevada and Ohio) checked both Yes and No for Question I2, but did provide amounts in response to Question I2. Nevada Response at 19; Ohio Response at 16-17. See Table 23.

these jurisdictions reported spending \$512,168,670.94 on NG911 programs in 2022. Five states,²²³ American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported no expenditures for NG911-related programs. Table 23 shows all the reported NG911-related expenditures and projects.²²⁴

Table 23 – Funds Spent on Next Generation 911 Programs²²⁵

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
AK	[NA]	Northstar Borough worked on an upgrade of the NG911 call handling system in 2022. Kenai Borough completed an upgrade of the NG911 call handling system and worked on implementing text to 9-1-1 through their call handling CPE in 2022.
AL	\$14,241,077.09	All of the 106 primary PSAPs on the Alabama NG9-1-1 network, known as ANGEN, were converted to NG9-1-1 ALI by the system service provider. The state law enforcement agency was provided with ESInet connectivity as secondary PSAPs to have the ability to receive 9-1-1 call data rather than having voice calls transferred over ten-digit telephone numbers. Further work on wireline and VoIP carrier conversion has been completed but has been hampered by having to work separately with each provider. The state’s text-for-911 solution installation was completed providing statewide coverage with text to and from 9-1-1. All 85 Emergency Communication District’s (ECD) GIS datasets were collected and are undergoing preparation and remediation to be utilized in the NG9-1-1 environment.
AR	\$1,473,510.83	In July, 2021, the Arkansas 911 Board contracted with AT&T to implement a statewide ESInet & NGCS. 50 PSAPs were transitioned in 2022. The 911 Board has an interlocal agreement with the Arkansas GIS Office for NG911 data layer improvements as well as a contract with 1Spatial, Inc. for GIS data validation.
AZ	[NA]	[No Response]
CA	\$85,723,223.90	The Prime Network Service Provider and the four (4) Region Network Service Providers have continued PSAP remediation, equipment install, and network build out to all of the PSAPs. NG 9-1-1 has been deployed at Tuolumne County, South Lake Tahoe PD, and El Camino Community College.
CO	\$5,600,978.97	A statewide migration of all of Colorado’s PSAPs from a legacy E9-1-1 network to an ESInet began in 2020, and this migration is essentially complete, with two military PSAPs remaining to be migrated.
CT	\$11,069,394.00	ESInet deployment at 100% of Connecticut’s [sic] public safety answering points, implementation of Rapid Deploy, deployment of RapidSOS integration, backup PSAP and NG 911 training center and ongoing NG 911 training.
DE	n/a	The state of Delaware is currently working on porting the PSAP’s administrative lines to the a cloud based solution. This will allow any of the PSAPS to receive their own administrative calls in a different location in the event their center is inoperable.
FL	\$17,252,980.00	Counties are working to implement NG911 on a regional basis in Florida. One of the regions has completed a regional GIS project to enable geospatial call routing. Several of the other regions were in the planning stages of a similar project. Other counties are preparing their GIS data implementation

²²³ The five states checking No to Question I2 were Alaska, Arizona, Georgia, Mississippi, and Wyoming.

²²⁴ Three states (Alaska, Mississippi, and Wyoming) indicated they did not spend any funds on NG911 programs in 2022, but nevertheless provided a description of NG911-related programs in response to Question I4. For example, Mississippi explained that plans for NG911 were in progress, but funding was not yet available. Mississippi Response at 20.

²²⁵ American Samoa, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin completed Addendum Section I2 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/fifteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>. Ohio states, “We have an NG9-1-1 pilot with six counties and the state expends funds for the pre-ESInet network for the pilot and state hosting of locally owned pilot core services.” Ohio Response at 17.

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		of Next Generation Core Services and upgrading their call handing [sic] system hardware for NG911.
GA	[NA]	[No Response]
HI	\$91,456.00	Currently in the process of creating an RFP for a consultant to transition to NG911
ID	[DNF]	[DNF]
IA	We do not track amounts by 'NG programs.' At the state level, a reasonable estimate is that approximately \$13,697,928 was spent on Next Generation programs. At this time, it is difficult to determine how much was spent on next-generation programs by local jurisdictions.	<p>During this reporting period PSAPs continued to upgrade to the NENA i3 standard Next Gen. PSAPs upgraded their CPE's and Recorders to SIP capable/enabled.</p> <p>During this reporting period, PSAPs worked with GeoComm to continue the maintenance phase for GIS data that will ultimately be used for NextGen upgrades. HSEMD offered GIS grants to local jurisdictions to help facilitate this effort. Iowa transitioned to a GIS derived MSAG during this period and preparations were made for ECRF implementation in the upcoming year.</p> <p>During this time period, we continued implementation of the providing shared services for CPE, CAD, mapping, EMD, and recorder to the benefit of the PSAPs. Additional redundancy to the core of this system is derived from FirstNet.</p> <p>During this time period we continued the effort to merge the legacy landline network onto the existing ESInet. The remaining work is focused on landline providers with direct trunks to PSAPs and getting those routed to POIs for the State network.</p> <p>During this time period, the State continued contractual relationships with the NGCS provider, ESInet provide, GIS provider, and host/remote i3 enabled CPE provider. As part of the shared services, we have also added additional cyber security monitoring.</p>
IL	\$2,857,703.35	<p>Regional ESInet 3: INdigital Telecom assumed 9-1-1 System provider responsibilities for two 9-1-1 Authorities/Counties consisting of 2 PSAPS and have provided them with a hosted ESInet and NG911 system during 2022.</p> <p>Regional ESInet 4: The State of Illinois is currently implementing the AT&T ESInet. During 2022, 14 9-1-1 Authorities/Counties consisting of 19 PSAPs were cut over to the ESInet. Implementation will continue throughout 2023.</p> <p>Future ESInet: A region of 9 local 9-1-1 Authorities/Counties consisting of 14 PSAPs established the Northern Illinois Next Generation Alliance (NINGA) to create a hosted NG9-1-1 system whereby they would share NG9-1-1 Core Services (NGCS) and an ESInet. The NINGA System is currently in the implementation stage.</p>
IN	[No Response]	As of August 4, 2021 AT&T migrated their buildout of the second ESInet for Indiana. Indigital completed their buildout in 2015 and upgraded in 2019. The Board continues to work towards moving from the RFAI to the i3 standards.
KS	\$12,869,819.00	<p>Statewide NG911 system implementation continued throughout 2022, with a total of 106 PSAPs on the system by year's end. An additional 3 PSAPs will join in 2023. All of these PSAPs are (or will be) connected via IP to the AT&T Nationwide ESInet in an i3 routing configuration. Migration of the statewide system PSAPs to geospatial call routing was completed by August of 2020. All PSAPs on the system are currently text enabled.</p> <p>The MARC system has completed replacement of legacy selective routers with IP Selective routers and a planned migration to NGCS and i3 routing is underway. A part of that migration plan includes interconnection with the statewide ESInet.</p>
KY	\$4,427,267.38	With assistance from the 2019 federal NG911 grant, Kentucky completed a new state NG911 Road Map and Readiness Assessment; launched a statewide NG911 GIS integration and aggregation project; and constructed a statewide supplemental data portal to push validated and aggregated GIS data along with supplemental mapping and data layers to all certified Kentucky PSAPs

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects	
LA	Louisiana does not track the funds expended on NG-911 projects as a separate amount	Louisiana Parish	Project
		Acadia	Currently working with the Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium and NG911 Committee with plans for Next Generation 911.
		Allen	Currently working with the Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium and NG911 Committee with plans for Next Generation 911
		Ascension	We have an ongoing project to implement text to 911. All existing equipment is capable; yet, we continue to wait on ATT to implement SIP trunks for our area. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project.
		Assumption	Currently working with the Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium and NG911 Committee with plans for Next Generation 911
		Avoyelles	[No Response]
		Beauregard	Currently working with the Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium and NG911 Committee with plans for Next Generation 911
		Bienville	Refresh 911 equipment and Currently working with the Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium and NG911 Committee with plans for Next Generation 911
		Bossier	Actively working with 9-1-1 directors across the state to develop a plan/RFP moving forward to NG911. This includes research of funding for acquisition [sic] of ESI Net service in preparation of NG911 systems.
		Caddo	Signed a contract with Motorola for Vesta NG911 Call Handling System. Equipment has been delivered and we are preparing for installation. We have signed a multi-parish agreement to begin the process of converting to an ESI Net. The next phase is to establish standards for a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to find a consulting firm to help the Consortium author a Request for Proposal (RFP).
		Calcasieu	Actively working with 9-1-1 directors across the state to develop a plan/RFP moving forward to NG911. This includes research of funding for acquisition [sic] of ESI Net service in preparation of NG911 systems.
		Caldwell	Caldwell has entered into a Cooperative Endeavor Agreement [sic] with multiple parishes to secure professional services for the development and purchase of ESInet.
		Cameron	Actively working with 9-1-1 directors across the state to develop a plan/RFP moving forward to NG911. This includes research of funding for acquisition [sic] of ESI Net service in preparation of NG911 systems.
		Catahoula	[No Response]
		Claiborne	[No Response]
		Concordia	Actively working with 9-1-1 directors across the state to develop a plan/RFP moving forward to NG911. This includes research of funding for acquisition [sic] of ESI Net service in preparation of NG911 systems.
		De Soto	Working with State Directors Consortium exploring state wide ESINET service
		East Baton Rouge	Planning is underway for upgrading the complete 911 call-taking system to ESI net and NG-911 starting in 2021. An RFP was awarded to NGA911 and the contract was signed in December 2021. The installation has begun and go-live is projected for 2023.
		East Carroll	[No Response]
		East Feliciana	Working with State Directors Consortium on a statewide ESI Net

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		project
		Evangeline Currently getting pricing and working with other parishes to get a cost effective ESI NET Plan. Training that is specific to NG911 for dispatchers [sic].
		Franklin APCO/NENA Statewide Plan
		Grant One Map data migration (x,y)
		Iberia Continued accuracy improvement in our ESRI map, addresses, road segments and parish borders.
		Iberville [No Response]
		Jackson [No Response]
		Jefferson State and regional ESInet discussions as well as CAD to CAD
		Jefferson Davis [No Response]
		La Salle LaSalle has entered into a Cooperative Endeavor Agreement with multiple parishes to secure professional [sic] services for the development and purchase of an ESInet.
		Lafayette Working with the State Directors' Consortium which consists of 911 Directors in the state to enter into a cooperative endeavor agreement [sic] to hire a consultant to develop a RFP for an ESI Net services project.
		Lafourche [No Response]
		Lincoln Currently working with the Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium and NG911 Committee with plans for Next Generation 911
		Livingston Livingston Parish Communications District in cooperation with East Baton Rouge Parish, Terrebonne Parish, Lafourche Parish and East Carroll Parish developed an RFP and signed a contract with NGA to provide cloud-based Call-Handling solution and ESInet and Core Services that is a true Next Generation 911 System. This system was brought live in January of 2023.
		Madison Install upgraded Motorola/lex dispatch system. Currently working with the Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium and NG911 Committee with plans for Next Generation 911
		Morehouse [No Response]
		Natchitoches We are currently exploring funding opportunities for ESINET build out.
		Orleans Successful cutover to ESI-Net June 23, 2022
		Ouachita YES; We continue to work closely with APCO/NENA and other [sic] Districts on a State-Wide ESInet project.
		Plaquemines [No Response]
		Pointe Coupee No project in place. Intrado will launch updates in the coming months.
		Rapides Currently working with the Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium and NG911 Committee with plans for Next Generation 911
		Red River Working with State Director's Consortium on Statewide ESI net Project.
		Richland Currently working with the Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium and NG911 Committee with plans for Next Generation 911
		Sabine [No Response]
		St. Bernard Currently working with the Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium and NG911 Committee with plans for Next Generation 911
		St. Charles [No Response]
		St. Helena [No Response]
		St. James [No Response]
		St. John The Baptist ON GOING

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		<p>St. Landry</p> <p>St. Landry Parish 911 has partnered with St Landry Parish Sheriff's Office and has configured a CAD system in effort to transition to NG-911. Also SLP 911 has installed a SolaCom ANI/ALI system that is NG_911 Ready. At the end of 2019, the 911 District installed a new voice recorder that is capable of recording voice and data received through the recently installed SolaCom system. In 2020 the installation of two new 700 MHz LWIN radio network [sic] Consoles began in the 911 Communications Center and was completed in 2021. This has provided more efficient radio communications between the 911 center and Public Safety response agencies in the parish and region, in addition to enhancing interoperable communication between area response agencies. Regarding mapping, currently a GIS map of the parish is still being updated and addressing data is being prepared for the Parish's transition to Next Gen 911. Finally, St. Landry Parish 911 is actively participating with the Louisiana 911 Directors in researching and evaluating current options for establishment of, or buy into an ESI net.</p>
		St. Martin
		St. Mary
		St. Tammany
		Tangipahoa
		Tensas
		Terrebonne
		Union
		Vermilion
		Vernon
		Washington
		Webster
		West Baton Rouge
		West Carroll
		West Feliciana
		Winn
MA	The estimated amount to provide 911 Service is: \$51,745,295 ²²⁶	[No Response]

²²⁶ This amount is the same as the amount that Massachusetts reported at Question B3 (estimated total cost to provide 911/E911 service). Massachusetts explained at Question B3: "The estimated amount to provide 911 Service is: \$51,745,295[.] This estimated amount includes the costs associated with the Next Generation 911

(continued....)

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
MD	\$16,031,501.28 (Fiscal Year 2022).	Twelve Maryland counties were live with Next Generation 9-1-1 services in 2022. All remaining counties were approved and awarded funds in 2022 for migration, with all counties anticipated going live in 2023.
ME	\$5,393,194	System Assessment; GIS Data Enhancement
MI	\$24,539,031.89	<p>In 2022, there were 34 additional PSAPs that completed their conversions to an IP-based 911 service provider. There was also one county (9 PSAPs) plus one service district (3 PSAPs) left that are in process or waiting to begin.</p> <p>August 9, 2019, the State of Michigan was awarded a federal grant to help move the state towards NG911. The 911 Grant Program awarded the State of Michigan \$3,939,670 to complete three projects. A description of each of the projects follows:</p> <p>Primary Project 1- Customer Premise Equipment (CPE) for PSAPs in need of NG911 CPE. As more counties have migrated to NG911 and the 911 service provider has changed from the existing analog legacy 911 network to the digital NG911 system, some PSAPs lack the resources to replace the CPE to bring together the full digital capabilities. To maintain continuity in services and back-up abilities with PSAPs in the neighboring counties that have upgraded, most PSAPs either already have or plan to migrate to NG911 to the demarcation point of their PSAP's CPE and then it will be converted to an analog transmission in CPE.</p> <p>Primary Project 1 secured the funding to provide PSAPs with a demonstrated financial need for CPE and that the CPE will be used to either implement or continue providing NG911 services. The goal is to bring all Michigan PSAPs to a minimum level of digital CPE 911 call processing capabilities. Through the NG911 Federal Grant Program we updated 147 workstations in 30 county/service districts.</p> <p>Primary Project 2 - Upgrade the Michigan 911 GIS Repository Code. With much of the Michigan 911 GIS Repository application code still being the original from 2012, the system was in need of an application code upgrade. Some of the coding technology was no longer supported and there are improvements that exist to newer coding which will streamline some of the workflows and increase performance of the system. The enhancements leverage technology that has been implemented at the State since 2012, such as the recent implementation of the new Michigan Geographic Framework system. There have also been requests by service providers to include additional data transfer tools for improved data integration with ECRF/LVF data stores. This activity involved the following tasks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upgrade the Michigan 911 GIS Repository application code to the latest versions and leverage the new technologies within the latest versions of the third-party commercial, off the shelf (COTS) products being utilized as part of the system such as ESRI's ArcGIS Server. • Update the existing Michigan 911 GIS Repository to leverage the Michigan Geographic Framework data integration technology and validation tools to update application code and improve the data importing process and data validation reports. • Develop a process through the Michigan Geographic Framework technology for the upload of Emergency Service Response Zones from local 911 agencies. • Develop upgraded data transfer protocols with NG911 service providers to push updates to ECRF/LVF and improve processes for data discrepancy notification workflows from ECRF/LVF back to statewide repository system and local authoritative sources. <p>Primary Project 3 - Statewide Address Points Gap Fill. The State of Michigan does not currently have a complete statewide address point GIS data layer. For this project, the Department of Technology, Management, and Budget's Center for Shared Solutions (CSS) will work with local jurisdictions to integrate existing rooftop-based address points into the repository to create address points where gaps currently exist. The State did conduct a survey to</p>

(Continued from previous page) _____
service provider contract, MassGIS, Radio, and the mobile PSAP. This estimated amount does not include costs associated with grant programs, training programs, disability access programs, public education, administrative costs, or other costs for the administration and programs of the State 911 Department.” Massachusetts Response at 3, 18.

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		<p>determine which areas of the state still have gaps in structure-based address points. For this activity, the State of Michigan will look to leverage, where possible, existing authoritative data and build upon that to achieve the highest accuracy level for rooftop-based structure address points. The activity will consist of the following tasks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update the repository data model standards for 911 structure address points and emergency response boundaries using the latest NENA GIS Data Model 2.0 standard. • Conduct outreach meetings and a survey with local and regional governments to foster collaboration and coordinate for gap fill projects. • Assess existing local source data for completeness and accuracy, and determine gaps that need to be filled to meet GIS data baselines for the project. Assessments will include a comparison of addresses and street names against other possible sources including, but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o ALI database. o Road centerlines. o Michigan Geographic Framework data. o Tax parcel data. o United State Postal Service (USPS) addresses. o Other state agency address database sources. • Perform data development work to complete the address point gap fill phase of the project. This task will leverage the data sources listed above to create address points in jurisdictions that do not have address points.
MN	\$37,641,198.33	Ongoing work on statewide GIS dataset creation, completion and review of cybersecurity assessments, ongoing CHE replacements/upgrades in the PSAPs, ongoing individual PSAP deployments of text to 9-1-1 (regional answering point relinquishes to local answering point), the RFP for NG Core Services Egress and 911 Network Center has closed and review of responses is underway.
MO	\$2,000,000.00	Some ESINets are being established at local and regional levels with local funds as well as some with Board grant funding from prepaid wireless fees. Establishment of a State NG911 GIS plan with Standard and Best Practices along with a remediation plan was starting to be implmeneted [sic] through procurement processes in 2022 as well.
MS	[NA]	Plans for NG911 were in progress in 2022, but funding was not yet available for additional expansion and buildout. Mississippi Emergency Management Agency (MEMA) will move forward with the implementation of Phase 2 of the strategic plan for development of the Next Generation (NG) 911 project. Emergency Services Ip Network (ESiNet) core network configurations and resource acquisition for deployment of the State ESiNet will be part of Phase 2 as funding is avialable. [sic] Deployment of resources to selected PSAPs in the ESiNet buildout, will strengthen the backbone gateways for adding redundancy with Mississippi Wireless Information Network (MSWIN) and carrier class solutions.
MT	NA	[No Response]
NC	\$26,498,869.00	<p>ESiNet and Hosted Call Handling Statewide PSAP migration: The NC 911 Board approved the award of the State ESiNet contract to AT&T in June 2017 with the actual contract award in August 2017. The contract provides for a Statewide ESiNet provided as a managed service. In addition, the contract provides hosted call handling services that are also provisioned as a managed service. In 2022, the project witnessed the migration of 8 PSAPs to the NG911 service platform. At the end of 2022, 104 of the 126 PSAPs migrations had utilized a hosted call handling design, and 22 PSAPs utilized an on-premise call handling solution connected to the State ESiNet. The current status of the project can be viewed here: https://nconemap.maps.arcgis.com/apps/dashboards/ca70ca087c084a35ab644ea0b693ffc</p> <p>GIS project for the development of i3 Statewide data set: This project was launched in March of 2019 and runs concurrently with the NG911 ESiNet/Hosted call Handling project. Its goal is the migration of all PSAPs coming on the ESiNet to utilize the NENA i3 standard for geospatial call routing as the SOP for North Carolina. The project is managed under the auspices of a contract award to GeoComm Inc in March of 2019. The project also includes in its scope the retrofit of RFAI PSAPs migrated to the ESiNet in 2018-2019 to the i3 standard. This is a Statewide effort that also involves the</p>

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		participation of the NC Center for Geographic Information Analysis (CGIA) as a critical project coordination partner. At the end of 2022, all 110 jurisdictions were i3 ready in EGDMS. The status of the project can be viewed here: https://nconemap.maps.arcgis.com/apps/dashboards/bf74d87b26654801ab3d69c686bacf3e
ND	\$2,546,589.00	Additional counties were added to the GeoMSAG provisioning process using their GIS data as a base dataset, 2 counties are left to migrate. Continued work preparing for IP origination from OSPs.
NE	\$2,561,946.00	Nebraska established the 911 Service System Advisory Committee, which is an advisory committee composed of state and local public safety officials as well as representatives of the telecommunications industry. The committee has been active in establishing working groups to make recommendations in the following areas: Technical [sic], GIS, Training, Funding, and Operations. The Technical Working Group established criteria to be used in the development of a Request For Proposal (RFP) for a vendor hosted statewide Emergency Services Internet Protocol Network and NG 911 Core Services. That RFP resulted in a contract in January 2021 with Lumen/Intrado to provide the services necessary for the Nebraska 911 Service System. After establishing Points of Interconnect for Originating Service Providers, and building circuits to the PSAP's, PSAPs began migrating to the statewide ESInet and became Next Generation 911 PSAPs. At the end of 2022, there were 31 of 68 PSAPs connected to the Statewide ESInet. The Funding Working Group collaborated on the development of a new funding mechanism for NG 911 which was adopted by the Public Service Commission and became effective January 1, 2022. The Training Working Group developed minimum statewide training standards that were adopted and became effective January 1, 2022. The Operations Working Group continues to work on developing model operational policies that PSAPs can adopt. Additionally, the Public Service Commission contracted with Mission Critical Partners to provide implementation consulting services and Intrado to provide Geographic Information Systems (GIS) quality assurance/quality control services on GIS data statewide.
NH	\$1,076,794.63	The State property that our 911 facility in Laconia is located on is in the process of being sold. Due to the sale of the property, the Division of Emergency Services and Communications, has begun the process of planning for the design and construction for the new PSAP. The Division has been working with New Hampshire's Department of Public Works and in 2022 a feasibility study was completed on the desired property to ensure the land could occupy the needs of a robust state of the art 911 facility.
NJ	\$12,279,411.76	A contract for the Statewide NG9-1-1 network, based on the NENA i3 Standards, was awarded in March of 2022. The vendor has completed the planning and design of the network and has placed the CORE Network Orders. In addition, they have designed the support and maintenance program and coordinated the Verizon database load solution. The vendor is still working on the Verizon Transitional Connectivity Planning, surveying PSAPs and providing electrical remediation, and other network related projects leading up to the deployment of the first county in the summer of 2023.
NM	\$5,732,244.00	RFP for ESInet and NGCS finalized at end of 12/31/22. NG911-ready call handling equipment at 90% complete statewide. PSAP boundaries and emergency service zones finalized by State in 2022. Currently under local review.
NV	\$17,183.00	Douglas County - Douglas County, NV Emergency Communications Center provides contracted dispatch service to Alpine County, California. California Office of Emergency Services or CALOES is in an implementation phase to bring NG9-1-1 to all of California including Alpine County. Douglas County will receive some benefit of upgraded CPE as a result of this arrangement. Eureka County - Add text to 911 in the next fiscal year have quotes.
NY	\$554.28	NYC -NG911 project is in progress. NYS NG911 conducted several planning meetings.
OH	\$114,000.00	All local jurisdictions are in various stages of preparing for NG911 implementation.
OK	[No Response]	Planning and implementation of a Statewide NG9-1-1 GIS data set. Development of an a statewide NG9-1-1 plan.
OR	\$248,000.00	Statewide NG9-1-1 strategic plan in development. Statewide GIS assessment for NG9-1-1 readiness complete.

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
PA	\$18,823,887.00	In accordance with the Statewide 911 Plan, PEMA continues to work with Comtech Telecommunications Corp and the PSAPs to implement and operate Pennsylvania's NG911 System. A phased implementation of NG911 across Pennsylvania is underway and will last for the duration of approximately [sic] three years with an estimated completion date of August 2024. As of December 2022, 10 PSAPs have migrated to NG911 service.
RI	\$162,340.77	[No Response]
SC	\$5,748,291.26	South Carolina is in year 3 of a multi-year staged approach to transition all the PSAPs onto the state ESInet.. 26 PSAPs were migrated by the annual period ending December 31, 2021. 22 PSAPs are scheduled to migrate in 2023.
SD	\$3,872,279.00	PSAP initiated text was fully implemented in early 2022. i3 geospatial call routing was implemented for all state hosted PSAPs for wireless and VoIP calls; still working on remaining migrations to full geospatial call routing when all PSAPs/counties reach 98% data accuracy. Eight hosted PSAPs were upgraded to new call handling software in late 2022. These software upgrades will help lay the foundation for future NG911 enhancements and interoperability.
TN	\$18,590,619.48	The TECB's contract for NG911 expires in 2023. In order to seamlessly maintain NG911 services, the TECB issued a request for proposals ('RFP') for a new NG911 network. The RFP was specifically designed to allow for a more robust and secure network. It contained over one hundred specific technical requirements, including diverse call path delivery, cyber-security monitoring, and continuity of network operations plans. AT&T was ultimately selected as the successful respondent. As part of the new contract with AT&T, each 911 call center will have two redundant physical connections to the NG911 network, as well as a wireless backup connection through AT&T's FirstNet wireless network.
TX	\$49,976,384.00	CSEC state 9-1-1 Program: No fully i3 NG911 compliant networks were turned up and operational during CY 2022. All 20 RPCs deployed services with NGCS (4 with Motorola, 16 with ATT) by 12/31/22. BY CY 2022 year-end, the four on Motorola were in the process of completing OSP migrations (scheduled for completion in CY 2023). The 16 on ATT are in the process of beginning OSP traffic migration to the ATT NG Core. As a sub-project, CSEC began the procurement process for a statewide cybersecurity assessment for all 20 RPCs for all 237 PSAPs and awarded a contract in July 2023. One RPC completed work on a sub-project for indoor mapping (CVCOG). Continued progress was made on implementing NG911, including: Governance, GIS Data Standards; GIS Data Quality. Municipal ECDs: Plano completed its procurement, special construction completed, and planning for implementation in 2023. Sherman transitioned to ATT ESInet as part of a hosted solution with Texoma Council of Governments. RichardsonLongview conducted internal discussions regarding possibly contracting for NGCS from a vendor or possibly becoming a satellite agency from its local Council of Governments' existing network. Dallas executed an NG9-1-1 agreement with AT&T. A majority of Municipal ECDs neither have ESInets nor have expended funds for NG9-1-1 projects. The Texas Legislature appropriated to CSEC \$150 million in federal American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 to CSEC to award to Texas 9-1-1 Entities to implement NG9-1-1. For a majority of Municipal ECDs, the federal funds are the first occasion the entity will begin the process of transitioning to NG9-1-1 service. 772 statutory ECDs: Several 772 ECDs reported ongoing NG9-1-1 projects during CY 2022, including Greater Harris County 9-1-1, Lubbock County, Bexar Metro 9-1-1, El Paso, North Central Texas, Austin County, and Abilene-Taylor. No descriptions of project specifics were provided.
UT	\$6,045,476.00	Implementation of the new NENA i3 NG911 statewide hosted call handling and NG Core Services project continued into 2022. The call handling equipment installations were completed 3/31/2022, and continued efforts to implement the new ESInet with NENA i3 NG Core Services took place with a transition completion date of 8/11/2022.
VA	\$9,440,840.40	Virginia's NG9-1-1 deployment dashbord [sic] can be found here : https://vgin.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=d8426fe09efc4ad1b4fd756e1fb4d47b
VT	\$4,587,898.00	In October 2020, the Board and our new contracted system provider, INdigital, deployed a new statewide NG911 system which continues to operate.
WA	~\$12M	King County, the 14th largest county in the US and home to the City of Seattle, has entered in to a

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		<p>contract with Intrado to provide a three-host, 12-remote Call Handling System riding on a county-wide ESInet. The statewide ESInet/NGCS will deliver 911 sessions, bound for King County PSAPs, to one of the three hosts in an active/active configuration. The hosts will then deliver those sessions over the county ESInet. The county ESInet willnot [sic] have any NGCS. The project is scheduled to be completed in CY 2023.</p> <p>A new cross-state Host/Remote Call Handling System project was started in late 2021 with initial completion in early 2022. The project will consist of two host call handling systems located in a county PSAP on each side of the Cascade Range and each of the four remote PSAPs will be connected to each of the Host through geographically diverse connections utilizing the statewide ESInet for transport. There are currently as many as three additional counties/PSAPs interested in joining this Host/Remote system.</p>
WI	\$1,182,609.76	<p>Wisconsin signed a statewide ESInet and NextGen Core Services contract with AT&T in 2021. The second year of the initial five year contract began in 2022. 67 PSAPs had signed an agreement to join the statewide ESInet by the end of 2022.</p> <p>The federal 911 grant award was closed out in June 2022, with \$2.9 million in federal grant dollars and \$1.9 million in state/local match spent to replace PSAP equipment with NG911 capable equipment and NG911 GIS planning projects.</p> <p>Two state NG911 grant programs totaling \$7.5 million were established in 2022 for PSAPs and GIS authorities to prepare for NG911 implementation. State administrative rules were published to govern the Chapter DMA 2 PSAP grant program eligibility/allowable expense requirements, and an agency policy was approved to govern the GIS grant program. The first application period for both programs opened in mid-2022 and 39 grant awards were issued under the PSAP grant program and 24 grant awards were issued under the GIS grant program totaling \$6,797,298.72 in state grant funding awarded as of December 2022 and into early 2023.</p> <p>Wisconsin issued an RFP for a NG911 GIS managed service to aggregate statewide GIS data for NG911 call routing. The procurement process was still ongoing at the end of 2022.</p>
WV	\$18,714,985.83	<p>Upgrade CAD Systems; Upgrade Radio and Phone Systems; Implement Text to 911; Upgrade Existing Text to 911 System; Began or Continued Work on ESI-Net Project; Upgraded 911 Center Connectivity; Upgraded Call Recorder for NG911; RapidSOS Projects; State Addressing and Mapping (SAMS) Projects</p>
WY	<p>Local jurisdictions have spent money on systems and equipment in preparation for being NG911 ESI-Net ready. There is not an audit amount reported to the state. The State of Wyoming has not spend [sic] funds directly on any NG911 program.</p>	<p>The State of Wyoming NG911 Plan was signed in March of 2022. The Public Safety Communications Commission was recognized as the NG911 Governing Board in the State of Wyoming through statute. Wy Statute 9-2-1104 identifies the PSCC composition and responsibilities for NG911</p>
Other Jurisdictions		
AS	[NA]	[No Response]
DC	\$3,279,925.69	[No Response]
Guam	\$1,782,147.30	Build up: Planning of buildup, major renovation of proposed NG911 center, Design of workstations

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		layout, electrical requirements completed, workstations and monitors installed, furnitures [sic] procured and installed.
NMI	[DNF]	[DNF]
PR	\$229,835.76	[No Response]
USVI	[NA]	NONE
Total		\$512,168,670.94

54. **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 2022.²²⁷ 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 24 below, 24 states and the District of Columbia reported having deployed statewide ESInets; 14 states reported having regional ESInets; and 11 states reported local-level ESInets.²²⁸

Table 24 – States and Jurisdictions Deploying ESInets and Total PSAPs Operating on ESInets²²⁹

Type of ESInet	Number of States/Jurisdictions Indicating PSAPs Connected to ESInets		States/Jurisdictions Responding YES	Total PSAPs Operating on ESInets
	Yes	No		
Single Statewide ESInet	25	29	Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota,	1347

²²⁷ 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 indicate that significant ESInet deployment has occurred, the data also indicate that the majority of PSAPs nationwide continue to operate on legacy networks.

²²⁸ Twelve states reported having more than one type of ESInet operating in 2022. For example, the following states indicated that they have both regional and local ESInets operating within the state: Florida, Michigan, Missouri, South Carolina, and Wisconsin.

²²⁹ Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and Wyoming provided substantive entries in Addendum Section I3 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/fifteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>. Michigan states, “The ESInets started as a regional ESInet in the Upper Peninsula. Over time, there have been several different regions that have joined together to get on the same network, helping to share equipment. At the end of 2022, there were 131 PSAPs on a Regional ESInet; 38 PSAPs have their own individual ESInet. All PSAPs and regional ESInets are able to connect to each other and share information.” Michigan Response at 21. Virginia states, “In previous years we have listed other regional ESInets on the annual FCC report. As of the end of 2022, there is only a single ESInet provider in Virginia.” Virginia Response at 19.

Type of ESInet	Number of States/Jurisdictions Indicating PSAPs Connected to ESInets		States/Jurisdictions Responding YES	Total PSAPs Operating on ESInets
			Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington	
Regional ESInet	14	34	Arizona, Arkansas, California, Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin	840
Local ESInet	11	37	Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, South Carolina, West Virginia, Wisconsin	287

55. **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 2022. The Bureau also requested that respondents estimate the number of PSAPs that they anticipated would become text capable by the end of calendar year 2023. Table 25 sets forth the information provided by 49 states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Collectively, respondents reported 3,423 PSAPs as being text capable as of the end of 2022. Respondents further reported that they anticipated a total of 3,657 PSAPs would be text capable by the end of 2023. For purposes of comparison, Table 25 also includes data from the FCC’s Text-to-911 Registry as of the November 3, 2023 edition, which shows a total of 3,026 text-capable PSAPs registered with the FCC.²³⁰

²³⁰ 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.

Table 25 – Text-to-911 Deployments²³¹

State	Text-Capable PSAPs as of Year End 2022	Estimated Total Text-Capable PSAPs as of Year End 2023 ²³²	Total Text-Capable PSAPs Listed in FCC Text-to-911 Registry as of November 3, 2023
AK	2	8	6
AL	101	104	4
AR	17	17	18
AZ	81	81	77
CA	440	440	386
CO	76	77	72
CT	107	106* ²³³	107
DE	8	8	9
FL	178	197	130
GA	63	Unknown	34
HI	8	8	9
IA	111	112	106
ID	[DNF]	[DNF]	39
IL	107	Unknown	50
IN	117	117	90
KS	118	121	115
KY	26	Unknown	13
LA	16	20	14
MA	216	216	242
MD	24	N/A	19
ME	24	24	42
MI	133	135	67
MN	89	95	84
MO	58	95	57
MS	33	33	15
MT	NA	NA	45

²³¹ Alabama, Alaska, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nevada, New Jersey, North Carolina, South Dakota, and Wisconsin provided substantive entries in Addendum Section I5 of the Questionnaire; and Alaska, Colorado, Connecticut, Hawaii, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Utah, and Wisconsin provided substantive entries in Addendum Section I6 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/fifteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

²³² Where states did not report a specific number at Question I6 for the estimated, projected number of total text-capable PSAPs as of the end of 2023, but reported other information that allowed an estimate to be ascertained, the Bureau used that estimated number in its Question I6 calculation. *See, e.g.*, New Hampshire Response at 2, 19 (reporting at Question I6 that “[t]he entire state is currently capable of text to 911” and reporting elsewhere that the state had two PSAPs; the Bureau used two PSAPs in its I6 calculation). In addition, several states properly responded to Question I5 but then entered “Unknown,” “N/A,” or similar to Question I6. In such cases, for I6 calculation purposes, the Bureau assumed that the same number of PSAPs in those states that accepted texts as of year-end 2022 would also accept texts as of year-end 2023.

²³³ At Addendum Section I6, Connecticut states, “Reduced number of PSAPs due to a consolidation.” Connecticut Response at 21.

State	Text-Capable PSAPs as of Year End 2022	Estimated Total Text-Capable PSAPs as of Year End 2023 ²³²	Total Text-Capable PSAPs Listed in FCC Text-to-911 Registry as of November 3, 2023
NC	125	125	101
ND	22	22	22
NE	56	66	30
NH	2	The entire state is currently capable of text to 911	1
NJ	17	35 ²³⁴	19
NM	0	0	0
NV	2	3 ²³⁵	7
NY	48	Unk[nown]	45
OH	33	59	45
OK	22	33	8
OR	33	1 ²³⁶	25
PA	59	61	38
RI	2	2	0
SC	20	30	25
SD	32	32	33
TN	54	80	54
TX	502	558 All PSAPs	502
UT	30	28 ²³⁷	35
VA	119	119	97
VT	6	6	6
WA	40	48	47
WI	17	Unknown	18
WV	16	25	7
WY	9	15	9
Other Jurisdictions			
AS	None	None	0
DC	1	1	1
Guam	NONE	2	0
NMI	[DNF]	[DNF]	0
PR	3	3	1

²³⁴ At Addendum Section I5, New Jersey states, “Text to 9-1-1 capability became available statewide in July 2016 through 17 regional PSAPs equipped with the necessary equipment.” At Question I6, New Jersey reports 35 as the estimated, projected total number of text-capable PSAPs at the end of 2023. At Addendum Section I6, New Jersey states, “Text to 9-1-1 is available statewide through 17 regional PSAPs now. As the NG9-1-1 Network is built it is anticipated that the number of PSAPs with Text to 9-1-1 capability will increase to approximately 35.” New Jersey Response at 19-20.

²³⁵ At Addendum Section I5, Nevada states, “Consolidated Municipality of Carson City NV - Unknown. Clark County – Don’t have information for other PSAPs. Does not use text-to-911.” At Addendum Section I6, Nevada states, “Clark County – Don’t have information for other PSAPs. Will not have implemented by 12/23.” Nevada Response at 21-22.

²³⁶ At Question I6, it appears that Oregon only counted additional projected PSAPs rather than total projected PSAPs that would be text capable by the end of 2023. Oregon Response at 19.

²³⁷ At Addendum Section I6, Utah states, “In 2023, 4 PSAPs consolidated into 2, changing the PSAP total from 30 to 28. UT fully implemented text to 911 statewide as of 3/31/2022.” Utah Response at 25.

State	Text-Capable PSAPs as of Year End 2022	Estimated Total Text-Capable PSAPs as of Year End 2023 ²³²	Total Text-Capable PSAPs Listed in FCC Text-to-911 Registry as of November 3, 2023
USVI	0	2	0
Totals	3,423	3,657	3,026

J. Cybersecurity Expenditures

56. The Bureau requested that states and jurisdictions provide information on whether they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs in 2022 and, if so, the amounts of those expenditures. As represented in Table 26 below, 27 states and the District of Columbia reported that they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs in 2022, with a combined total reported expenditure of \$7,944,429.03. Twenty-one states, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands responded that they did not expend funds on PSAP-related cybersecurity programs. The Bureau additionally requested information on the number of PSAPs in each state or jurisdiction that had or participated in a cybersecurity program in 2022. Collectively, respondents reported that 975 PSAPs had or participated in a cybersecurity program in calendar year 2022. Nineteen states, the District of Columbia, and Guam reported that one or more of their PSAPs either had a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program in 2022. Eight states, American Samoa, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that their PSAPs did not have or participate in cybersecurity programs. Seventeen states reported that they lacked data or otherwise did not know whether their PSAPs had or participated in cybersecurity programs.

Table 26 – Annual Cybersecurity Expenditures²³⁸

State	Jurisdictions reporting that they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs during the annual period ending December 31, 2022			Amount	Number of PSAPs that either had a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program
	Yes	No	No Response		
AK		X		[NA]	0
AL	X			These expenses are part of the NG911 system service provider’s scope, but are not completely itemized in their invoicing.	Unknown
AR		X		[NA]	UNK[NOWN]
AZ		X		[NA]	0
CA	X			\$192,000.00	0
CO		X		[NA] ²³⁹	[No Response]

²³⁸ Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, Texas, and Utah provided substantive entries in Addendum Section J1 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses in this table. Colorado, Hawaii, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming provided substantive entries in Addendum Section J2 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/fifteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

State	Jurisdictions reporting that they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs during the annual period ending December 31, 2022				Number of PSAPs that either had a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program
	Yes	No	No Response	Amount	
CT		X		[NA]	Unk[nown]
DE	X			[No Response]	8
FL	X			\$829,345.00	67
GA		X		[NA]	Unknown
HI		X		[NA]	4
IA	X			Unknown	112
ID	[DNF]	[DNF]		[DNF]	[DNF]
IL		X		[NA]	Unknown
IN	X			[No Response]	Unknown
KS	X			\$138,983.00	23 ²⁴⁰
KY		X		[NA]	Unknown
LA	X			Not Tracked	UNK[NOWN]
MA	X			Although not broken out as a separate line item, monitoring, alerting, and prevention of external attacks is undertaken under the Next Generation 911 service provider contract. The boundary of the network is protected with Anti-Malware, Anti-Virus, Firewall, and Network Intrusion Protection capabilities, monitored 24x7x365 by a Security Operations Center. A second layer of Firewalls protect the data centers (the brains of the systems) from the Internet DMZ and ESInet/PSAPs. This provides blocks to prevent both malware and internal user threats from accessing key systems. Finally, the PSAP system is isolated on the Massachusetts Next Generation	Unknown

(Continued from previous page) _____

²³⁹ At Addendum Section J1, Colorado states, “While the state spent no funds on cybersecurity [sic] programs for PSAPs, the local 9-1-1 governing bodies reported that they expended \$844,111 on cybersecurity-related expenses. Not all governing bodies responded to our data collection effort, so the actual figure may be higher. Several governing bodies also reported that their cybersecurity expenses are included in the budgets of the county or city that operates their PSAP(s), so they were unable to provide a figure.” Colorado Response at 20; *see also id.* at 21 (Addendum Section J2).

²⁴⁰ At Addendum Section J2, Kansas states, “The 106 PSAPs that participate in the statewide call handling system benefit from the Council’s efforts to ensure cyber security is maintained on the system. The costs of this cyber effort is [sic] rolled up in the overall system costs. In 2023 the Council plans to implement a cybersecurity monitoring platform to ensure that cyber efforts made by the system vendor are validated.” Kansas Response at 21.

State	Jurisdictions reporting that they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs during the annual period ending December 31, 2022				Number of PSAPs that either had a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program
	Yes	No	No Response	Amount	
				911 networks, they do not share any connections or networks with the police stations or fire stations in which they are installed, and all VPN applications have a cybersecurity brief.	
MD	X			\$2,969,492.03	24
ME	X			Exact amount unknown because it is part of the contract for NG911 Services.	24
MI	X			[No Response]	[No Response]
MN	X			\$56,155.00	0
MO	X			[No Response]	28
MS		X		[NA]	N/A
MT			X	NA	NA
NC		X		[NA]	[No Response]
ND	X			Unknown	Unknown
NE	X			\$590,550.00	67
NH	X			[No Response]	2
NJ		X		[NA]	Unknown
NM		X		[NA]	0
NV	X			\$24,000.00 ²⁴¹	[No Response]
NY	X			[No Response]	36
OH		X		[NA]	65
OK		X		[NA]	Unknown
OR		X		[NA]	Unknown
PA	X			Unavailable	61
RI	X			\$31,680.00	2
SC		X		[NA]	unknown
SD		X		[NA]	0
TN	X			\$833,111.00	46
TX	X			\$2,170,655.00	285
UT	X			The statewide NG911 end to end solution includes strict cybersecurity [sic] protocols that UCA pays for in the monthly reoccurring [sic] costs on behalf of the Utah PSAPs.	30
VA		X		[NA]	Unknown
VT	X			Elements of cybersecurity	Unknown

²⁴¹ At Addendum Section J1, Nevada states, “Consolidated Municipality of Carson City NV- Service contract with mission critical partners. Douglas County - Unknown. Mineral County - Unknown.” Nevada Response at 22.

State	Jurisdictions reporting that they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs during the annual period ending December 31, 2022				Number of PSAPs that either had a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program
	Yes	No	No Response	Amount	
				programs are included in contract with the system provider.	
WA	X			Amount is included in an overall contract for NG911 ESInet and not itemized.	66
WI		X		[NA]	Unknown
WV	X			\$50,636.00	23
WY		X		[NA]	[No Response]
Other Jurisdictions					
AS		X		[NA]	None
DC	X			\$57,822.00	1
Guam		X		[NA]	1
NMI	[DNF]	[DNF]		[DNF]	[DNF]
PR		X		[NA]	0
USVI		X		[NA]	0
Total	28	25	1	\$7,944,429.03	975

57. 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)²⁴² for networks that support one or more PSAPs. As detailed in Table 27 below, 26 states and the District of Columbia reported that they adhere to the NIST Framework; three states reported that they do not; 19 states, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands indicated that they did not know; and one state provided no response.

²⁴² See National Institute of Standards and Technology, *Cybersecurity Framework*, <https://www.nist.gov/cyberframework> (last visited Dec. 20, 2023).

Table 27 – Adherence to the NIST Cybersecurity Framework²⁴³

State	State or jurisdiction adheres to the National Institute of Standards and Technology <i>Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity</i> (April 2018) for networks supporting one or more PSAPs in the state or jurisdiction			
	Yes	No	Reported “Unknown”	No Response
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	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	
IL			X	
IN	X			
KS	X			
KY	X			
LA			X	
MA	X			
MD	X			
ME			X	
MI	X			
MN			X	
MO			X	
MS	X			
MT			X	
NC	X			
ND	X			
NE	X			
NH	X			
NJ			X	
NM	X			
NV				X

²⁴³ Delaware, Georgia, Illinois, Kansas, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, and Texas provided substantive entries in Addendum Section J3 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/fifteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>. Kansas states, “64 PSAPs reported that their local jurisdictions are NIST compliant.” Kansas Response at 21-22. Texas states, “Yes, unknown, or N/A were the prevalent answers -- with a majority of the 77 Texas 9-1-1 Entities reporting yes. The CSEC state 9-1-1 Program anticipates implementing NIST cybersecurity framework by the end of CY 2023.” Texas Response at 33.

State	State or jurisdiction adheres to the National Institute of Standards and Technology <i>Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity</i> (April 2018) for networks supporting one or more PSAPs in the state or jurisdiction			
	Yes	No	Reported “Unknown”	No Response
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	
NMI	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	
PR			X	
USVI			X	
Totals	27	3	23	1

K. Measuring Effective Utilization of 911/E911 Fees

58. 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.”²⁴⁴ Of the jurisdictions that responded, many described some effort to measure the effectiveness of 911/E911 fund expenditures, as detailed below in Table 28. Responses varied from descriptions of how funds had been spent on NG911 to state plans with metrics describing improvements to the 911 system.

59. 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.²⁴⁵ Included in the Task Force’s report are detailed recommendations for state and local NG911 planning and budgeting and a

²⁴⁴ FCC Questionnaire at 20 (K1).

²⁴⁵ See FCC, *Task Force on Optimal Public Safety Answering Point Architecture (TFOPA)* (Dec. 7, 2016), <https://www.fcc.gov/about-fcc/advisory-committees/general/task-force-optimal-public-safety-answering-point>.

common NG911 “scorecard” to enable jurisdictions to assess the progress and maturity of their NG911 implementations. States and other jurisdictions may incorporate these guidelines into their planning and use them to assess whether utilization of 911/E911 fees has been effective.

Table 28 – Statements Regarding Effective Utilization of 911/E911 Fees

State	Assessment of Effects Achieved from the Expenditure of State 911/E911 or NG911 Funds, Including Any Criteria Used to Measure the Effectiveness of the Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges
AK	The collection and expenditure of 911 fees allows the Boroughs and Municipalities maintain and support 911 emergency calling.
AL	<p>Data collection and legal compliance examination at the district level began in late 2013 on a biennial basis by a third-party state agency. All districts have now completed four rounds of these examinations. The legal compliance examinations are designed to ensure that 911 funds are being utilized properly, as directed by statute, but do not deliver a comprehensive or consistent [sic] assessment of effective use of funds from a quality of service perspective. The various audit reports for each Emergency Communication District can be searched on the Alabama Department of Examiners of Public Accounts website, (https://examiners.alabama.gov/audit_reports.aspx).</p> <p>The Alabama 9-1-1 Board supplements this data by utilizing an expanded annual district certification form. Most of this data collection consists of operational systems in the various PSAPs, staffing numbers, and what training programs were in place per district and are required. The filing of this annual certification is mandatory from emergency communication districts. The NG911 reporting suite is being continually improved upon and provides certain quality of service indicators such as call total by defined time period, ring time, talk time, and inter-network transfers that has improved visibility into local operational efficiency [sic]. With all PSAPs being migrated onto the Alabama Next Generation Emergency Network (ANGEN), we continue to improve our visibility into all points of data mentioned above and use that data in conjunction with the other reports to improve the measure of effective utilization of 911 funding in Alabama.</p>
AR	The increase in 911 fees collected due to Act 660, the Public Safety Act of 2019, has reduced the amount of funds that localities are supplementing from general funds to operate a PSAP by approximately 50% - 75%. The Arkansas 911 Board is in the process of implementing a Statewide ESInet and NGCS through the collection of fees and improving GIS data statewide.
AZ	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 100% of wireline and wireless access lines in Arizona have access to 9-1-1 2. 100% of wireline and wireless access lines with PSAP systems for which the state has approved 9-1-1 Service Plans have Enhanced 9-1-1 (E9-1-1) 3. 100% of access lines within approved PSAP systems have Wireless Phase II 9-1-1 4. 34 Arizona PSAPs are operating on a NG911 ESInet 5. 100% of Arizona PSAPs have Text to 9-1-1 capability
CA	Cal OES, California 9-1-1 Branch conducts a Fiscal and Operational Review (F.O.R.) of all PSAPS in the state. These reviews take place, on average, every other year and provide the information needed to ensure that PSAPs are in compliance with statutory requirements. Cal OES also uses the F.O.R. process to provide the PSAPs with the information and guidance the PSAPs need to run efficiently and effectively. The State recently made a staffing prediction tool available to all PSAPs to assist PSAPs with staffing levels that support P.01 level of service and call answer times established by the state. Cal OES also completes an annual review of wireless call routing for all cellular sectors in the state and tracks all outages in the state. The results of these assessments, reviews and data gathering are presented to the 9-1-1 Advisory Board and Long Range Planning Committee who provide guidance and input to the effectiveness of 9-1-1 in California.
CO	A copy of the 2021-2022 State of 9-1-1 Report will be provided. This is a comprehensive report from the Colorado Public Utilities Commission to the Colorado General Assembly on the state of 9-1-1 services in Colorado.
CT	The Division of Statewide Emergency Telecommunications submits its annual budget request to the Public Utility Regulatory Authority (PURA) for approval [sic] and the setting of the 9-1-1 surcharge fee. Funds provide for equipment, maintenance and management of the 911 system, grants and subsidies to PSAPs and funded municipalities, training and certification, training funds, reimbursement of costs for

State	Assessment of Effects Achieved from the Expenditure of State 911/E911 or NG911 Funds, Including Any Criteria Used to Measure the Effectiveness of the Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges
	<p>basic and recertification of EMD training, public education initiatives, and a statewide emergency notification system. All purchasing and expenditures are authorized by the Division of Statewide Emergency Telecommunications and meet the state’s guidelines for procurement. Requests and approvals for grants measure the success of consolidation efforts and improvements to infrastructure of RECCs and funded entities, use of training funds is a measurement of ongoing efforts by PSAPs to encourage telecommunicators to pursue [sic] ongoing educational opportunities, surveys conducted to assess the public’s awareness of Text-to-911, indicate a high level of awareness, which was achieved through successful public education initiatives.</p>
DE	<p>The State of Delaware has established a public education campaign to promote NG911 and 911/E911 functions to the citizens we serve. We have seen sizeable increases in the Smart911 registrations due to the public education campaigns. We are capturing 300-400 new Smart 911 accounts each month. The effects of expending portions of the 911/E911 funds to promote 911 literacy has impacted the state positively.</p>
FL	<p>https://www.dms.myflorida.com/content/download/159261/1053934/20212022E911BoardAnnualReportVersionFINAL.pdf</p>
GA	<p>The State of Georgia currently does not have a means of assessing the effects achieved from the expenditure of state 911/E911 or NG911 funds.</p>
HI	<p>Neither the State or Counties have formalized assessments of the effectiveness [sic] of the use of 911/E911 fees and charges. However, the State of Hawaii Enhanced 911 Board evaluates the effects achieved [sic] from [sic] the expenditures of E911 funds in terms of efficiency [sic] through our reimbursement request system that ensures all PSAPs receive funding in a timely manner. These actions ensure the continued efficiency [sic] of their systems replacing legacy equipment, maintenance of existing equipment, and training of personnel in new and emerging technology. Furthermore, the State of Hawaii Enhanced 911 Board monitors the number and efficiency [sic] of call processing of the PSAPs on a monthly basis. The PSAPs in the State of Hawaii have benefitted tremendously by the leadership of the Enhanced 911 Board and successful [sic] funding. Furthermore, all PSAPs have benefitted by continuing to update the 9-1-1 Database and GIS to ensure timely and successful [sic] location of 9-1-1 Callers.</p>
IA	<p>Iowa’s 911 program entered a period of more steady state operations during this year. Our two large projects continued, along with continual efforts to transition to NG911. Our two large projects consist of migrating the legacy landline 911 network onto the existing ESInet, as well as leveraging shared call handling equipment, allowing the PSAPs to share technology. Since 2019, the State worked with PSAPs to continue implementing a state-hosted shared services technology environment, allowing the PSAPs to achieve cost savings while leveraging technology made possible by next-generation 911. No longer will each PSAP need to have its own call processing equipment within the walls of its PSAP. As part of this virtual consolidation plan, PSAPs can share call handling equipment throughout the state. This project now includes additional ESInet redundancy leveraging FirstNet LTE. This project will be ongoing for the foreseeable future. There are currently 70 PSAPs utilizing this program, with an additional 5 signed up for activation in the near future. Also since 2019, HSEMD has been undertaking an effort with public and private partners to merge the legacy wireline 911 network onto the existing wireless ESInet. This project is 96% complete but has reached a steady state. The remaining PSAPs have direct trunks and due to cost recovery precedent concerns, we are not ordering the relocation of those trunks to aggregation points at this time but are slowly working with telco’s willing to cooperate on their own. Iowa processed 6,038 text to 911 in the 12-month period. Text to 911 is available in 98 out of Iowa’s 99 Counties. We also are now able to transfer text to 911 messages from one PSAP to another. Additionally, great strides were made in the state’s NG911 GIS program, achieving over 98% match rates, and 98% ALI match rates and zero critical errors through the use of GIS grants to local jurisdictions. We implemented a GeoMSAG and are nearing implementation of an ECRF during the next reporting year. Approximately 99% of PSAPs in Iowa are receiving SIP calls and are therefore truly receive end to end IP based wireless calls. Our Strategic Plan is available at: https://homelandsecurity.iowa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/911-</p>

State	Assessment of Effects Achieved from the Expenditure of State 911/E911 or NG911 Funds, Including Any Criteria Used to Measure the Effectiveness of the Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges
	Strategic-Plan-2021_2025.pdf Our legislative report is available at: https://homelandsecurity.iowa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/2022-911-annual-report-FINAL.pdf
ID	[DNF]
IL	The State of Illinois requires that every 9-1-1 Authority complete an Annual Financial Report (AFR) each year by the end of January. This provides a complete assessment of annual expenditures and revenues for each 9-1-1 system in the State. This assists the State in determining the financial condition of each 9-1-1 system and whether there is appropriate funding available and whether inappropriate spending exists.
IN	attach reports [sic]
KS	<p>Expenditure of 911 funds allows PSAPs to maintain their legacy 911 systems or NG911 systems and accompanying support systems (radio, recorders, CAD, etc.). The structure of the statute allows these funds to be carried forward from year to year, unlike general funds, allowing PSAPs to accrue the funds for major purchases. Through the use of 911 funds and general fund supplements, the entire State of Kansas is served by Phase 2, E911, and 98% of the state's Counties by an ESInet. The Council is utilizing prepaid wireless fees to provide great benefit to all PSAPs participating in the statewide system. Kansas is a leader in the nation in the migration to ESInet with geospatial routing and i3 services. This has been accomplished with funds generated by the state 911 fee.</p> <p>Some examples of statements from the PSAPs in regard to this question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OPD is able to stay up to date and have equipment capable of handling and dispatching 911 calls. We were able to purchase a 911 recording system with our 911 funds that will also be ready for when we are getting pictures and videos to 911 in the future. Our radio consoles are well maintained. Dispatchers are able to get out and go to training that make them better 911 operators and they are able to network and make contacts from other areas to bring more ideas back to the psap. • Without the 911 fee fund Republic County would not have been afforded the ability to enhance the equipment and operations of the center. For the County to bear the total costs to operate a 911 PSAP there would have been sacrifices made with equipment that would have hindered the accuracy and response to a lifesaving 911 calls. With the State imposed tax lid, budgetary dollars have been cut and this halts any expenditures that would be needed to be able to update and take advantage of the new technology that is available for 911 PSAP's and this in returns hurts the 911 caller to get the best service they deserve. <p>Criteria to measure the effectiveness of the use of 911 funding is measured by the improved response time. This is attributed to the more accurate mapping module, the faster more detailed hosted phone system, and the ability for the dispatchers to zone in on the caller's location. Also, the positive public comments about more efficient 911 service.</p> <p>Staying up to date with the new technology that is continuously being developed, is nothing more than a must. If we fall behind it will be a disaster and costly, in money and lives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are only capable of providing the enhanced level of service we do because of 911 fees, so by that measure, they are highly effective. If we were to rely solely on general fund and property tax revenues, I'm confident that many tools we have at our disposal today would not be affordable for our county. Our county is highly conservative and attempts to keep tax levies low to enhance economic strength and development. 911 fees are paid by everyone who uses a telephone, not just limited to property owners, therefore everyone who has the ability to access emergency services shares in the cost. • The 911 fee funds have allowed our agency to purchase and utilize the equipment needed to assure an updated and effective emergency center for our citizens.
KY	<p>In accordance with 202 KAR 6:100, Board-certified PSAPs (those PSAP receiving wireless funds from the 911 Services Board because they have proven that they are capable of properly handling wireless E911 calls) receive a geospatial audit that measures the accuracy of their ability to receive a plot wireless 911 calls on the PSAP map.</p> <p>Board-certified PSAPs are also subject to a financial review, each PSAP being audited at least once every two years.</p> <p>Board-certified PSAPs are also required to complete a comprehensive 'PSAP Survey' annually in order to maintain certification. The 911 Services Board has attempted to modify this survey each year in</p>

State	Assessment of Effects Achieved from the Expenditure of State 911/E911 or NG911 Funds, Including Any Criteria Used to Measure the Effectiveness of the Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges
	<p>accordance with the type of information required to provide to the federal government. PSAPs are also required to submit GIS data sets necessary for NG911 (PSAP boundary, ESBs, RCLs, SSAPs) on at least a quarterly basis.</p> <p>The 911 Services Board competitive grant program administered by the Board adheres to guidelines that align with the state plan. During the review process, projects are evaluated based upon their adherence toward next generation frameworks.</p> <p>In conjunction with the Kentucky Office of Homeland Security (to which the 911 Services Board is administratively attached), the 911 Services Board produces an annual report that includes detailed reporting on the receipt and expenditure of wireless 911 fees collected and disbursed by the Board. The 2021 annual report can be viewed at: https://homelandsecurity.ky.gov/About/Annual%20Reports/2021%20KOHS%20Annual%20Report%20FINAL.pdf.</p>
LA	UNK[NOWN]
MA	<p>Pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 6A, Section 18B(j), ‘the [State 911] department shall file a written annual report with the governor and shall file a copy thereof with the state secretary, the clerks of the house of representatives and the senate who shall forward such report to the joint committee on public safety and homeland security and the house and senate ways and means committees. The [State 911] department shall review and monitor the expenditures incurred under the grant programs established in this section to ensure compliance with grant guidelines. The [State 911] department shall include a reporting of grant expenditures by municipality in the written annual report. Not later than June 30, every 3 years, the [State 911] department shall prepare a report documenting the expenditures of each recipient of funds from surcharge revenues to ensure compliance with applicable statutes and regulations. In addition, pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 6A, Section 18H(b), the State 911 Department is required to report annually to the department of telecommunications and cable on the financial condition of the Enhanced 911 Fund and on the department’s assessment of new developments affecting the enhanced 911 system.’ Additional information is available on the State 911 Department’s website at www.mass.gov/e911.</p>
MD	<p>Maryland’s 9-1-1 Trust Fund administered by the Maryland 9-1-1 Board is a national model. By collecting funds that any county may use for 9-1-1 enhancements, each county provides 9-1-1 service at a consistent level through the funding of telephone equipment, protocol systems and training, regardless of county population or county budget. The Board does more than a funding source, and serves a regulatory, oversight and leadership role for Maryland’s 9-1-1 community. The Board has convened monthly, and more frequently in sub-committees, to consider a variety of 9-1-1 related issues and projects.</p> <p>Maryland continues to benefit from an effective 9-1-1 system. Recent Board statewide efforts include working with Verizon and NG911 service providers, Maryland PSAP personnel, Maryland Department of Emergency Management, and the Maryland Public Service Commission to review the implementation of policies and standards adopted by the Federal Communications Commission and Board to minimize disruptions to 9-1-1 service caused by power outages and network failures. Ongoing Board activities include providing a vigorous 9-1-1 training program throughout the state, cybersecurity assessments and response planning, recruitment support, working with vendors to improve 9-1-1 service delivery, and continuing research, planning and implementation of ‘Next Generation’ technologies. The Board has also required demonstrations of interoperability with other systems before being approved to go-live with NG911 service.</p> <p>The Board remains focused on the enhancement of 9-1-1 and the critical role it plays in public safety.</p>
ME	<p>All 911 surcharge funds are used to support a statewide 911 system and are not distributed locally. In 2014 the State of Maine completed a statewide, end-to-end NG911 deployment, positioning it well for new technologies as they are developed and tested. The system was refreshed in 2020 and continues to operate at a much lower cost than the legacy E911 system it replaced.</p>
MI	<p>Each year the SNC collects data and submits a report to the Michigan Legislature which exceeds the statutorily required reporting of data to provide a comprehensive status report on Michigan’s 911 system. The 2022 Annual Report to the Michigan Legislature may be accessed at: https://www.michigan.gov/msp/-/media/Project/Websites/msp/911/About-SNC-Page/Annual-Reports/2022-Annual-Report-to-the-Michigan-Legislature.pdf?rev=b23f4e0c9c3e44aaa7ccc6349292bca1</p>

State	Assessment of Effects Achieved from the Expenditure of State 911/E911 or NG911 Funds, Including Any Criteria Used to Measure the Effectiveness of the Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges
	The 2023 Annual Report to the Michigan Legislature is due August 1, 2023, and will be posted on the SNC website once submitted.
MN	Electronic Excel Document included with submission ('CY22 MN Compliance Report Summary'). Contains list of expenditures made by PSAPs eligible to receive monthly 911 fee distributions from ECN. Expenses divided into 11 specified categories.
MO	Missouri is working towards process at a state level and has not established official assessment measures as of yet.
MS	In 2022 the State of Mississippi did not have a committee, organization, or board that had full oversight or that implemented policies and procedures regarding 911/E911 fee usage. The responsibility lay solely with the local board of supervisors. Therefore, the supervisors measure the effective utilization of 911/E911 usage and whether those efforts are meeting the standards and needs of their citizens.
MT	NA
NC	<p>The annual 911 service charge is distributed to primary PSAPs based on a 5-yr rolling average; secondary PSAPs are funded based on a cost-per-call basis using the primary PSAPs' expenditures for the current year. N.C.G.S. § 143B-1402(b)(5) provides guidelines to ensure the funding is disbursed and expensed appropriately. The NC 911 Board staff conducts an annual 'Revenue/Expenditure Review' of each PSAP receiving 911 funds. For any expenditures identified as an ineligible 911 expenses, the PSAP is required to reimburse the 911 Fund the amount determined ineligible.</p> <p>North Carolina Administrative Code. Board rule 09 NCAC 06C .0209(a) requires ninety percent (90%) of 911 calls received on emergency lines to be answered within 10 seconds, and 95 percent (95%) of 911 calls received on emergency lines shall be answered within 20 seconds. The Code further states that the PSAP and the Board shall evaluate call answering times monthly by using data from the previous month. In the North Carolina Administrative Code, Board rule 09 NCAC 06C .0216(a), 'Assessing PSAP Operations' requires the Board to conduct annual reviews of PSAP operations to determine whether a PSAP meets the requirements in Section .0200 of the Board's rules.</p> <p>Next Generation 911 efforts are continuing, with 126 PSAPs having migrated to the Statewide ESInet at the close of 2022. As of the date of this report, 126 PSAPs have migrated to the ESInet with an estimated 86% of those PSAPs utilizing the hosted call handling solution offered by two platforms. The NG911 project has also resulted in all 100 counties/110 jurisdictions in North Carolina contributing to a Statewide GIS dataset in which all PSAPs have reached NG911 i3 compliance. Additionally, all PSAPs have participated in cybersecurity assessments funded by the Board in 2020-2021, which will assist them in identifying any areas of improvement for cyber hygiene.</p> <p>Note: Due to consolidations, there are currently 125 PSAPs in the State. However, prior to the consolidations, 126 PSAPs migrated to Next Generation 911 services. There is one remaining PSAP in NC left to migrate to the Next Generation offering, and it is expected to do so early 2024. At that point, there will be 125 PSAPs on the Statewide ESInet, representing 100% of State funded PSAPs in NC.</p>
ND	Report for the legislature published for the 2023 legislative session can be found at: https://www.ndaco.org/image/cache/LegReport2022_FINAL.pdf
NE	<p>State wireless 911 funds continue to be used to support the 68 PSAPs providing 911 in Nebraska. Each PSAP receives an annual allocation of these funds to supplement their general fund and wireline dollars to provide 911 services. During 2022, 911 wireless funds have also been used to continue the statewide transition to Next Generation 911. This includes contracting with a vendor [sic] to provide a statewide ESInet and NG 911 Core Services, an NG 911 Implementation Consulting firm, contracting with a statewide MIS provider, and a vendor to assist with the development of a statewide [sic] GIS data, as well as, quality assurance/quality control services. The Commission is supported by the 911 Service System Advisory Committee which is comprised of state and local stakeholders of the 911 Service System. This committee is working on developing statewide technical and quality assurance standards. Minimum training standards were developed and became effective in 2022. Additionally, a new funding mechanism has been developed and was adopted by the Commission in 2021.</p> <p>The Public Service Commission submits a report annually to the Nebraska Legislature on telecommunications with a section on 911 included. That report can be found at: chrome-extension: https://psc.nebraska.gov/sites/psc.nebraska.gov/files/doc/FINAL2022AnnualReportonTelecommunication</p>

State	Assessment of Effects Achieved from the Expenditure of State 911/E911 or NG911 Funds, Including Any Criteria Used to Measure the Effectiveness of the Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges
	sFINAL2022-29-08.pdf
NH	The State of New Hampshire has provided PSAP services to all E911 callers and first responders through two state-run PSAPs since July 1995. We believe that it has been an extremely cost-effective E911 system providing even the smallest jurisdictions with services they could not have afforded on their own. In addition to all call handling functions, the state provides mapping and addressing services to all jurisdictions, telephony database maintenance, interpreter services, emergency notification as well as Emergency Medical Dispatch for 100% of the state's population. Currently, there is no annual assessment completed that measures the effectiveness of the use of E911 funds, however, the state has a seventeen-member Enhanced 911 Commission that meets quarterly to review expenditures and advise the Division on the proper use of funds.
NJ	No assessments or reports exist related to the effectiveness of the expenditures of the 9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Fee collected in New Jersey. The amount of funds collected annually is approximately \$127M are used to offset over \$355M in State expenditures for programs itemized in the enabling legislation N.J.S.A. 52:17C in support of emergency response.
NM	Periodic assessments are done by the legislative finance committee with a program evaluation last conducted in 2018. The DFA, Local Government Division has performance measures for all funding programs and reports to legislature on an annual basis.
NV	Consolidated Municipality of Carson City NV - Defer to the Nevada Division [sic] of Emergency Management Statewide Interoperability [sic] Coordinator. Douglas County - Since there is no 9-1-1 program manager in Nevada, Douglas County is unaware of any such assessment. Storey County - Does not collect fees. Clark County - We do not charge a fee in Clark County so no ability to access. Nye County - Has an established Emergency Systems Fund (911) where collected 911 surcharge fees are deposited. Fund is used for the purchase, lease, installation or maintenance of 911 equipment and any other expense outlined in NRS 244A.7643 which was amended by NV SB 176 (2017). This fund can support the cost of monthly phone bills to maintain phone service at the PSAP as well as very few strategically planned projects decided up by the Nye County 911 advisory committee. The fund is not effective in covering the cost of PSAP staffing, CAD equipment or maintenance fees, the BWC's as outlined in NRS, or any other allowed covered equipment that is needed by the PSAP. In addition, these funds cannot support any type of expansion or remodel of the PSAP currently. These costs have been paid by the County General Fund.
NY	Since its [sic] inception, the PSAP Grant Program has provided over \$60 million to counties and NYC. These monies have resulted in the improvements needed to keep our PSAPs updated with emerging technologies in equipment. Also these funds have allowed for improvements in training and other programs which improved the delivery of 911 emergency dispatch services to all who live, work and visit New York
OH	Ohio is a Home Rule state and as such, counties have operational control of all 9-1-1 operations through the County 9-1-1 Planning Committee. The Ohio ESINet Steering Committee, through the Ohio 9-1-1 Program Office and the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio have limited regulatory authority and duties. 9-1-1 funds collected at the state level are monitored and the program ensures proper use for 9-1-1 purposes as outlined in Ohio Revised Code Chapter 128. Locally collected funds are also outlined as it pertains to allowable uses through the Ohio Revised Code when the fund collection is through tax levies or other collection methods. Annually, all eighty-eight (88) counties must submit a WGAF reconciliation form to record state 9-1-1 fund expenditures
OK	Do not currently have a matrix in use to assess effectiveness.
OR	We do not conduct an assessment of the effects achieved from the expenditure of state 911/E911 or NG911 funds at this time.
PA	911 fees in Pennsylvania have been critical to not only sustaining current 911 systems but also for facilitating our transition to NG911 service. Pennsylvania's 911 Fund and County General Funds continue to face significant financial pressure from increasing personnel, technology and

State	Assessment of Effects Achieved from the Expenditure of State 911/E911 or NG911 Funds, Including Any Criteria Used to Measure the Effectiveness of the Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges
	connectivity/infrastructure costs associated with today’s 911 service. In addition, Pennsylvania is incurring significant costs to implement a statewide ESInet and NG911 service. Funding constraints [sic] are impacting the ability of PSAPs to recruit/retain personnel, invest in 911 system improvements, and invest in future technologies. Pennsylvania’s 911 Fee collections have been level since 2016. With level revenue and increasing costs, the county’s contribution to support 911 service with General Fund revenue is expected to increase in the coming years.
RI	Rhode Island E-911 monitors the number of incoming 911 calls daily, the number of calls that enter queue, the duration of the calls that enter queue, the maximum duration of the calls that enter queue, and the average duration of the calls that enter queue. RI E-911 also examines the duration of the call before transfer as well as the median and total duration of the length of the calls within each dispatch area including fire, police and medical responses. Additionally, RI E-911 monitors, on a weekly basis, our incoming call volume reports and staffing levels. These measures/metrics provide RI E-911 with an overview of our operational effectiveness.
SC	[No Response]
SD	Compliance reviews are completed by the State 9-1-1 Coordinator for PSAPs receiving State 9-1-1 surcharge funds. Operational, training, and financial standards are reviewed, as are equipment and facilities to ensure proper procedures are in place for the effective operation of a PSAP. Local jurisdictions must also submit an annual report detailing their 911 fund expenditures which is reviewed by the State 9-1-1 Coordinator.
TN	<p>The TECB collects the 911 surcharge from service providers and uses those funds to fulfill the TECB’s statutory mandates of establishing emergency communications for all citizens of the state and assisting the state’s 100 ECDs in the areas of management, operations and accountability. A majority of 911 funds collected by the state are redistributed to the local ECDs to support local operations. The TECB works closely with the ECDs to ensure those funds are used to provide efficient and effective 911 service across the state.</p> <p>The 911 Emergency Communications Fund is a separate fund of deposits in the state treasury comprised of 911 surcharges collected by the TECB and interest accumulated on those deposits. The 911 surcharge is the TECB’s sole recurring revenue source. It is levied on communications services that are capable of contacting a public safety answering point (‘PSAP’) by entering or dialing the digits 911.</p> <p>Disbursements from the fund are limited solely to the operational and administrative expenses of the TECB. Authorized operational and administrative expenditures include distributing a statutorily-determined amount of base funding to each ECD, implementing and maintaining an IP-based NG911 network, and funding 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.</p> <p>In addition to providing Tennessee’s NG911 network, text-to-911 platform, and cyber-security assessments, the TECB provides an on-line training service at no cost to Tennessee’s 911 telecommunicators. This training initiative averaged more than nine hundred (900) hours of training each month in FY2022. The platform provides a direct benefit to the frontline operations of 911 in Tennessee, saving local jurisdictions significant time and money. It allows local 911 personnel to meet Tennessee’s training requirements while reducing travel, staffing, and tuition costs on ECDs. During FY2022, there were over 2500 users registered on the platform, and over 11,800 hours of content was delivered to Tennessee’s 911 telecommunicators.</p> <p>The 911 Funding Modernization and IP Transition Act, which took effect January 1, 2015, created a uniform 911 surcharge of \$1.16 on all services capable of contacting 911 in Tennessee. This rate increased to \$1.50 on January 1, 2021.</p> <p>The TECB’s Annual Report on 911 progress and expenditures can be found here: https://www.tn.gov/commerce/e911/financial-information/annual-report.html</p>
TX	(The majority of this response is the same as provided for CY 2020.) CSEC state 9-1-1 Program: CSEC and its RPC stakeholders are required to submit 9-1-1 strategic plans: CSEC to the Governor and Texas Legislative Budget Board for 9-1-1 service within the CSEC state 9-1-1

State	Assessment of Effects Achieved from the Expenditure of State 911/E911 or NG911 Funds, Including Any Criteria Used to Measure the Effectiveness of the Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges
	<p>Program; and the RPCs to CSEC, approval of which is a prerequisite to being awarded grants of appropriated 9-1-1 fees and equalization surcharge (Health and Safety Code §§ 771.055(e) and 771.055(a)-(c), respectively). CSEC Statewide 9-1-1 Strategic Plan: For each fiscal biennium, CSEC prepares a strategic plan for statewide 9-1-1 service for the following five state fiscal years ‘using information from the strategic information contained in the regional plans and provided by emergency communication districts and home-rule municipalities that operate 9-1-1 systems independent of the state system.’ The plan must:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) include a survey of the current performance, efficiency, and degree of implementation of emergency communications services throughout the whole state; (2) provide an assessment of the progress made toward meeting the goals and objectives of the previous strategic plan and a summary of the total expenditures for emergency communications services in this state; (3) provide a strategic direction for emergency communications services in this state; (4) establish goals and objectives relating to emergency communications in this state; (5) provide long-range policy guidelines for emergency communications in this state; (6) identify major issues relating to improving emergency communications in this state; (7) identify priorities for this state’s emergency communications system; and (8) detail the financial performance of each regional planning commission in implementing emergency communications service including an accounting of administrative expenses. <p>Included in the plan as Appendix 1 is CSEC’s Next Generation Master Plan detailing CSEC’s vision of Texas NG9-1-1 System as being comprised of interconnected and interoperable NG9-1-1 systems of local, regional, and other emergency services networks. As a ‘system-of-systems’ and ‘network-of-networks,’ the Texas NG9-1-1 System will provide Texas 9-1-1 Entities the choice to connect their PSAPs directly to emergency services networks and utilize NG9-1-1 Core Services (NGCS) provisioned by NG9-1-1 systems deployed by the CSEC, the Regional Planning Commissions (RPCs), the Emergency Communications Districts (ECDs) and collaborating 9-1-1 Entities at the local and regional level in Texas. These interconnected NG9-1-1 systems will serve as multiple input points for all 9-1-1 calls in the State of Texas. The current plan including the NG9-1-1 appendix can be obtained at https://www.csec.texas.gov/s/next-generation-9-1-1?language=en_US.</p> <p>RPC Strategic Planning Per Health and Safety Code § 771.055:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Each regional planning commission shall develop a regional plan for the establishment and operation of 9-1-1 service throughout the region that the regional planning commission serves. The 9-1-1 service must meet the standards established by the commission. (b) A regional plan must describe how the 9-1-1 service is to be administered. The 9-1-1 service may be administered by an emergency communication district, municipality, or county, by a combination formed by interlocal contract, or by other appropriate means as determined by the regional planning commission. In a region in which one or more emergency communication districts exist, a preference shall be given to administration by those districts and expansion of the area served by those districts. (c) A regional plan must be updated at least once every state fiscal biennium and must include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) a description of how money allocated to the region under this chapter is to be allocated in the region; (2) projected financial operating information for the two state fiscal years following the submission of the plan; and (3) strategic planning information for the five state fiscal years following submission of the plan. <p>Statutory 772 ECDs As noted earlier the director of a statutory 772 ECD is required to, as soon as practicable after the end of each ECD fiscal year, prepare and present to the board and to all participating public agencies in writing a sworn statement of all money received by the ECD and how the money was disbursed or otherwise disposed of during the preceding fiscal year, and the report must show in detail the operations of the district for the period covered by the report. In addition, the board of managers of a statutory ECD shall perform an annual independent financial audit.</p> <p>Municipal ECDs Several commented about the declining overall amount in 9-1-1 fees or that 9-1-1 fees alone were</p>

State	Assessment of Effects Achieved from the Expenditure of State 911/E911 or NG911 Funds, Including Any Criteria Used to Measure the Effectiveness of the Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges
	<p>insufficient in providing effective 9-1-1 service; hence the municipality relies upon general revenues in order to provide effective 9-1-1 service. A couple of Municipal ECDs provided their performance objectives (e.g., staffing levels, call-wait times, certification/licensing levels), paid with 9-1-1 fees to the extent sufficient, as indicators of effectiveness.</p> <p>Plano: Answering 95% of all 9-1-1 calls within 15 seconds and 99% of all calls within 40 seconds. Maintain 100% passing rate for State TCOLE licensing exam Continued progress towards implementation of NG9-1-1 ESINet and Core Services.</p> <p>Portland: E911 call answer times average less than 5 rings and officer average response time 5 minutes or less. No formal reports.</p> <p>Highland Park: We collect so little compared to our overall budget that no assessment is needed.</p> <p>Longview utilizes E911 fees to fund our admin staff, training staff, employee professional development, maintenance of our 911 system, and public education. The effectiveness of that spending is essentially judged based upon the quality of services we're able to provide, and the fact that we can do so without overburdening the City of Longview General Fund.</p>
UT	<p>The Utah Communications Authority Governing Board approved a 911 Strategic Plan that outlines what needs updated for further NG9-1-1 technology in Utah. UCAs 911 Strategic Plan can be found on our website: www.uca911.org; 911; Phase II of UCA’s Strategic Plan 911</p> <p>The UCA Governing Board also approved Minimum Standards and Best Practices for Utah PSAPs and a mechanism for the UCA 911 Division to assess how the PSAPs are performing each year. Minimum Standards and Best Practices can be located on our website: www.uca911.org; 911; Minimum Standards and Best Practices</p> <p>A self reporting questionnaire is sent to the PSAPs January of each year, for the prior year, the 911 Center Performance Reports can be located on our website: www.uca911.org; 911; 911 Center Performance Report 2022</p>
VA	<p>The Code of Virginia (§56-484.14) (https://law.lis.virginia.gov/vacode/title56/chapter15/section56-484.14/) requires the 9-1-1 Services Board to report annually to the Governor, the Senate Committee on Finance, the House Committee on Appropriations, and the Virginia State Crime Commission on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the state of enhanced 9-1-1 services in the Commonwealth, (ii) the impact of, or need for, legislation affecting enhanced 9-1-1 services in the Commonwealth, (iii) the need for changes in the E-911 funding mechanism provided to the Board, as appropriate, and (iv) monitor developments in enhanced 9-1-1 service and multi-line telephone systems and the impact of such technologies upon the implementation of Article 8 (§ 56-484.19 et seq.) of Chapter 15 of Title 56.
VT	<p>The Board has a number of numerical standards related to system availability that are monitored by Board staff along with our system provider, INdigital. In addition, the Board has access to MIS reporting tools that provide information on call volumes, call routing, call answer times, call duration times etc. Board staff perform annual ALI and GIS audits to ensure accuracy. Call-taker performance is tracked through a call review process which measures how well call-takers are adhering to established call-handling standards.</p>
WA	<p>Washington State strives to be a national leader at the forefront of the 911 evolution. Since 1998, Washington State has dedicated hundreds of millions of state taxpayer dollars for the provision and enhancement of a statewide 911 system. In the period from 2012 through 2021, Washington State alone expended well over \$100M on NG911 modernization – including the first-ever statewide ESInet, a replacement of this ESInet with a NENA i3 standards-based ESInet which includes NGCS, and NG911 modernization of the Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) – all from state 911 funds. This is in addition to the millions of dollars of county/local 911 funds dedicated to NG911 modernization.</p> <p>Washington State views 911 as a statewide enterprise, developed in a collaborative effort with the counties, the PSAPs, the State 911 Coordination Office, the commercial 911 service providers, and a dedicated community of stakeholder representatives, to ensure 911 access from the call-maker to the call-taker.</p> <p>The completion of the NENA i3 standards-based ESInet/NGCS allows for multi-media (i.e. Voice, Text,</p>

State	Assessment of Effects Achieved from the Expenditure of State 911/E911 or NG911 Funds, Including Any Criteria Used to Measure the Effectiveness of the Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges
	<p>Data, etc.) 911 access and provides an even faster, more reliable, resilient, geo-diverse and scalable system, with cyber-security planned into the design. The Washington State NG911 enterprise has the capabilities and tools needed to provide a more efficient and effective 911 service, while keeping pace with the ever-evolving communications technologies used by our citizens. In addition, due to the increased reliability, resilience and security, as well as the designed interoperability with other 911 centers – intrastate, interstate, and international (Canada) – the Washington State NG911 enterprise system will be able to be more effective at collecting and disseminating initial situational awareness during major emergencies and disasters.</p> <p>Finally, although we are well along the path of transitioning to the jurisdictional end-state of NG911, we still need strong federal support to completely realize and take full advantage of NG911 features and capabilities. In addition to legislative and regulatory support, additional support through continuing Federal Grants is needed to fully achieve the goal of the jurisdictional end-state of NG911. We strongly endorse continued support and further investment in 911 at the national level to assist all states as they move toward NG911</p>
WI	<p>Wisconsin has not undertaken a specific program to measure the effective utilization of 911/E911/NG911 fees or funds. The Wisconsin Department of Military Affairs published the first NG911 State Biennial Report in November 2022, which details the progress made in NG911 implementation, operation, and maintenance: https://oec.wi.gov/wp-content/library/2022/2020-22_NG911_Biennial_Report_FINAL.pdf This new state biennial report is due to the Governor and State Legislature on November 1 of every even numbered year. Each report will provide the Governor and State Legislature with the NG911 expenditures during the reporting period.</p>
WV	[No Response]
WY	<p>PSAPS have self-reported their NG911 readiness; communities heavily depend on the 911 taxes to maintain operational status. There has been an effort by the local government to support equipment upgrades for NG911 capabilities. Funding continues to plague their efforts for implementation of 100% within the PSAP. The State has compiled a snapshot of the self-reported information for GIS, CAD., Phone Systems, Recording and Phone Trunk status for updates and capabilities of NG911.</p>
Other Jurisdictions	
AS	N/A
DC	<p>All 911/E911 or NG911 funds collected by the Government of the District of Columbia government support the operations of the Office of Unified Communications (OUC). These funds are used to support the acquisition of critical services, software, supplies and equipment necessary to provide 911 communications in the District. Additionally, the OUC has leveraged E911 funds to bolster cybersecurity and implement NG911 technology. The D.C. government utilizes the following Key Performance Indicators to measure the overall effectiveness of the OUC: Percent of 911 calls answered within 10 seconds; Percent of 911 calls in which call to queue is 90 seconds of less; Percent of 911 calls which move from queue to dispatch in 60 seconds of less; Percentage of QA/QI 911 call reviews that receive a rating of 80% or better; and Total number of sustained complaints.</p>
Guam	<p>The Guam Fire Department E911/Communications Bureau uses and implements NENA standards for call takers, i.e. Operational level of service, Order of answering priority, Answering protocol, Information gathering and Call transfers. These measures provides GFD with an effective overview and the effectiveness of our operations, thus allowing us the most efficient means of the expenditures of 911 funds.</p>
NMI	[No Response]
PR	<p>ePuerto [sic] Rico’s criteria for use and measure the use of 911/E911 funds, is established in Act No. 20 of April 10, 2017, Section 4.06.- Distribution and Use of the Funds Collected on Account of Charges Billed to Telephone Service Subscribers. Also Act No. 55 of June 21, 2019 amends Act No. 3-2017 to establish the following: (translated by the Bureau): It is prohibited for funds from the Puerto Rico 9-1-1 Emergency System Bureau and other telecommunications funds to be diverted for purposes other than to ensure the provision and stability of 9-1-1 and telecommunications services.</p> <p>The Bureau generates a monthly report called ‘Budget vs Actual’ required by the Office of Management and Budget of the Government of Puerto Rico.</p>

State	Assessment of Effects Achieved from the Expenditure of State 911/E911 or NG911 Funds, Including Any Criteria Used to Measure the Effectiveness of the Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges
	This report is available upon request
USVI	N/A

L. Underfunding of 911

60. Section 902(d)(2) provides that the Commission “shall include in each [annual] report . . . all evidence that suggests the diversion by a State or taxing jurisdiction of 9-1-1 fees or charges, including any information regarding the impact of any underfunding of 9-1-1 services in the State or taxing jurisdiction.”²⁴⁶ In the *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*, the Commission directed the Bureau to modify the annual fee report questionnaire to “seek additional information on the underfunding of 911 systems, including both (1) information on the impact of fee diversion on 911 underfunding, and (2) information on 911 underfunding in general.”²⁴⁷ Accordingly, as of the Fourteenth Report, the Bureau revised the annual questionnaire to include a new Section L that specifically addresses underfunding. Question L1 asked respondents to describe the impact of any underfunding of 911 services in the state or jurisdiction, and Question L2 asked respondents to describe how any fee diversion affected 911 underfunding.²⁴⁸

61. Generally, respondents report that underfunding results in degradation of 911 service and contributes to delays in maintenance to 911 systems, equipment replacement, and deployments of new technology. Missouri states that it “still has 8 Counties with only Basic 911,” and Alaska reports that 20% of residents are underserved.²⁴⁹ Similarly, Oklahoma reports that “[t]he State has 13 counties that do not have sufficient funding to pay for core 911 services.”²⁵⁰ As shown in Table 29 below, Alabama, Arizona, Georgia, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming indicate that underfunding limits their abilities to implement or transition to NG911. Washington says that although it is “well along the path of transitioning” to NG911, “we still need strong federal support to completely realize and take full advantage of NG911 features and capabilities,” and says that in addition to legislative and regulatory support, “additional support through continuing Federal Grants is needed.”²⁵¹

62. As shown in Table 29 below, Nevada, Pennsylvania, Texas, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming, and the U.S. Virgin Islands report that underfunding has led to staff shortages, vacancies, and/or retention issues, which Wyoming reports have “plagued” its PSAPs.²⁵² Arkansas indicates that

²⁴⁶ 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1 Statutory Notes (as amended); section 902(d)(2).

²⁴⁷ *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*, 36 FCC Rcd at 10840-41, para. 82.

²⁴⁸ FCC Questionnaire at 21 (Section L).

²⁴⁹ Missouri Response at 22-23; Alaska Response at 23 (“Approximately 20% of Alaskan’s [sic] are underserved with unincorporated communities unable to support basic location information or advanced 911 technology.”).

²⁵⁰ Oklahoma Response at 21-22 (“There is also a statewide funding shortage to deploy NG911.”).

²⁵¹ Washington Response at 22-23 (addressing underfunding at K1 and L1; “We strongly endorse continued support and further investment in 911 at the national level to assist all states as they move toward NG911.”). *See also* Georgia Response at 23-24 (“The Authority will continue seeking legislative changes and grant funding to transition and sustain NG911 throughout the state; however, funding continues to limit the state’s NG911 implementation efforts.”); Iowa Response at 23 (saying that 911 “is currently funded at an adequate level in Iowa,” but “the transition to NG11 could occur more rapidly with an influx of cash”).

²⁵² Wyoming Response at 21; *see also* Alabama Response at 22-23 (reporting some districts state they do not receive enough funding to pay competitive salaries to recruit and retain employees and adequately train staff, and noting other programs Alabama uses to try to provide additional funding).

underfunding results in personnel having multiple job duties (“such as Jailer/Dispatcher”), as well as PSAPs being unable to purchase and upgrade software and equipment.²⁵³

63. Most states and jurisdictions indicate that 911/E911 fee revenues alone do not fully cover the cost of 911 service, and that the state and/or local governments must provide additional funding (e.g., from the General Fund) to attempt to make up for some of the shortfalls.²⁵⁴

64. In response to Question L2, no state or jurisdiction specifically reported that 911 fee diversion had caused underfunding. The vast majority of respondents answered “N/A” and a few explicitly stated that there had been no diversion.²⁵⁵ Minnesota noted that \$683,000 that had been statutorily appropriated to two Metropolitan Regional Communication Centers (MRCCs) “has been discontinued and incorporated into the appropriation that is distributed to the PSAPs effective July 2022,” but did not say that this appropriation had caused any underfunding.²⁵⁶

65. Table 29 below shows responses describing impacts of underfunding of 911 services and how any fee diversion affected 911 underfunding.

Table 29 – Underfunding of 911

State	Impact of Any Underfunding of 911 Services During the Annual Period	How Any Fee Diversion Affected 911 Underfunding During the Annual Period
AK	Alaska’s geography is mostly wilderness where 911 calls are forwarded to a State operated PSAP via call forwarding which land on dispatcher’s desk without caller information. Approximately 20% of Alaskan’s are underserved with unincorporated communities unable to support basic location information or advanced 911 technology.	N/A
AL	Districts are made whole based on current statute for 911 funding distribution, however some districts state that they do not receive enough funding to maintain up to date equipment, pay competitive [sic] salaries to recruit and retain employees, adequately train staff, and implement NG9-1-1. The Alabama 9-1-1 Board has created programs to assist districts with additional funding including ones that reimburse districts for certain legacy 9-1-1 costs that have not yet ceased, even with the installation of an IP based emergency call delivery system. The	N/A

²⁵³ Arkansas Response at 22.

²⁵⁴ States and jurisdictions report this issue in responses to Question L1 and also in other entries in the annual questionnaire. *See, e.g.*, Florida Response at 11, 22 (“General taxes from counties are 50% of the E911 fee revenue shortfall”); Maryland Response at 11, 21 (“Counties make up funding shortfalls with their general funds.”); North Dakota Response at 11, 22 (“local government must dig deeper into their general funds each year to support 911 services”); Oklahoma Response at 10-11, 22 (noting that some counties do not have sufficient funding and saying “[t]hese counties are supplemented by State grant funds to ensure they have enough funding to operate”; “30% of the overall costs to deliver 911 service is covered by 911 fees”); Washington Response at 11-12, 23 (“We estimate that only a third of the true, total end-to-end cost to operate 911 in the State of Washington comes from the 911 tax; the remainder has to be made up through agency user fees, other tax bases (sales, property, etc) and other general funding.”); Wyoming Response at 10-11, 21.

²⁵⁵ *See, e.g.*, Ohio Response at 21 (“There is no fee diversion in Ohio.”).

²⁵⁶ Minnesota Response at 23. Minnesota indicates that \$341,500 of this amount was appropriated to MRCCs in 2022, explaining, “ECN was obligated to provide these funds to MRCCs until June 30, 2022, so half of the annual amount is reported here.” *Id.* at 13.

State	Impact of Any Underfunding of 911 Services During the Annual Period	How Any Fee Diversion Affected 911 Underfunding During the Annual Period
	Alabama 9-1-1 Board also provides grants for districts to assist with funding projects from equipment replacement to facility renovation.	
AR	Personnel having multiple job duties such as Jailer/Dispatcher, PSAPs unable to purchase Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) software or upgrade call handling equipment.	N/A
AZ	The impact in lack of funding causes significant issues with our lack of technological [sic] advancement. While we are currently migrating to NG911, we are not able to take advantage of additional features and functionality [sic] that we should have access to in a NG911 environment [sic]. Lack of funding is the single greatest issue with our program and state in terms of public safety. Arizona spends the least amount per capita on 9-1-1 services nationwide.	No fee diversion [sic] occurred.
CA	N/A	N/A
CO	Because local 9-1-1 governing bodies are able to set their own local emergency telephone charge rates, which generate the bulk of the 9-1-1 funds available to them, the adequacy of funding may vary widely from jurisdiction to jurisdiction in Colorado. We are unable to provide specific examples of impacts from underfunding.	N/A
CT	NA	NA
DE	n/a	n/a
FL	General taxes from counties are 50% of the E911 fee revenue shortfall	N/A
GA	<p>In 2021, the Georgia Emergency Communications Authority (GECA) consulted with Mission Critical Partners to complete an NG911 needs assessment. According to this assessment, it will cost around \$58 million to transition the state to NG911. To secure NG911 funding, the state sought to amend Article 12 of Chapter 3 of Title 38 and Part 4 of Article 2 of Chapter 5 of Title 46 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, relating to emergency communications authority and emergency telephone number 9-1-1 system, respectively, so as to provide for Next Generation 911 systems and services. This bill, however, was not passed. The Authority applied for funding from the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), citing negative economic impact, but the Authority was not awarded funding.</p> <p>According to the budget survey distributed in 2020, telecom fees cover approximately 55% of PSAPs' operational expenses. Many local governments cannot afford to pay NG911 transitional and maintenance costs, while continuing to pay legacy expenses.</p> <p>A three-year trend shows that GECA collects approximately \$2.3 to \$2.4 million annually without any foreseeable increase. The funding disbursed to GECA pays for the Authority's operational costs; therefore, it's unlikely the Authority can encumber funds to transition to and sustain NG911.</p> <p>The Authority will continue seeking legislative changes and grant funding to transition and sustain NG911 throughout the state; however, funding continues to limit the state's NG911 implementation efforts.</p>	N/A
HI	N/A	N/A
IA	We are fortunate that 911 is currently funded at an adequate level in Iowa. More can always be done with additional funding, however, and the transition to NG911 could occur more rapidly with an influx of cash, rather than through utilizing the small surplus we have available at the	NA

State	Impact of Any Underfunding of 911 Services During the Annual Period	How Any Fee Diversion Affected 911 Underfunding During the Annual Period
	end of each year.	
ID	[No Response]	[No Response]
IL	N/A	N/A
IN	N/A	N/A
KS	The answer to this varies from PSAP to PSAP. Many feel that the funding is adequate, while some feel that the funding falls short of their needs. This variation relates to the types of additional services beyond answering, processing and dispatching 911 calls that the individual PSAP performs. All PSAPs received adequate funding to support the base level of service.	N/A
KY	Each PSAP is governed by a local government. Each has it's [sic] own unique challenges when considering funding. Most use grant funds as a solution to funding needs.	NA
LA	Underfunding of 9-1-1 Services in the State of Louisiana hamper [sic] our ability to implement NG 9-1-1 Services	N?A [sic]
MA	N/A	N/A
MD	Counties make up funding shortfalls with their general funds. Funds dedicated to 9-1-1 cannot be used for other county uses.	N/A
ME	N/A	N/A
MI	Due to the volatile nature of 911 surcharges and the unpredictability of what revenue may be generated, the state 911 prepaid charges revenue brought in significantly less than what was projected between 2018-2021. Due to this unexpected lack of revenue, the 911 Act was revised December 17, 2021, to include an increase of prepaid state 911 surcharges from 5% to 6% beginning March 1, 2022. The state of Michigan also agreed to a one-time allocation of \$16,000,000 to be deposited directly into the E911 fund to help continue to fund NG911 services. Without this increase and the one-time allocation, after Q1 of 2023, the state 911 surcharge was not going to be able to sustain funding for the transition of NG911 services for the remaining counties in Michigan or maintain the services already converted. The responsibility to fund NG911 would have fallen to the local counties to take on at that point. The current 911 act is due to sunset December 31, 2027, and we are hopeful the projections for revenue will sustain the funding necessary to maintain NG911 services, at least up until then.	N/A
MN	N/A	The \$683,000.00 annually that had been statutorily provided to two Metropolitan Regional Communication Centers has been discontinued and incorporated into the appropriation that is distributed to the PSAPs effective July 2022.
MO	Missouri still has 8 Counties with only Basic 911.	No impact that we are aware of.
MS	N/A	N/A
MT	NA	NA

State	Impact of Any Underfunding of 911 Services During the Annual Period	How Any Fee Diversion Affected 911 Underfunding During the Annual Period
NC	N/A	N/A
ND	911 fee revenues have never been sufficient to cover the full cost of 911 service. In addition, as the cost of technology and human resources increases the surcharge fees and percentages do not increase comensurate [sic] with those additional expenses. This means that local government must dig deeper into their general funds each year to support 911 services.	N/A
NE	Nebraska has one of the lower wireless surcharge rates in the country. With the funds collected, the Public Service Commission funds a statewide ESInet and Next Generation 911 Core Services, as well as, text-to-911, GIS, and provides an allocation to each PSAP in the state. In 2022, the Public Service Commission was able to meet the financial obligations [sic] for the 911 projects in the state while still maintaining a lower surcharge rate	N/A
NH	N/A	N/A
NJ	Unknown	N/A
NM	The State of New Mexico's scope of eligible expenses for 911 fees is narrower than the FCC's which place a significant funding responsibility for PSAP operations on the local government(s). All E-911 capital equipment requests from PSAPs were approved and authorized by the State and fund balance was utilized when necessary. Investments to transition the State to NG911 will likely deplete the State's 911 cash reserves with the E-911 fund.	N/A
NV	<p>NV- Staffing shortages.</p> <p>Consolidated Municipality of Carson City NV - None known.</p> <p>Douglas County - N/A.</p> <p>Storey County - Staff shortages.</p> <p>White Pine County - Cost related to General Fund Dispatch Department is \$535,469.07.</p> <p>Lyon County - N/A.</p> <p>Mineral County - N/A.</p> <p>Eureka County - N/A.</p> <p>Clark County - We are unable to move forward with interoperability such as a CAD to CAD connection within Clark County due to cost and each agency having to pay a portion for the project. We were unable to increase our staffing FTEs to a sufficient number to meet NFPA standards for call answer times since our funding is solely [sic] by general funds of the fire departments.</p> <p>Nye County - Underfunding 911 has had a huge impact on our jurisdiction. Funds that could be used for other emergency services are being diverted to cover the cost of maintaining 911 and the staff who provide services. This has an impact on the basic operations of the Sheriff's Office in our County because the additional costs come out of their budget. Insufficient funding for critical positions results in inadequate staffing. Our PSAP regularly has issues with low staffing and retention [sic]. There are inadequate funds to provide any additional training which could have a direct impact on the public. There is no funding available for updated workstations, chairs, etc. Underfunding has created an issue with space. There is no funding to build or remodel facilities. Underfunding makes it difficult to attain technology; if it is</p>	<p>NV - N/A</p> <p>Mineral County - N/A</p> <p>Storey County - N/A</p> <p>Eureka County - N/A</p> <p>White Pine County - Cost related to General Fund Dispatch Department is \$535,469.07.</p> <p>Douglas County - N/A.</p> <p>Nye County - N/A.</p> <p>Clark County - N/A.</p> <p>Lyon County - N/A.</p>

State	Impact of Any Underfunding of 911 Services During the Annual Period	How Any Fee Diversion Affected 911 Underfunding During the Annual Period
	not free then it will probably not be implemented. In addition, the issue with funds makes it difficult to plan for any type of emergency or evacuation of the center [sic]. There is no way to fund any type of community education, outreach or engagement to make sure that callers know how and when to utilize the system.	
NY	Unknown	N/A
OH	N/A	There is no fee diversion in Ohio.
OK	The State has 13 counties that do not have sufficient funding to pay for core 911 services. These counties are supplemented by State grant funds to ensure they have enough funding to operate. There is also a statewide funding shortage to deploy NG911. This shortage includes both State and local needs to meet the requirements. We have one county cannot afford to deploy E911 and is still operating in as basic 911 system with dedicated trunks but without any ALI or location services. 30% of the overall costs to deliver 911 service is covered by 911 fees so there is a major shortage if the expectation is to pay for 911 call taking and 911 call delivery to the proper police fire ems or mental health service.	N/A
OR	Undetermined	N/A
PA	Recruitment and retention remains a critical issue for Pennsylvania PSAPs. Pennsylvania counties collectively contributed over \$76 million to support 911 service in 2022 which has impacted efforts to recruit and retain personnel, maintain mission [sic] critical systems, develop GIS data, further invest in security and future technologies, and much more.	N/A
RI	None	None
SC	[No Response]	N/A
SD	N/A	N/A
TN	N/A	N/A
TX	<p>Sherman has had to use funds from the City General Fund to ensure all aspects of 911 service are covered.</p> <p>Longview cannot currently afford to transition to NG11 or implement an ESInet. The State's grant program was woefully insufficient and felt orchestrated to make the process difficult.</p> <p>Non-identified responses from prior CYs include:</p> <p>Underfunding will cause equipment failure and delayed response for emergency calls. It will also causes staffing shortages.</p> <p>We are tremendously impacted by underfunding of 911 services. 91% of our budget is funded directly by our municipality as the cost way outweighs the money collected to support 911</p> <p>E911 funds are not sufficient to cover the cost of procurement, implementation, and management of an NG911 solution. Additionally, dispatcher salaries (32) positions all must be funded from the City general fund.</p> <p>New technology in 911 is putting more of a strain on the PSAP, if the city is unable to supplement or expend the money for new or upgraded technology that the center needs then we are unable to provide a better public safety service to the community.</p> <p>Underfunding has affected the timeframe as to implementation of NG911 projects and hiring adequate staff for the center.</p>	N/A

State	Impact of Any Underfunding of 911 Services During the Annual Period	How Any Fee Diversion Affected 911 Underfunding During the Annual Period
	<p>Reliance on grant funds to pursue and pay for projects and services. Wireline fees have been raised to a level that is not optimal for our jurisdiction to offset declining revenue.</p> <p>Since our wireline fee is decreasing, and we have to do with the \$0.50 wireless fee, underfunding will cause a degradation of our 9-1-1 services. We won't be able to keep up with the rapidly changing technology that our citizens expect and deserve.</p> <p>Our budget only allows for 1 full time and 1 part time employee. Since our wireline fee is decreasing, and we have to do with the \$0.50 wireless fee, underfunding will cause a degradation of our 9-1-1 services. We will not be able to keep up with the rapidly changing technology that our citizens expect and deserve.</p> <p>Have had to keep businesses paying a higher fee even though they account for less than 2% of our 911 calls. Would possibly be able to reduce this fee if wireless fees were increased. Have also had to decrease amounts that we are able to budget towards donating/assisting other public safety agencies. Have not been able to create and hire new positions to help with the increased responsibilities required by NG911. Not been able to fully implement NG9-1-1 services, full range of mitigation strategies, or full security measures.</p> <p>Replacement of UPS systems at end of life had to be delayed due to lack of funding in current budget.</p>	
UT	N/A	N/A
VA	Unknown	N/A
VT	None	N/A
WA	<p>We estimate that only a third of the true, total end-to-end cost to operate 911 in the State of Washington comes from the 911 tax; the remainder has to be made up through agency user fees, other tax bases (sales, property, etc) and other general funding. There are PSAPs who have had to delay replacement and/or maintenance of key equipment due to underfunding. Another area where underfunding has impacted 911 services is the inability in some areas to compensate telecommunicators to a level that will keep them in the job. Salary level is not the only cause of the current telecommunicator shortage, but it does play a factor in some of our PSAPs and Counties.</p>	[No Response]
WI	<p>Costs to provide 911/E911 services in Wisconsin are recovered by participating [sic] local exchange carriers through the wireline 911 surcharge on their subscriber bills. The collection from the 911 surcharge reimburses the service suppliers for their network costs. Any costs beyond what the surcharge covers is paid for through respective county and municipal budgets. Due to a decrease in wireline subscribers, the wireline 911 surcharges do not always cover the complete costs for providing the network and jurisdictions are required to pay the difference in network costs which reduces available local funding for equipment replacement, staffing, training, etc.</p>	N/A
WV	Retention of employees, outdated and end of life equipment, outdated dispatch center, telephone system, lacking upgrades to take advantage of newest technology, etc..	N/A
WY	There is a documented 3 million dollar deficit between funds collected and the current cost of providing 911 services by local government in	NA

State	Impact of Any Underfunding of 911 Services During the Annual Period	How Any Fee Diversion Affected 911 Underfunding During the Annual Period
	the state. This deficit has heavily impacted the ability of the development of a state wide Esi-Net and a state GIS Portal for the implementation of NG911 services in the state. Vacancies have plagued our PSAP's[sic];this may be a direct effect of the underfunding from the 911/E911 Fees.	
Other Jurisdictions		
AS	[No Response]	[No Response]
DC	N / A	N / A
Guam	NONE	N/A
NMI	[No Response]	[No Response]
PR	N/A	N/A
USVI	Staffing shortages, Training, Telecommunicator Certifications.	N/A

66. Finally, other sections of the questionnaire and responses provide information on potential underfunding. For example, Table 14 above has a column of “Fees as a Percentage of Cost.” Many states and jurisdictions have percentages less than 100%, indicating the reported collected 911/E911 fees do not entirely cover the reported cost of providing 911 service. Such cases may indicate underfunding or reliance on other sources of 911 funding, such as state or local general funds or grants. Table 16 above lists respondents’ estimates of the proportional contributions of various funding sources for 911 service, including fees, general funds, and grants.

Appendix A

Summary of State and Other Jurisdiction Responses Regarding Collections During 2022 Annual Period

State/ Other Jurisdiction	Type of Fund Collection	Authority to Approve 911 Expenditures	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service	Total 911 Funds Collected	Total Funds Used for Non- 911 Related Purposes	NG911 Funding Permissible Under 911/E911 Funding Authority	Total Funds Used for NG911	NG911 Expenditures as a Percentage of Total Funds Collected
AK	Local	Local	\$14,313,303.63	\$14,313,303.63	\$0.00	No	[NA]	0.00%
AL	State	Hybrid	\$134,395,660.33	\$132,143,645.56	\$0.00	Yes	\$14,241,077.09	10.78%
AR	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$70,191,250.97	\$62,382,232.43	\$0.00	Yes	\$1,473,510.83	2.36%
AZ	State	State	\$17,900,564.00	\$19,303,922.64	\$0.00	Yes	[NA]	0.00%
CA	State	State	\$188,704,000.00	\$179,471,000.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$85,723,223.90	47.76%
CO	Hybrid	Local	\$86,898,443.69	\$112,792,447.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$5,600,978.97	4.97%
CT	State	State	\$34,291,825.00	\$35,198,214.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$11,069,394.00	31.45%
DE	State	[Hybrid]	\$9,656,734.12	\$9,656,734.12	\$0.00	Yes	n/a	0.00%
FL	State	Hybrid	\$264,729,365.00	\$129,208,618.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$17,252,980.00	13.35%
GA	State	Hybrid	Unknown	\$242,257,794.69	\$0.00	Yes	[NA]	0.00%
HI	State	State	N/A	\$11,297,898.00	\$0.00	No	\$91,456.00	0.81%
IA	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$167,388,143.00	\$41,566,227.21	\$0.00	Yes	We do not track amounts by 'NG programs.' At the state level, a reasonable estimate is that approximately \$13,697,928 was spent on Next Generation programs. At this time, it is difficult to determine how much was spent on next-generation programs by local jurisdictions.	32.95%
ID	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]
IL	Hybrid	Hybrid	Local 9-1-1 Authorities reported \$196,441,148.45 in 911 Expenses and the State paid \$12,892,593.59 for 911 network costs[;] Total cost to provide 911/E911 is \$209,333,742.04	\$212,652,961.11 from Surcharge + \$21,151,208.84 from Other = \$233,804,169.95	\$0.00	Yes	\$2,857,703.35	1.22%
IN	State	State	\$230,675,002.37	\$92,963,981.60	\$0.00	Yes	[No Response]	0.00%
KS	State	Hybrid	\$120,614,547.00	\$35,047,858.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$12,869,819.00	36.72%
KY	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$156,293,058.00	[No Response]	\$0.00	Yes	\$4,427,267.38	[Could Not Calculate]
LA	Hybrid	Local	\$93,319,006.86	\$95,910,119.47	\$0.00	Yes	Louisiana does not track the funds expended on NG-911 projects as a separate amount	[Could Not Calculate]
MA	State	State	The estimated amount to provide 911 Service is: \$51,745,295	\$164,881,343.79	\$0.00	Yes	The estimated amount to provide 911 Service is: \$51,745,295	31.38%

State/ Other Jurisdiction	Type of Fund Collection	Authority to Approve 911 Expenditures	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service	Total 911 Funds Collected	Total Funds Used for Non- 911 Related Purposes	NG911 Funding Permissible Under 911/E911 Funding Authority	Total Funds Used for NG911	NG911 Expenditures as a Percentage of Total Funds Collected
			This estimated amount includes the costs associated with the Next Generation 911 service provider contract, MassGIS, Radio, and the mobile PSAP. This estimated amount does not include costs associated with grant programs, training programs, disability access programs, public education, administrative costs, or other costs for the administration and programs of the State 911 Department.					
MD	State	Hybrid	\$177,429,053.00	\$118,613,227.02	\$0.00	Yes	\$16,031,501.28 (Fiscal Year 2022).	13.52%
ME	State	State	\$7,006,439.00	\$7,159,475.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$5,393,194.00	75.33%
MI	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$323,583,726.38	\$145,142,920.49	\$0.00	Yes	\$24,539,031.89	16.91%
MN	State	State	\$43,601,378.00	\$67,948,180.01	\$0.00	Yes	\$37,641,198.33	55.40%
MO	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$201,950,326.00	[No Response]	\$0.00	Yes	\$2,000,000.00	[Could Not Calculate]
MS	Hybrid	[Hybrid]	\$59,190,113.45	\$23,437,703.60	\$0.00	Yes	[NA]	0.00%
MT	State	[Hybrid]	\$47M	\$14M	\$0.00	Yes	NA	0.00%
NC	State	State	\$197,535,864.00	\$99,746,051.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$26,498,869.00	26.57%
ND	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$30,100,000.00	[No Response]	\$0.00	Yes	\$2,546,589.00	[Could Not Calculate]
NE	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$62,821,713.00	\$15,689,781.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$2,561,946.00	16.33%
NH	State	State	\$18,335,158.00	\$16,359,317.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$1,076,794.63	6.58%
NJ	State	State	Unknown	\$127,124,000.00	\$99,302,000	Yes	\$12,279,411.76	9.66%
NM	State	State	\$13,706,572.00	\$13,046,173.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$5,732,244.00	43.94%
NV	Local	Local	\$25,207,281.90	\$2,891,425.85	[Unknown]	Yes and No	\$17,183.00	0.59%
NY	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$576,636,299.00	\$318,496,668.68	\$106,099,927.93	Yes	\$554.28	0.00%
OH	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$216,192,217.90	\$27,842,726.57	\$0.00	Yes	\$114,000.00	0.41%
OK	Hybrid	State	\$129,906,546.01	\$39,417,924.41	\$0.00	Yes	[No Response]	0.00%
OR	Hybrid	State	\$160,063,177.84	\$79,156,270.45	\$0.00	Yes	\$248,000.00	0.31%
PA	State	Hybrid	\$399,120,482.00	\$322,246,239.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$18,823,887.00	5.84%
RI	State	State	\$7,565,150.09	\$7,980,851.49	\$0.00	Yes	\$162,340.77	2.03%
SC	Hybrid	Hybrid	unknown	\$38,298,711.29	\$0.00	Yes	\$5,748,291.26	15.01%
SD	State	State	\$36,508,354.00	\$13,285,625.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$3,872,279.00	29.15%
TN	State	Hybrid	Unknown	\$149,174,362.16	\$0.00	Yes	\$18,590,619.48	12.46%
TX	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$319,457,001.00	\$243,559,032.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$49,976,384.00	20.52%
UT	State	[Hybrid]	84 Million	\$42,052,450.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$6,045,476.00	14.38%
VA	State	Hybrid	Unknown	\$74,806,311.22	\$0.00	Yes	\$9,440,840.40	12.62%
VT	State	State	\$4,587,898.00	\$4,050,065.02	\$0.00	Yes	\$4,587,898.00	113.28%
WA	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$410,496,002.00	Total State Revenue: \$26,927,047.23 Total County Revenue:	\$0.00	Yes	~\$12M	11.24%

State/ Other Jurisdiction	Type of Fund Collection	Authority to Approve 911 Expenditures	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service	Total 911 Funds Collected	Total Funds Used for Non- 911 Related Purposes	NG911 Funding Permissible Under 911/E911 Funding Authority	Total Funds Used for NG911	NG911 Expenditures as a Percentage of Total Funds Collected
				\$79,797,612.04 Total Combined Revenue: \$106,724,659.27				
WI	[No Response]	[No Response]	Unknown	Unknown	\$0.00	No	\$1,182,609.76	[Could Not Calculate]
WV	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$353,259,544.19	\$75,088,035.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$18,714,985.83	24.92%
WY	Hybrid	Local	\$10,657,850.59	\$7,623,733.89	\$0.00	Yes	Local jurisdictions have spent money on systems and equipment in preparation for being NG911 ESI- Net ready. There is not an audit amount reported to the state. The State of Wyoming has not spend funds directly on any NG911 program.	0.00%
Other Jurisdictions								
AS ²⁵⁷	[No Response]	State	see answer to 3a	\$0.00	\$0.00	No	[NA]	[Could Not Calculate]
DC	State	[Hybrid]	\$52,370,384.00	\$12,395,923.43	\$0.00	Yes	\$3,279,925.69	26.46%
Guam	State	State	\$4,115,037.00	\$2,090,912.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$1,782,147.30	85.23%
NMI	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]
PR	State	State	\$24,756,536.00	\$22,439,060.64	\$0.00	No	\$229,835.76	1.02%
USVI	State	State	\$2,973,341.00	\$779,377.00	\$0.00	No	[NA]	0.00%

²⁵⁷ American Samoa reports that it does not collect any 911/E911 phone fees, and has not established a funding mechanism. American Samoa Response at 5-6, 8-9.

Appendix B1

Overview of Total State and Other Jurisdiction 911 Fees – 2009 to 2016 Reports²⁵⁸

State	Report Year							
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
	1st Report	2nd Report	3rd Report	4th Report	5th Report	6th Report	7th Report	8th Report
AK	[DNP]	\$8,199,046	\$8,649,083	\$12,320,888	\$12,256,620	\$12,448,651	\$13,969,231	\$12,837,114
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
AR	\$24,799,338	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNF]	[DNP]	\$25,290,790	\$26,985,555
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
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
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
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
DE	[DNP]	\$2,259,728	\$8,044,859	\$8,775,757	\$7,623,392	\$7,786,659	\$8,159,730	\$8,159,730
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
GA	[DNP]	\$8,537,319	\$8,950,569	\$13,700,097	[DNP]	\$18,462,645	\$17,538,556	\$17,659,037
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
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
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
IL	[DNP]	\$67,000,000	\$69,700,000	\$71,900,000	\$69,200,000	\$71,200,000	\$213,983,628	\$95,500,349
IN	\$71,000,000	\$39,600,000	\$30,000,000	[DNP]	\$69,515,800	\$73,114,656	\$72,075,593	\$79,108,858
KS	[DNP]	\$6,705,539	[DNF]	\$22,125,937	\$20,477,020	\$20,573,217	\$20,337,748	\$20,821,974
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
LA	[DNP]	[DNP]	\$3,017,672	[DNF]	\$4,912,926	[DNF]	[DNF]	\$42,750,000
MA	[DNP]	\$69,694,702	\$75,125,185	\$73,408,835	\$73,677,263	\$74,561,728	\$74,947,715	\$95,508,773
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
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
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
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
MO	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]
MS	\$11,758,733	[DNP]	\$56,335,986	\$60,813,014	\$65,290,042	\$58,175,490	\$31,280,357	\$26,510,538
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
NC	\$84,613,672	\$87,367,015	\$80,001,662	[DNP]	\$69,424,897	\$71,688,784	\$78,161,246	\$81,135,377
ND	[DNP]	\$8,369,366	[DNP]	\$9,506,000	\$9,506,000	\$9,998,322	\$10,337,907	\$10,337,907
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

²⁵⁸ All numbers in the two B Appendices are rounded to the nearest dollar. Appendix B2 below covers report years 2017 to 2023. In these Appendices, “[DNP]” indicates that the state or jurisdiction filed a report but did not provide the information.

State	Report Year							
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
	1st Report	2nd Report	3rd Report	4th Report	5th Report	6th Report	7th Report	8th Report
NH	\$10,854,203	[DNP]	\$9,832,831	[DNF]	\$10,493,486	\$10,467,787	\$10,582,269	\$12,317,418
NJ	\$130,000,000	\$128,900,000	[DNF]	\$125,000,000	\$126,000,000	\$121,000,000	\$120,000,000	\$122,632,000
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
NV	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	\$2,010,342	\$1,944,447	[DNP]	\$1,591,367
NY	\$83,700,000	[DNP]	\$193,194,759	\$194,787,113	\$190,281,716	\$183,219,891	\$185,513,240	\$185,262,082
OH	\$28,544,924	\$28,164,050	\$29,175,929	[DNP]	\$28,837,121	\$25,689,296	\$25,736,970	\$40,382,365
OK	[DNP]	[DNF]	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]
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
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
RI	\$19,400,000	\$18,200,000	\$15,488,729	[DNF]	\$16,500,000	\$17,454,000	\$17,640,703	\$16,345,364
SC	\$22,000,000	[DNP]	\$21,988,052	\$22,215,748	\$28,948,882	\$27,690,958	\$28,458,896	\$39,054,282
SD	[DNP]	[DNP]	\$8,100,000	\$8,200,000	\$9,111,476	\$13,275,031	\$13,095,234	\$13,093,702
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
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
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
VA	[DNP]	\$52,022,170	\$53,217,635	\$54,079,487	\$51,658,843	\$55,212,204	\$85,187,560	\$85,431,606
VT	\$4,832,374	\$5,487,046	\$4,605,803	\$4,993,132	\$5,416,336	\$4,628,027	[DNP]	\$6,256,658
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
WI	\$9,602,745	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]
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
WY	\$6,700,000	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]
Other Jurisdictions								
AS	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNP]	[DNP]
DC	\$12,744,103	\$12,714,347	\$12,700,000	[DNP]	\$12,064,842	\$13,700,000	\$10,488,988	\$12,189,231
Guam	\$1,468,363	[DNF]	[DNF]	\$1,779,710	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]
NMI	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]
PR	\$20,952,459	\$21,876,277	[DNF]	\$21,367,260	\$20,323,324	\$19,507,889	[DNF]	\$21,896,789
USVI	[DNF]	\$590,812	\$554,245	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	\$1,297,671
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

Appendix B2

Overview of Total State and Other Jurisdiction 911 Fees – 2017 to 2023 Reports

State	Report Year						
	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
	9th Report	10th Report	11th Report	12th Report	13th Report	14th Report	15th Report
AK	\$11,595,445	\$15,211,064	[DNP]	\$14,922,887	\$14,529,982	\$13,883,187	\$14,313,304
AL	\$115,944,883	\$114,271,364	\$116,456,606	\$122,551,466	\$125,543,047	\$129,772,205	\$132,143,646
AR	\$20,161,873	\$22,734,249	[DNP]	[DNP]	\$62,176,075	\$67,360,463	\$62,382,232
AZ	\$20,389,514	\$16,991,893	\$16,127,405	\$19,870,228	\$18,877,349	\$19,008,964	\$19,303,923
CA	\$79,648,535	\$76,916,882	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	\$179,471,000
CO	\$53,987,426	\$58,574,919	\$74,243,804	\$63,987,233	\$81,778,479	\$117,493,888	\$112,792,447
CT	\$1,658,219	\$28,651,233	\$27,359,070	\$32,489,998	\$29,355,329	[DNP]	\$35,198,214
DE	\$8,718,169	\$8,246,009	\$9,151,657	\$9,542,756	\$9,286,530	\$9,836,049	\$9,656,734
FL	\$111,799,871	\$114,480,143	\$117,947,467	\$119,669,746	\$122,106,617	\$124,319,181	\$129,208,618
GA	\$19,840,298	\$14,969,525	\$21,473,448	\$225,670,526	\$230,153,414	\$236,472,389	\$242,257,795
HI	\$10,634,306	\$11,700,000	\$11,600,900	\$10,779,781	\$11,007,307	\$11,124,644	\$11,297,898
IA	\$39,849,592	\$39,920,992	\$39,349,123	\$41,385,737	\$42,379,489	\$41,185,131	\$41,566,227
ID	\$22,456,722	\$22,401,523	\$24,172,149	\$23,096,305	\$24,360,214	\$23,433,016	[DNF]
IL	\$234,070,304	\$169,572,608	\$357,853,280	\$185,697,848	\$199,782,643	\$233,681,341	\$233,804,170
IN	\$86,865,020	\$87,125,936	\$88,906,439	\$89,079,970	\$91,474,115	\$91,151,563	\$92,963,982
KS	\$19,193,708	\$22,900,621	\$23,361,954	\$28,633,281	\$34,049,478	\$34,627,233	\$35,047,858
KY	\$111,089,076	\$59,093,367	\$56,867,707	\$72,261,427	\$71,486,870	\$65,595,357	[DNP]
LA	\$66,235,990	\$88,718,075	\$92,275,591	\$93,561,892	\$95,519,601	\$79,966,995	\$95,910,119
MA	\$117,883,899	\$102,917,091	\$105,511,936	\$153,818,991	\$148,631,181	\$172,788,940	\$164,881,344
MD	\$53,974,012	\$55,852,809	\$55,880,355	\$56,097,287	\$62,910,929	\$102,977,311	\$118,613,227
ME	\$8,506,670	\$8,452,998	\$8,533,879	\$8,535,045	\$6,492,764	\$6,898,514	\$7,159,475
MI	\$102,388,366	\$103,526,157	\$38,924,595	\$130,275,141	\$140,317,136	\$152,264,881	\$145,142,920
MN	\$76,542,107	\$77,151,433	\$70,820,782	\$79,278,839	\$77,782,284	\$76,595,214	\$67,948,180
MO	[DNF]	[DNP]	[DNP]	\$3,377,845	\$4,984,961	[DNP]	[DNP]
MS	\$31,884,472	\$31,533,680	\$29,759,156	\$28,492,593	\$10,751,578	\$23,342,003	\$23,437,704
MT	[DNF]	\$13,000,000	\$13,000,000	\$13,000,000	\$13,000,000	\$13,500,000	\$14,000,000
NC	\$81,801,499	\$82,891,066	\$88,279,782	\$93,907,694	\$90,399,400	\$102,902,575	\$99,746,051
ND	\$12,814,683	\$14,607,294	\$14,672,353	\$18,907,531	[DNP]	\$18,643,276	[DNP]
NE	\$14,061,973	\$8,282,774	\$13,541,990	\$13,926,145	\$13,085,400	\$12,844,177	\$15,689,781
NH	\$15,288,598	\$15,427,022	\$15,543,492	\$15,661,198	\$15,655,122	\$16,007,591	\$16,359,317
NJ	\$122,150,000	\$121,909,000	\$122,905,000	\$124,393,000	\$127,370,000	\$126,224,000	\$127,124,000
NM	\$10,919,490	\$11,203,574	\$11,228,627	\$12,237,705	\$12,242,923	\$12,295,318	\$13,046,173
NV	\$437,144	\$2,291,102	\$1,122,187	[\$2,857,298]	[DNP]	\$710,374	\$2,891,426
NY	[DNF]	\$189,094,916	[DNP]	\$33,867,659	\$34,313,654	\$109,693,132	\$318,496,669
OH	\$44,720,083	\$39,736,489	\$33,421,679	[DNP]	\$34,192,222	\$29,646,883	\$27,842,727

State	Report Year						
	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
	9th Report	10th Report	11th Report	12th Report	13th Report	14th Report	15th Report
OK	[DNF]	\$34,986,975	\$44,712,874	\$38,248,507	\$42,595,575	\$39,733,951	\$39,417,924
OR	\$42,832,475	\$43,919,835	\$45,550,841	\$44,541,808	\$53,508,690	\$77,641,699	\$79,156,270
PA	\$315,963,650	\$316,592,551	\$316,216,704	\$315,238,084	\$317,290,983	\$325,646,069	\$322,246,239
RI	\$14,021,695	\$16,817,000	\$15,684,553	\$15,340,800	\$7,595,987	\$8,811,218	\$7,980,851
SC	\$40,880,762	\$30,108,371	\$31,274,227	\$32,818,798	\$33,615,719	\$34,696,379	\$38,298,711
SD	\$12,976,019	\$13,087,266	\$13,306,863	\$13,476,892	\$13,533,579	\$13,540,493	\$13,285,625
TN	\$102,699,664	\$102,819,090	[DNP]	\$105,652,433	\$110,023,959	\$141,523,441	\$149,174,362
TX	\$223,315,125	\$219,673,860	\$220,165,001	\$224,756,152	\$226,212,339	\$241,157,251	\$243,559,032
UT	\$27,162,203	\$23,485,454	\$29,262,881	\$32,775,607	\$37,397,817	\$38,478,764	\$42,052,450
VA	\$86,028,766	\$86,909,858	\$60,974,472	\$63,742,980	\$64,374,744	\$67,098,002	\$74,806,311
VT	\$6,170,851	\$5,981,135	[DNP]	\$5,427,095	\$4,951,056	\$5,362,000	\$4,050,065
WA	\$95,242,119	\$98,653,163	\$99,923,008	\$101,002,074	\$104,837,836	\$106,418,863	\$106,724,659
WI	[DNP]	\$0	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]
WV	\$56,340,460	\$60,189,650	\$63,686,697	\$63,081,749	\$68,560,173	\$72,339,137	\$75,088,035
WY	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	\$7,125,243	\$7,623,734
Other Jurisdictions							
AS	[Does Not Collect Fees]	[Does Not Collect Fees]	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	\$0 ²⁵⁹
DC	\$11,354,347	\$11,428,064	\$11,832,609	\$11,913,519	\$12,156,071	\$12,410,065	\$12,395,923
Guam	[DNF]	\$2,209,374	\$2,183,716	\$2,109,415	\$2,210,810	\$2,137,514	\$2,090,912
NMI	[DNF]	\$0	\$0	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]	[DNF]
PR	[DNF]	\$19,889,006	\$20,204,116	\$20,254,043	\$20,898,411	\$21,608,815	\$22,439,061
USVI	\$1,416,865	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	[DNP]	\$863,765	\$779,377
Total	\$2,763,916,948	\$2,937,108,459	\$2,675,270,976	\$3,032,215,008	\$3,175,759,843	\$3,492,838,462	\$3,850,866,703

²⁵⁹ American Samoa reports that it does not collect any 911/E911 phone fees, and has not established a funding mechanism. American Samoa Response at 5-6, 8-9.

Appendix C

State and Other Jurisdiction 911/E911 Fees by Service Type²⁶⁰

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	No Response
AK	Wireline	\$2.00		X		
	Wireless	\$2.00		X		
	Prepaid	\$0				X
	VoIP	\$0				X
	Other	\$0				X
AL	Wireline	\$1.86	X			
	Wireless	\$1.86	X			
	Prepaid	\$1.86	X			
	VoIP	\$1.86	X			
	Other	\$1.86	X			
AR	Wireline	5 - 12%		X		
	Wireless	\$1.30	X			
	Prepaid	10%	X			
	VoIP	\$1.30	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X
AZ	Wireline	\$0.20	X			
	Wireless	\$0.20	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.80 [.] 3%	X			
	VoIP	\$0.20	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X
CA	Wireline	\$.30 per month	X			
	Wireless	\$.30 per month	X			
	Prepaid	\$.30 per month	X			
	VoIP	\$.30 per month	X			
	Other	N/A				X
CO	Wireline	\$.79-3.09			X	
	Wireless	\$.79-3.09			X	
	Prepaid	\$1.63	X			
	VoIP	\$.79-3.09			X	
	Other	[No Response]				X
CT	Wireline	\$0.66/\$0.70 ²⁶¹	X			
	Wireless	\$0.66/\$0.70.	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.66/\$0.70	X			
	VoIP	\$0.66/\$0.70	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X

²⁶⁰ American Samoa, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Kansas, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Nevada, New York, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming provided substantive entries in Addendum Section F1 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/fifteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>. West Virginia provided a list of wireline and VoIP fees by county. West Virginia Response at 11-13.

²⁶¹ At Addendum Section F1, Connecticut states, “* The State of Connecticut E911 Surcharge is set for the State’s fiscal year. Therefore fees imposed for 2022 are: Jan-June 2022 = \$0.66[;] July -Dec 2022 = \$0.70[.]” Connecticut Response at 10.

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	No Response
DE	Wireline	\$0.60	X			
	Wireless	\$0.60	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.60	X			
	VoIP	\$0.60	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X
FL	Wireline	\$0.40	X			
	Wireless	\$0.40	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.40	X			
	VoIP	\$0.40	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X
GA	Wireline	\$1.50			X	
	Wireless	\$1.50			X	
	Prepaid	\$1.50			X	
	VoIP	\$1.50			X	
	Other	[No Response]				X
HI	Wireline	\$0.27				X
	Wireless	\$0.66	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.00				X
	VoIP	\$0.66	X			
	Other	\$0.00				X
IA	Wireline	\$1.00		X		
	Wireless	\$1.00	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.51	X			
	VoIP	\$1.00	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X
ID	Wireline	[DNF]				
	Wireless	[DNF]				
	Prepaid	[DNF]				
	VoIP	[DNF]				
	Other	[DNF]				
IL (outside City of Chicago) <small>262</small>	Wireline	\$1.50	X			
	Wireless	\$1.50	X			
	Prepaid	3%	X			
	VoIP	\$1.50	X			
	Other	A fee of which ever [sic] is greater: \$25 for each month or an amt. equal to the product of 1% and the sum of all delinquent amounts each month that payment is delinquent.	X			
IN	Wireline	\$1.00	X			
	Wireless	\$1.00	X			
	Prepaid	\$1.00	X			
	VoIP	\$1.00	X			

²⁶² At Addendum Section F1, Illinois states, “The City of Chicago is exempt from the Statewide uniform 9-1-1 surcharge legislative requirements. The State does not collect surcharge revenue for Chicago nor does it pay for its network costs. Wireline, Wireless, VoIP \$5.00 City of Chicago (local authority)[;] Prepaid Wireless 7% City of Chicago (local authority)[.]” Illinois Response at 9.

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	No Response
	Other	\$1.00	X			
KS	Wireline	\$0.90 per subscriber account	X			
	Wireless	\$0.90 per subscriber account	X			
	Prepaid	2.06%	X			
	VoIP	\$0.90 per subscriber account	X			
	Other	\$0.90 per subscriber account	X			
KY	Wireline	\$1.38		X		
	Wireless	\$0.70	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.93	X			
	VoIP	\$1.43		X		
	Other	NA				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%	X			
	VoIP	varies		X		
	Other	n/a				X
MA	Wireline	\$1.50 per month for the period ending December 31, 2022.	X			
	Wireless	\$1.50 per month for the period ending December 31, 2022.	X			
	Prepaid	\$1.50 per month for the period ending December 31, 2022.	X			
	VoIP	\$1.50 per month for the period ending December 31, 2022.	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X
MD	Wireline	\$2.00			X	
	Wireless	\$2.00			X	
	Prepaid	\$0.60			X	
	VoIP	\$2.00			X	
	Other	[No Response]				X
ME	Wireline	\$0.35	X			
	Wireless	\$0.35	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.35	X			
	VoIP	\$0.35	X			
	Other	\$0				X
MI	Wireline	\$0.25 ²⁶³	X			
	Wireless	\$0.25	X			
	Prepaid	6%	X			
	VoIP	\$0.25	X			
	Other	Varies by county		X		
MN	Wireline	\$0.80	X			
	Wireless	\$0.80	X			

²⁶³ At Addendum Section F1, Michigan provides additional fee information: “Wireline \$0.00-\$3.00 (local, varies by county); Wireless \$0.00-\$3.00 (local, varies by county); Prepaid Wireless State only, retailers point of sale for services purchased January 1-March 1 - 5%, March 1-December 31 - 6%; VoIP \$0.00-\$3.00 (local, varies by county).” Michigan Response at 10.

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	No Response
	Prepaid	\$0.80	X			
	VoIP	\$0.80	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X
MO	Wireline	[No Response]		X		
	Wireless	[No Response]		X		
	Prepaid	3%	X			
	VoIP	[No Response]		X		
	Other	[No Response]		X		
MS	Wireline	\$1.00 residential/\$2.00 commercial per lin [sic]		X		
	Wireless	\$1.00			X	
	Prepaid	\$1.00				
	VoIP	1.00 per line.		X		
	Other	[No Response]				X
MT	Wireline	\$1.00			X	
	Wireless	\$1.00			X	
	Prepaid	\$1.00				X
	VoIP	[No Response]				X
	Other	[No Response]				X
NC	Wireline	\$0.65	X			
	Wireless	\$0.65	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.65	X			
	VoIP	\$0.65	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X
ND	Wireline	\$1.50-2.00		X		
	Wireless	\$1.50-2.00		X		
	Prepaid	2.5%	X			
	VoIP	\$1.50-2.00		X		
	Other	[No Response]				X
NE	Wireline	\$0.50 to \$1.00 per line		X		
	Wireless	\$0.70 per line statewide except Douglas County is at \$0.50 per line.	X			
	Prepaid	1.4% statewide except for Douglas County which is 1	X			
	VoIP	\$0.50 to \$1.00 per line		X		
	Other	[No Response]				X
NH	Wireline	\$0.75	X			
	Wireless	\$0.75	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.75	X			
	VoIP	\$0.75	X			
	Other	N/A				X
NJ	Wireline	\$0.90	X			
	Wireless	\$0.90	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.00 [] 0%				X
	VoIP	\$0.90	X			
	Other	\$0.00				X
NM	Wireline	\$0.51	X			
	Wireless	\$0.51	X			
	Prepaid	1.38%	X			

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	No Response
	VoIP	\$0.51	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X
NV	Wireline	\$0.75-1.00 ²⁶⁴		X		
	Wireless	\$0.75-1.00		X		
	Prepaid	\$1.00		X		
	VoIP	\$1.00-2.50		X		
	Other	\$10.00		X		
NY	Wireline	\$.35-\$1.65 ²⁶⁵		X		
	Wireless	\$0.30-\$1.40 \$1.20			X	
	Prepaid	0.30-\$1.40 \$0.90			X	
	VoIP	\$0.35-\$1.65		X		
	Other	[No Response]				X
OH	Wireline	\$0.50		X		
	Wireless	\$0.25	X			
	Prepaid	0.5%	X			
	VoIP	[No Response]				X
	Other	[No Response]				X
OK	Wireline	\$0 [/] 3% - 15% of the base tariff rate		X		
	Wireless	\$0.75 per transaction	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.75 per transaction	X			
	VoIP	\$0.75 per transaction	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X
OR	Wireline	\$1.25	X			
	Wireless	\$1.25	X			
	Prepaid	\$1.25	X			
	VoIP	\$1.25	X			
	Other	\$1.25	X			
PA	Wireline	\$1.65	X			
	Wireless	\$1.65	X			
	Prepaid	\$1.65	X			
	VoIP	\$1.65	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X
RI	Wireline	\$0.50	X			
	Wireless	\$0.50	X			
	Prepaid	2.5%	X			
	VoIP	Included in wireless charge	X			
	Other	None				X
SC	Wireline	\$0.45-\$1.00		X		
	Wireless	\$0.62	X			

²⁶⁴ At Addendum Section F1, Nevada states, “White Pine County - Cost related to General fund Dispatch Department is \$535,469.07.” Nevada Response at 10.

²⁶⁵ At Addendum Section F1, New York states, “Where two charges are listed above, the first line reflects the Wireless Communications Surcharge (New York Tax Law § 186-g) and the second line reflects the Public Safety Communications Surcharge (New York Tax Law § 186-f). Ranges are used to summarize the different amounts that some counties are permitted to impose.” New York Response at 10.

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	No Response
	Prepaid	\$0.62	X			
	VoIP	\$0.45-\$1.00		X		
	Other	[No Response]				X
SD	Wireline	\$1.25/line	X			
	Wireless	\$1.25/line	X			
	Prepaid	2%	X			
	VoIP	\$1.25/line	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X
TN	Wireline	\$1.50	X			
	Wireless	\$1.50	X			
	Prepaid	\$1.50	X			
	VoIP	\$1.50	X			
	Other	\$1.50	X			
TX	Wireline	\$0.50 ²⁶⁶	X			
	Wireless	\$0.50	X			
	Prepaid	2%	X			
	VoIP	\$0.50	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X
UT	Wireline	\$.96 cents per phone line ²⁶⁷			X	
	Wireless	\$.96 cents per wireless line			X	
	Prepaid	3.7%			X	
	VoIP	\$.96 cents per VoIP line			X	
	Other	[No Response]				X
VA	Wireline	\$0.75	X			
	Wireless	\$0.82	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.55	X			
	VoIP	\$0.55	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X
VT	Wireline	2.4%	X			
	Wireless	2.4%	X			
	Prepaid	2.4%	X			
	VoIP	2.4%				X
	Other	[No Response]				X
WA	Wireline	\$0.25 State /	X	X ²⁶⁸		

²⁶⁶ At Addendum Section F1, Texas states, “VoIP monthly rates correspond to state and local wireline rates and therefore are not separately stated. Texas’s 57 Municipal and Chapter 772 ECDs individually set their Landline/VoIP fee rates, which are imposed on service users’ local exchange access lines and equivalent local exchange access lines as defined in CSEC rule 255.4 (1 Tex. Admin. Code § 255.4). ECD Landline/VoIP rates generally are set at different rates for residential and business users, including trunks. ECD Landline/VoIP rates range from: Residential: \$.20 - \$1.44; 6% - 8% of base rate of charges of predominate telecommunications provider. Business: \$.50 - \$8.70; 6% - 8% of base rate of charges of predominate telecommunications provider. Trunks: \$.50 - \$8.70; 6% - 8% of base rate of charges of predominate telecommunications provider. For the CSEC state 9-1-1 Program Wireline/VoIP fee and the statewide wireless, prepaid wireless, and equalization surcharge fees, the amounts are either set by or capped by the Texas Legislature[.]” Texas Response at 17.

²⁶⁷ We have treated Utah’s Wireline, Wireless, and VoIP responses as 96 cents, or \$0.96, for calculation purposes. Utah Response at 11.

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	No Response
		\$0.70 County				
	Wireless	\$0.25 State / \$0.70 County	X	X		
	Prepaid	\$0.25 State / \$0.70 County	X	X		
	VoIP	\$0.25 State / \$0.70 County	X	X		
	Other	[No Response]				X
WI	Wireline	Varies by county, up to \$0.40 per exchange access line ²⁶⁹				X
	Wireless	\$0 [] 0%				X
	Prepaid	\$0 [] 0%				X
	VoIP	\$0 [] 0%				X
	Other	\$0 [] 0%				X
WV	Wireline	SEE BELOW SPREADSHEET SHOWING COUNTY FEES ²⁷⁰		X		
	Wireless	\$3.47	X			
	Prepaid	6%	X			
	VoIP	SEE BELOW SPREADSHEET				X
	Other	[No Response]				X
WY	Wireline	\$0.75		X		
	Wireless	\$0.75		X		
	Prepaid	1.5%			X	
	VoIP	\$0.75		X		
	Other	[No Response]				X
Other Jurisdictions						
AS	Wireline	N/A				X
	Wireless	N/A				X
	Prepaid	N/A				X
	VoIP	N/A				X
	Other	N/A				X
DC	Wireline	\$0.76		X		
	Wireless	\$0.76		X		
	Prepaid	\$0.76		X		
	VoIP	\$0.76		X		
	Other	\$.62 - Centrex / \$4.96 per PBC Trunks (\$0.62 x 8)	X	X ²⁷¹		
Guam	Wireline	\$1.00 monthly per account		X ²⁷²		

(Continued from previous page) _____

²⁶⁸ Washington checked both state and local checkboxes for Wireline, Wireless, Prepaid Wireless, and VoIP entries, but not the combination (of state and local) checkbox. Washington Response at 9.

²⁶⁹ At Addendum Section F1, Wisconsin states, "None of the 'Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance' for Wireline - monthly fee apply for Wisconsin as the fee goes directly to the service suppliers for their costs to provide the 911 service." Wisconsin Response at 10.

²⁷⁰ At Addendum Section F1, West Virginia provides a list of county fees. West Virginia Response at 11-13.

²⁷¹ The District of Columbia checked both state and local checkboxes, but not the combination (of state and local) checkbox. District of Columbia Response at 9.

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	No Response
	Wireless	\$1.00 monthly per account		X		
	Prepaid	\$1.00 monthly per account		X		
	VoIP	N/A				X
	Other	[No Response]				X
NMI	Wireline	[DNF]				
	Wireless	[DNF]				
	Prepaid	[DNF]				
	VoIP	[DNF]				
	Other	[DNF]				
PR	Wireline	\$.50 a month for residential subscribers, nonprofit and religious organizations \$1.00 for commercial, professional and government subscribers	X			
	Wireless	\$.50 a month for residential subscribers, nonprofit and religious organizations \$1.00 for commercial, professional and government subscribers	X			
	Prepaid	\$.50 a month for residential subscribers, nonprofit and religious organizations \$1.00 for commercial, professional and government subscribers	X			
	VoIP	\$.50 a month for residential subscribers, nonprofit and religious organizations \$1.00 for commercial, professional and government subscribers	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X
USVI	Wireline	\$0.80	X			
	Wireless	\$0.80	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.00				X
	VoIP	\$0.00				X
	Other	\$0.00				X

(Continued from previous page) _____

²⁷² At Section F1, Guam checked the boxes for “County or Local Authority” for jurisdiction receiving remittance. Guam Response at 9. At Section C1b, Guam indicates there was no change in the law in 2022. Guam Response at 5. However, in its Thirteenth Response at Section F1, which did not have checkboxes, Guam indicated that the “Government of Guam Treasurer” receives remittances. Guam Thirteenth Response at 8-9. For the Thirteenth Report, Bureau staff classified this response as “State.” Thirteenth Report at 109, Appx. C. We conclude that, for calendar year 2022, the fees likely were still going to the Government of Guam Treasurer, i.e., “State.”

Appendix D

**Approved by OMB
3060-1122
Expires: March 31, 2025
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 (the Bureau) seeks the following specific information in order to fulfill the Commission’s obligations under Section 6(f)(2) of the NET 911 Act, as amended by Section 902.¹

Instructions for Filling Out the Questionnaire

Please read and follow these general instructions:

- Please complete all sections of this form.
- Please enter only numeric responses where requested.
 - Dollar or percentage signs, decimal points, and thousands separator commas are acceptable.
 - Blank responses, “None”, “Unknown”, or “N/A” are also acceptable.
 - To facilitate the Bureau’s calculations for the Annual Fee Report, please avoid stray characters such as: *, ~, (), or [] in numeric responses.
- Use the associated Addendum fields to enter other information, such as footnotes, qualifiers, text, descriptions, and/or explanations.
- All responses should pertain to calendar year (January 1 – December 31), not fiscal year.
- Unless otherwise directed, please provide requested information directly on this form, rather than submit, refer to, and/or rely on supplemental materials.
- Please consolidate separate response forms (and/or responses to individual questions) completed by counties, municipalities, or other local jurisdictions into one response form for the entire state, using sums and averages as appropriate.

A. Filing Information

A1. Name of State or Jurisdiction

State or Jurisdiction

¹ See Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021, Public Law 116-260, Division FF, Title IX, section 902.

A2. Name, Title and Organization of Individual Filing Report

Name	Title	Organization

Addendum Section A

B. Overview of State or Jurisdiction 911 System

B1. Please provide the total number of active primary and secondary Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) in your state or jurisdiction that received funding derived from the collection of 911/E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2022. PSAPs that did not receive funding derived from the collection of 911/E911 fees need not be included in the response boxes, but may be reported in Addendum Section B1.

PSAP Type ²	Number of PSAPs
Primary	■
Secondary	■
Total	■

Addendum Section B1
■

B2. Please provide the total number of active telecommunicators³ in your state or jurisdiction that were funded through the collection of 911 and E911 fees during the annual period ending

² 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 (NENA), Master Glossary of 9-1-1 Terminology at 174 (June 22, 2021), https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/standards-archived/na-na-adm-000.24-2021_final_2.pdf.

³ For the purposes of this questionnaire, 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 voice, text, and multi-media calls and/or who provides for the appropriate emergency response either directly or through communication with the appropriate PSAP. See <https://nenawiki.org/wiki/Telecommunicator>.

December 31, 2022. Telecommunicators that were not funded through the collection of 911 and E911 fees need not be included in the response boxes, but may be reported in Addendum Section B2.

Telecommunicator Type	Number of Active Telecommunicators Funded by 911/E911 Fees
Full Time	[Redacted]
Part Time	[Redacted]

Addendum Section B2
[Redacted]

B3. For the annual period ending December 31, 2022, please provide an estimate of the total cost to provide 911/E911 service in your state or jurisdiction.

Amount (\$)	[Redacted]
-------------	------------

B3a. If an amount cannot be provided, please explain why.

[Redacted]

Addendum Section B3
[Redacted]

B4. Please provide the total number of 911 voice calls that your state or jurisdiction received during the period January 1, 2022 to December 31, 2022.

Type of Service	Total 911 Voice Calls
Wireline	[Redacted]
Wireless	[Redacted]
VoIP	[Redacted]

Other (report 911 texts separately below in B.4a)	
Total	

B4a. Please provide the total number of 911 texts that your state or jurisdiction received during the period January 1, 2022 to December 31, 2022.

Texts to 911	
--------------	--

Addendum Section B4

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

C1. 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

C1a. If YES, provide a citation to the legal authority for such a mechanism.

--

C1b. If YES to C1, during the annual period January 1, 2022 to December 31, 2022, did your state or jurisdiction amend, enlarge, or in any way alter the funding mechanism? *Check one (leave blank if NO to C1).*

- Yes
- No
- Unknown

C1c. If YES to C1b., provide a description of amendments, enlargements, or alterations to the funding mechanism, if applicable.




Addendum Section C1




C2. Which of the following best describes the type of authority arrangement for the collection of 911/E911 fees? Check one. If both State and local authorities collect fees, please check the “hybrid approach” box only.

- 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

Addendum Section C2


--

C3. 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

D1. Indicate which entities in your state have the authority to approve the expenditure of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes. Check one.

- The State has authority to approve the expenditure of funds
- One or more local authorities has authority to approve the expenditure of funds...
- A hybrid approach where two or more governing bodies (e.g., state or local authority) have authority to approve the expenditure of funds

D1a. 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.).

[Redacted]

Addendum Section D1

[Redacted]

D2. Has your state established a funding mechanism that mandates *how* collected funds can be used? *Check one.*

- Yes
- No

D2a. If you checked YES, provide a legal citation to the funding mechanism of any such criteria.

[Redacted]

D2b. If you checked NO, describe how your state or jurisdiction decides how collected funds can be used.

[Redacted]

E. Description of Uses of Collected 911/E911 Fees

E1. 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.

[Redacted]

E2. Please identify the uses of the collected funds.⁴ *Check all that apply.*

Type of Cost	Yes	No
--------------	-----	----

⁴ See 47 CFR § 9.23(b)(1)–(5).

PSAP operating costs, including technological innovation that supports 911	Lease, purchase, maintenance, replacement, and upgrade of customer premises equipment (CPE) (hardware and software)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Lease, purchase, maintenance, replacement, and upgrade of computer aided dispatch (CAD) equipment (hardware and software)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Lease, purchase, maintenance, replacement, and upgrade of PSAP building/facility	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	NG911, cybersecurity, pre-arrival instructions, and emergency notification systems (ENS)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
PSAP personnel costs	Telecommunicators' Salaries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Training of Telecommunicators	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
PSAP administrative costs	Program Administration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Travel Expenses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Costs for integration and interoperability of 911 systems and public safety/first responder radio systems	Integrating public safety/first responder dispatch and 911 systems, including lease, purchase, maintenance, and upgrade of CAD hardware and software to support integrated 911 and public safety dispatch operations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Providing for the interoperability of 911 systems with one another and with public safety/first responder radio systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Grant programs		<input type="checkbox"/> If YES, see E2a.	<input type="checkbox"/>
E2a. During the annual period ending December 31, 2022, describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of such grants.			
[Redacted]			

Addendum Section E2
[Redacted]

F. Description of 911/E911 Fees Collected

F1. Please describe the amount of 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 – provide <i>either</i> fee (\$) or percentage (%) (leave inapplicable cell blank for each type)	Fee/Charge Imposed	Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance <i>Check one for each Service Type. If both State and County/Local Authorities receive remittances, please check the “Combination” box only.</i>		
		State	County or Local Authority	Combination of State and County/Local
Wireline – monthly fee (\$) or percentage (%)	\$ [redacted]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	[redacted] %			
Wireless – monthly fee (\$) or percentage (%)	\$ [redacted]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	[redacted] %			
Prepaid Wireless – flat fee (\$) or percentage (%) per retail transaction	\$ [redacted]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	[redacted] %			
Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) – monthly fee (\$) or percentage (%)	\$ [redacted]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	[redacted] %			
Other – monthly fee (\$) or percentage (%)	\$ [redacted]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	[redacted] %			

Addendum Section F1

[redacted]

F2. For the annual period ending December 31, 2022, please report the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees or charges described in Question F1.

Service Type	Total Amount Collected (\$)
--------------	-----------------------------

Wireline	<input type="text"/>
Wireless	<input type="text"/>
Prepaid Wireless	<input type="text"/>
Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP)	<input type="text"/>
Other	<input type="text"/>
Total	<input type="text"/>

F2a. If an amount cannot be provided, please explain why.

Addendum Section F2

F3. Please identify any other sources of 911/E911 funding.

Question	Yes	No
F4. For the annual period ending December 31, 2022, 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Per		
<input type="text"/>		

Addendum Section F4

F5. 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	

Addendum Section F5

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

For the purposes of this questionnaire, diversion is the obligation or expenditure of a 911 fee or charge for a purpose or function other than the purposes and functions identified in 47 CFR § 9.23 of the Commission’s rules as acceptable.

Question	Yes	No
G1. In the annual period ending December 31, 2022, were funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes in your state or jurisdiction obligated or expended solely for acceptable purposes and functions as provided under 47 CFR § 9.23? Check one.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
G1a. If NO, please identify what amount of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes were obligated or expended for purposes or functions other than those designated as acceptable under 47 CFR § 9.23, 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 purposes or functions for such funds.	
Amount of Funds (\$)	Identify the purposes or functions other than those designated as acceptable by the Commission for which the 911/E911 funds were obligated or expended. (If you need more rows for your response, please enter the information in Addendum Section G1.)
█	█
█	█
█	█
█	█
█	█

Addendum Section G1
█

Question	Yes	No
G2. In the annual period ending December 31, 2022, were funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes in your state or jurisdiction obligated or expended for the purchase, maintenance, replacement, or upgrade of public safety radios, networks, equipment, or related infrastructure? <i>Check one.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
G2a. If YES to G2, are all of the public safety radios, networks, equipment, or related infrastructure on which funds were obligated or expended used to deliver 911-originated information to emergency responders? For the purposes of this questionnaire, 911-originated information includes all data and information delivered between the 911 request for assistance and the emergency responders.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
G2a(i). If NO to G2a, please explain.		

G2b. If YES to G2, please itemize the amounts that were obligated or expended and include descriptions of the public safety radios, networks, equipment, or related infrastructure.	
Amount of Funds (\$)	Description of such obligations or expenditures. (If you need more rows for your response, please enter the information in Addendum Section G2.)
█	█
█	█
█	█
█	█
█	█

Addendum Section G2
█

Safe Harbor for Multi-Purpose Fees. Section 9.23(d) of the rules provides an elective safe harbor for states and taxing jurisdictions that designate multi-purpose fees or charges for “public safety,” “emergency services,” or other similar purposes where a portion of those fees or charges supports 911 services. *See* 47 CFR § 9.23(d). The rule provides that the obligation or expenditure of such a fee or charge will not constitute diversion if the state or taxing jurisdiction (i) specifies the amount or percentage of such fees or charges that is dedicated to 911 services; (ii) ensures that the 911 portion of such fees or charges is segregated and not commingled with any other funds; and (iii) obligates or expends the 911 portion of such fees or charges for acceptable purposes and functions as defined under the Commission’s rules.

G3. Does your state or taxing jurisdiction collect multi-purpose fees or charges designated for “public safety,” “emergency services,” or other similar purposes where a portion of those fees or charges supports 911 services?⁵ Check one.

- Yes
- No

⁵ For purposes of this question, please report only multi-purpose fees or charges “applicable to commercial mobile services, IP-enabled voice services, or other emergency communications services,” where a portion of those fees or charges supports 911 services. 47 CFR § 9.22. Please do not report multi-purpose fees or charges applicable to other types of items (e.g., do not report multi-purpose fees on real estate where a portion of those fees supports 911 services).

If YES to G3, please answer Questions G3a – G3c below. If NO to G3 above, leave Questions G3a – G3c below blank.

Question	Yes	No
G3a. Does the state or taxing jurisdiction specify the amount or percentage of such fees or charges that is dedicated to 911 services? <i>Check one.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Question	Response	
G3a(i). Cite to the authority by which the state or taxing jurisdiction specifies the amount or percentage.	█	
G3a(ii). Indicate the amount or percentage of such a fee dedicated to 911 services. Provide <i>either</i> dollar amount or percentage. <i>(Leave inapplicable cell blank.)</i>	\$ █	█ %
Question	Yes	No
G3b. Does the state or taxing jurisdiction ensure that the 911 portion of such fees or charges is segregated and not commingled with any other funds? <i>Check one.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
G3b(i). Cite to the authority by which the state or taxing jurisdiction segregates such fees.		
█		
Question	Yes	No
G3c. Does the state or taxing jurisdiction obligate or expend the 911 portion of such fees or charges only for the purposes and functions designated by the Commission as acceptable pursuant to 47 CFR § 9.23? <i>Check one.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
G3c(i). If NO to G3c, please explain.		
█		

Addendum Section G3
█

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

Question	Yes	No
H1. Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures to determine whether collected funds have been obligated or expended for acceptable purposes and functions as designated under the Commission’s rules? <i>Check one.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
H1a. If YES, provide a description of: (i) the mechanisms or procedures and (ii) any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2022. (Enter “None” if no actions were taken.)		

Addendum Section H1

Question	Yes	No	
H2. 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>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Question	Yes	No	N/A
H2a. Did your state conduct an audit of service providers in connection with such auditing authority during the annual period ending December 31, 2022? <i>Check one; check N/A if Question H2 response above is NO.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

H2b. If YES to H2 and H2a, 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, 2022. (Leave blank if not applicable / no actions were taken.)

█

Addendum Section H2

█

I. Description of Next Generation 911 Services and Expenditures

Question	Yes	No
I1. Does your state or jurisdiction classify expenditures on Next Generation 911 (NG911) as within the scope of acceptable purposes and functions for the obligation or expenditure of 911 fees or charges? Check one.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I1a. If YES, please cite any specific legal authority:		
█		

Question	Yes	No
I2. In the annual period ending December 31, 2022, has your state or jurisdiction expended funds on NG911 programs? Check one.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I2a. If YES, please enter the dollar amount that has been expended during the annual period.		
Amount (\$)	█	

Addendum Section I2

█

I3. For the annual period ending December 31, 2022, please provide the number of PSAPs that operated on each type 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
I3a. A single, state-wide ESInet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I3b. Local (e.g., county) ESInet(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I3c. Regional ESInets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	[If one Regional ESInet is in operation, provide the total PSAPs on the first line below. If more than one Regional ESInet is in operation, provide the total PSAPs operating on each ESInet.]		
Name of Regional ESInet 1: ■			■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet 2: ■			■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet 3: ■			■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet 4: ■			■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet 5: ■			■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Name of Regional ESInet 6: █	█	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet 7: █	█	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If more Regional ESInets operate in your state or taxing jurisdiction, please list the names of Regional ESInets 8 and higher, and numbers of associated PSAPs, in the space below:			
█			

Addendum Section I3
█

I4. Please provide a description of any NG911 projects completed or underway during the annual period ending December 31, 2022.

█

I4a. Based on your response to I4, please indicate which categories of NG911 expenditures from this non-exhaustive list apply.	<i>Check all that apply.</i>
General Project or Not Specified	<input type="checkbox"/>
Planning or Consulting Services	<input type="checkbox"/>
ESInet Construction	<input type="checkbox"/>
NG911 Core Services	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hardware or Software Purchases or Upgrades	<input type="checkbox"/>
GIS	<input type="checkbox"/>
NG911 Security Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>
Training	<input type="checkbox"/>

I5. As of December 31, 2022, how many PSAPs within your state have implemented text-to-911 and are accepting texts? Please refrain from non-numeric responses such as “all PSAPs.” Enter any text in Addendum Section I5.

Total Number of PSAPs Accepting Texts as of	█
--	---

December 31, 2022	
-------------------	--

Addendum Section I5

I6. By the end of the *next* annual period ending December 31, 2023, how many *total* PSAPs do you anticipate will have implemented text-to-911 and will be accepting texts?

Estimated Total Number of PSAPs Accepting Texts as of December 31, 2023	
--	--


Addendum Section I6


J. Cybersecurity Expenditures

Question	Check the appropriate box		If Yes, Amount Expended (\$)
J1. During the annual period ending December 31, 2022, did your state expend funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	


Addendum Section J1

Question	Total PSAPs
-----------------	--------------------

J2. During the annual period ending December 31, 2022, how many PSAPs in your state either had a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program?	
---	---

Addendum Section J2


Question	Yes	No	Unknown
J3. Does your state or jurisdiction adhere to the National Institute of Standards and Technology Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity (April 2018) for networks supporting one or more PSAPs in your state or jurisdiction?⁶ Check one.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Addendum Section J3


K. Measuring Effective Utilization of 911/E911 Fees

K1. 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.



L. Underfunding of 911

For the purposes of this questionnaire, underfunding occurs when funding levels are below the levels required for optimal performance of 911 operations.

⁶ National Institute of Standards and Technology, Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity (2018), <https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/cswp/nist.cswp.04162018.pdf>.

L1. Describe the impact of any underfunding of 911 services in your state or taxing jurisdiction during the annual period ending December 31, 2022. Indicate N/A if your state or taxing jurisdiction did not experience underfunding.

L2. Describe how any fee diversion affected 911 underfunding in your state or taxing jurisdiction during the annual period ending December 31, 2022. Indicate N/A if your state or taxing jurisdiction did not divert.

We have estimated that your response to this collection of information will take an average of 10 to 55 hours. Our estimate includes the time to read the instructions, look through existing records, gather and maintain required data, and actually complete and review the form or response. If you have any comments on this estimate, or on how we can improve the collection and reduce the burden it causes you, please write the Federal Communications Commission, Office of Managing Director, AMD-PERM, Washington, DC 20554, Paperwork Reduction Act Project (3060-1122). We will also accept your PRA comments via the Internet if you send an e-mail to PRA@fcc.gov.

Please DO NOT SEND COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. You are not required to respond to a collection of information sponsored by the Federal government, and the government may not conduct or sponsor this collection, unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number and/or we fail to provide you with this notice. This collection has been assigned an OMB control number of 3060-1122.

THIS NOTICE IS REQUIRED BY THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT OF 1995, PUBLIC LAW 104-13, OCTOBER 1, 1995, 44 U.S.C. SECTION 3507.