**Approved by OMB**

**3060-1122**

**Expires: March 31, 2021**

**Estimated time per response: 10-55 hours**

Annual Collection of Information

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

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

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

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

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

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

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section A** |
|  |

1. **Overview of State or Jurisdiction 911 System**
2. **Please provide the total number of active Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) in your state or jurisdiction that receive funding derived from the collection of 911/E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2019:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PSAP Type[[1]](#footnote-1)** | **Total** |
| Primary | 82 |
| Secondary | 3 |
| **Total** | 85 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section B1** |
|  |

1. **Please provide the total number of active telecommunicators[[2]](#footnote-2) in your state or jurisdiction that were funded through the collection of 911 and E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2019:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Number of Active Telecommunicators** | **Total** |
| Full-Time | 550 |
| Part-time | 12 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section B2** |
| Based on partial survey responses. Does not include any telecommunicators paid for out of  general funds. |

1. **For the annual period ending December 31, 2019, please provide an estimate of the total cost to provide 911/E911 service in your state or jurisdiction.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Amount**  **($)** |  |

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

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

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section B3** |
|  |

1. **Please provide the total number of 911 calls your state or jurisdiction received during the period January 1, 2019 to December 31, 2019.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of Service** | **Total 911 Calls** |
| Wireline | 219,961 |
| Wireless | 7,157,649 |
| VoIP | 183,389 |
| Other | 78,402 |
| **Total** | 7,639,401 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section B4** |
| These figures are based on Automatic Location Identification retrievals, not actual call volume, which we do not have access to. As a result, these numbers may be inflated. Following the migration of all of our Public Safety Answering Points to the statewide Emergency Services IP-Network, we should be able to provide actual call counts. |

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

* Yes …………………..
* No ………………..…..

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

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

**1b. If YES, during the annual period January 1, 2019 to December 31, 2019, did your state or jurisdiction amend, enlarge, or in any way alter the funding mechanism.**

|  |
| --- |
| No. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section C1** |
|  |

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

* The State collects the fees …………………………………..
* A Local Authority collects the fees ………………………..
* A hybrid approach where two or more governing bodies

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

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section C2** |
|  |

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

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

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Indicate which entities in your state have the authority to approve the expenditure of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes.** | | |
| **Jurisdiction** | **Authority to Approve**  **Expenditure of Funds**  ***(Check one)*** | |
| **Yes** | **No** |
| State |  |  |
| Local  (*e.g.*, county, city, municipality) |  |  |
| **1b. Please briefly describe any limitations on the approval authority per jurisdiction (*e.g.*, limited to fees collected by the entity, limited to wireline or wireless service, etc.)** | | |
| Local governing bodies may expend all collected 911 surcharge fees for any of the purposes outlined in CRS § 29-11-104. | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section D1** |
|  |

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

* Yes …………………..
* No ………………..…..

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

|  |
| --- |
| CRS § 29-11-104 |

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

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

1. **Description of Uses of Collected 911/E911 Fees**
2. **Provide a statement identifying with specificity all activities, programs, and organizations for whose benefit your state, or political subdivision thereof, has obligated or expended funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes and how these activities, programs, and organizations support 911 and E911 services or enhancements of such services.**

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Please identify the allowed uses of the collected funds. *Check all that apply*.** | | | |
| **Type of Cost** | | **Yes** | **No** |
| **Operating Costs** | Lease, purchase, maintenance of customer premises equipment (CPE) (hardware and software) |  |  |
| Lease, purchase, maintenance of computer aided dispatch (CAD) equipment (hardware and software) |  |  |
| Lease, purchase, maintenance of building/facility |  |  |
| **Personnel Costs** | Telecommunicators’ Salaries |  |  |
| Training of Telecommunicators |  |  |
| **Administrative Costs** | Program Administration |  |  |
| Travel Expenses |  |  |
| **Dispatch Costs** | Reimbursement to other law enforcement entities providing dispatch |  |  |
| Lease, purchase, maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks |  |  |
| **Grant Programs** |  | **If YES, see 2a.** |  |
| **2a. During the annual period ending December 31, 2019, describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of the grant.** | | | |
| N/A | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section E2** |
|  |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Please describe the amount of the fees or charges imposed for the implementation and support of 911 and E911 services. Please distinguish between state and local fees for each service type.** | | |
| **Service Type** | **Fee/Charge Imposed** | **Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance**  **(*e.g.*, state, county, local authority, or a combination)** |
| Wireline | 70¢ to $3.00, depending on jurisdiction | local authority |
| Wireless | 70¢ to $3.00, depending on jurisdiction | local authority |
| Prepaid Wireless | 1.4% of retail sales | state |
| Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) | 70¢ to $3.00, depending on jurisdiction | local authority |
| Other | N/A | N/A |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section F1** |
| Local 911 surcharge rates are set by local 911 governing bodies with limited oversight from the Colorado Public Utilities Commission, and are remitted by service providers directly to the local 911 governing bodies.  Prepaid 911 surcharges are set by statute at 1.4% of retail sales of prepaid telephone services and remitted to the Colorado Department of Revenue, which then distributes the funds to the local 911 governing bodies. |

1. **For the annual period ending December 31, 2019, please report the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees or charges described in Question F 1.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Service Type** | **Total Amount Collected ($)** |
| Wireline | 6,723,185.27 |
| Wireless | 34,637,526.55 |
| Prepaid Wireless | 2,311,646.01 |
| Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) | 4,407,894.89 |
| Other | N/A |
| **Total** | 63,987,232.56 |

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section F2** |
| This is based on responses to surveys sent to local 911 governing bodies, as well as information from the Colorado Department of Revenue as it relates to prepaid 911 surcharge revenues. 50 out of 58 911 governing bodies (or 86%) responded to the request for total revenues. Several 911 governing bodies were able to provide total revenues, but were unable to provide them broken out by type of service, which is why the total is greater than the sum of the categories. |

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

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. **For the annual period ending December 31, 2019, 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.* |  |  |
| **4a.** **If YES, please describe the federal, state or local funds and amounts that were combined with 911/E911 fees.** | | |
| 911 surcharge funds are combined with local funds regularly across the state to fund PSAP operations. 911 surcharge funds are generally not sufficient to fully fund PSAP capital and operational costs, and the difference is made up by city and county governments. | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section F4** |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **Please provide an estimate of the proportional contribution from each funding source towards the total cost to support 911 in your state or jurisdiction.** | **Percent** |
| State 911 Fees |  |
| Local 911 Fees |  |
| General Fund - State |  |
| General Fund - County |  |
| Federal Grants |  |
| State Grants |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section F5** |
| We are unable to answer this question since we were unable to determine an estimate of the total cost to support 911 in the state. Budgeting for 911 services delivery, including 911 call delivery services to the PSAP, facilities and equipment, personnel, training, and other expenses are conducted locally. Additionally, many Public Safety Answering Points reside within the facilities of another agency, such as a police department or sheriff’s office, and it is unknown what the value of the provision of those facilities may be, or what other costs, such as utilities or  janitorial services, may be provided by the co-located agency. |

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. **In the annual period ending December 31, 2019, were funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes in your state or jurisdiction made available or used solely for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism?** *Check one*. | |  |  |
| **1a.** **If NO, please identify what amount of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes were made available or used for any purposes other than the ones designated by the funding mechanism or used for purposes otherwise unrelated to 911 or E911 implementation or support, including any funds transferred, loaned, or otherwise used for the state's general fund. Along with identifying the amount, please include a statement identifying the non-related purposes for which the collected 911 or E911 funds were made available or used.** | | | |
| **Amount of Funds ($)** | **Identify the non-related purpose(s) for which the 911/E911 funds were used. (*Add lines as necessary*)** | | |
|  |  | | |
|  |  | | |
|  |  | | |
|  |  | | |
|  |  | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section G1** |
| NOTE: All purchasing decisions are made by local 911 governing bodies pursuant to § 29-11-104, C.R.S. To the State’s knowledge, no local 911 governing bodies have used 911 surcharge funds for purposes other than those allowed by state law. |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. **Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures to determine whether collected funds have been made available or used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism or otherwise used to implement or support 911?** *Check one.* |  |  |
| **1a.** **If YES, provide a description of the mechanisms or procedures and any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2019.** *(Enter “None” if no actions were taken.)* | | |
| Local 911 governing bodies are subject to audit requirements covering all local governments, per § 29-1-601 et seq, C.R.S. Additionally, each local 911 governing body must include a description of their use of funds collected in their audit, and a copy of each audit report must be made available on the governing body’s website if it has one, per § 29-11-104 (5), C.R.S.  No enforcement or corrective action has been required or undertaken. | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. **Does your state have the authority to audit service providers to ensure that the amount of 911/E911 fees collected from subscribers matches the service provider’s number of subscribers?** *Check one.* |  |  |
| **2a. If YES, provide a description of any auditing or enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2019.** *(Enter “None” if no actions were taken.)* | | |
| While the State does not have authority to audit service providers regarding the amount of 911 fees collected and whether that amount matches the number of subscribers for that provider, local 911 governing bodies may, at their own expense, require an annual audit of the service supplier’s books and records concerning the collection and remittance of the 911 surcharge funds (§ 29-11-103(3)(b), C.R.S.).  The State is not aware of any audits or enforcement actions taken by any 911 governing body regarding 911 surcharge remittances in 2019. | | |

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

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. **In the annual period ending December 31, 2019, has your state or jurisdiction expended funds on Next Generation 911 programs?** *Check one.* | |  |  |
| **2a. If YES, in the space below, please enter the dollar amount that has been expended.** | | | |
| **Amount**  **($)** |  | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section I2** |
| No funds have been spent by the State in preparation for NG911. According to partial responses to a survey of local PSAPs, they have collectively spent $17,033,432 in preparation for NG9-1-1 in local equipment and network upgrades. This estimate is cumulative, not restricted to 2019. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **For the annual period ending December 31, 2019, please describe the type and number of NG911 Emergency Service IP Network(s) (ESInets) that operated within your state.** | | | | | | |
| **Type of ESInet** | **Yes** | **No** | **If Yes, Enter Total PSAPs Operating on the ESInet** | **If Yes, does the type of ESInet interconnect with other state, regional or local ESInets?** | |
| **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. A single, state-wide ESInet |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Local (*e.g.*, county) ESInet |  |  | Unknown |  |  |
| 1. Regional ESInets |  |  | [If more than one Regional ESInet is in operation, in the space below, provide the total PSAPs operating on each ESInet] |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 1: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 2: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 3: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 4: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 5: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 6: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 7: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 8: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 9: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 10: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 11: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 12: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 13: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 14: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 15: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 16: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 17: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 18: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 19: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 20: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 21: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 22: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 23: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 24: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 25: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 26: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 27: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 28: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 29: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 30: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 31: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 32: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 33: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 34: | | |  |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 35: | | |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section I3** |
| Colorado’s 911 System Service Provider is in the process of migrating all of the state’s PSAPs to a single statewide ESInet. By the end of 2019, however, there were no PSAPs operating on this new ESInet. |

1. **Please provide a description of any NG911 projects completed or underway during the annual period ending December 31, 2019.**

|  |
| --- |
| A tariff to provide ESInet services was filed with the Colorado Public Utilities Commission in 2017, and approved on December 28, 2018. Migration of every PSAP to a statewide ESInet was scheduled to begin in 2019, but was delayed for various reasons. Migrations began in January of 2020, and are expected to continue through February of 2021. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Total PSAPs**  **Accepting Texts** |
| 1. **During the annual period ending December 31, 2019, how many PSAPs within your state implemented text-to-911 and are accepting texts?** | 66 |
| **Question** | **Estimated Number of PSAPs**  **that will Become Text Capable** |
| 1. **In the next annual period ending December 31, 2020, how many PSAPs do you anticipate will become text capable?** | 75 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section I5** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section I6** |
|  |

1. **Description of Cybersecurity Expenditures**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Check the appropriate box** | | **If Yes,**  **Amount Expended ($)** |
| 1. **During the annual period ending December 31, 2019, did your state expend funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs?** | Yes | No |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section J1** |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Total PSAPs** |
| 1. **During the annual period ending December 31, 2019, how many PSAPs in your state either implemented a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program?** | 67 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section J2** |
| 67 PSAPs indicated that they have implemented a cybersecurity program in surveys. |

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

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section J3** |
|  |

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

|  |
| --- |
| Colorado’s incumbent 911 System Service Provider filed a tariff to provide Emergency Services IP Network (ESInet) service statewide in 2017, and that tariff was approved by the Colorado Public Utilities Commission in 2018 (See Decision R18-1063). The first PSAP to be migrated to the new network was migrated in January of 2020, and PSAPs are scheduled to be completely migrated by February of 2021. This is a significant achievement and a first step toward true Next Generation 911. An ESInet Users Group has been formed to oversee the migration and to direct future development of the ESInet into an NG911 System.  A 911 Diversity Working Group is also meeting regularly, under direction from the Colorado Public Utilities Commission, to formulate a plan and pricing mechanism for improving 911 network diversity statewide.  The Colorado Public Utilities Commission issues an annual State of 911 Report, as required by § 29-11-131, C.R.S. A copy of the 2018-2019 State of 911 Report is attached.  As in previous editions of this report, the State of Colorado notes that some of the questions in the report are difficult to answer due to the fact that 911 is a primarily local service in our State. |

**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**](mailto: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.**

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