**Approved by OMB**

**3060-1122**

**Expires: March 31, 2024**

**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** |
| Idaho |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Title** | **Organization** |
| Garret Nancolas | Chairman | Idaho Public Safety Communications 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 received funding derived from the collection of 911/E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2020:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PSAP Type[[1]](#footnote-1)** | **Total** |
| Primary | 48 |
| Secondary | 4 |
| **Total** | 52 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section B1** |
| Secondary PSAPs are not funded by the 911/E911 funds. Three are State agencies (2 Idaho State Police centers and on State Communications center). The other is operated by a contractor at the Idaho National Laboratory which is not funded by the 911 fees. |

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, 2020:**

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

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section B2** |
| The state does not have access to the number of Telecommunicators as that data and number is maintained at the local PSAP level typically at the County level. This data has to be requested of each PSAP and we did not get 100% feedback on our survey of the counties. Consequently, this data could not be aggregated at the state level. |

1. **For the annual period ending December 31, 2020, please provide an estimate of the total cost to provide 911/E911 service in your state or jurisdiction.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Amount**  **($)** | Unknown at aggregated State Level |

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

|  |
| --- |
| The cost of providing 911 services is kept at each of the jurisdictional levels and requests can be made for that data; however it is incomplete. The cost responses were not broken out sufficiently to give a solid number and only 23 of 52 PSAPs responded to the request with some responses as “unknown”. Due to some responses being intermingled with 911 costs paid by the 911 fees and personnel costs that were paid for by General Funds, not all responses could be calculated and not all jurisdictions reported on the survey that was sent out to gather the information. |

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

1. **Please provide the total number of 911 calls your state or jurisdiction received during the period January 1, 2020 to December 31, 2020.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of Service** | **Total 911 Calls** |
| Wireline |  |
| Wireless |  |
| VoIP |  |
| Other |  |
| **Total** | Unknown at Aggregated State Level |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section B4** |
| 23 of 52 PSAPs Responded and not all PSAPs are tracking or were able to pull the requested data for the state report. |

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.**

|  |
| --- |
| In 1988 the Idaho Legislature passed the Emergency Communication Act, Title 31, Chapter 48 to authorize funding to support implementation of consolidated emergency communications systems through the governance of Idaho counties or by the creation of 9-1-1 service areas. All 9-1-1 fee collections are done at the county level with the exception of the five (5) cities that were providing 9-1-1 services prior to the enactment of the statute. These cities are given allocations by the counties in which they are located or collect fees directly from the providers. |

**1b. If YES, during the annual period January 1, 2020 to December 31, 2020, 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.**

|  |
| --- |
| The authority to approve the expenditure of 9-1-1 funds in the State of Idaho is controlled at the county level by the boards of county commissioners or a joint powers board pursuant to Idaho Code §31-4809. The statute provides as follows:    “The county treasurer of each county or the administrator for a 911 service area in which an emergency communications system has been established pursuant to this chapter shall establish a fund to be designated the emergency communications fund in which all fees collected pursuant to this chapter, including fees distributed pursuant to section 31-4818(6), Idaho Code, shall be deposited and such fund shall be used exclusively for the purposes of this chapter. The moneys collected and the interest earned in this fund shall be appropriated by the county commissioners, or governing board, for expenses incurred by the emergency communications system as set forth in an annual budget prepared by the joint powers board, or in their absence, the county commissioners and incorporated into the annual county budget.” |

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.)** | | |
| 31-4804. EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS FEE.  (1) The emergency communications fee provided pursuant to the provisions of this chapter shall be a uniform amount not to exceed one dollar ($1.00) per month per access or interconnected VoIP service line, and such fee shall be used exclusively to finance the initiation, maintenance, operation, enhancement and governance of a consolidated emergency communications system and provide for the reimbursement of telecommunications providers for implementing enhanced consolidated emergency systems as provided for in section 31-4804A, Idaho Code. All emergency communications fees collected and expended pursuant to this section shall be audited by an independent, third-party auditor ordinarily retained by the governing board for auditing purposes. The purpose of the audit as related to emergency communications systems is to verify the accuracy and completeness of fees collected and costs expended.  (2) The fee shall be imposed upon and collected from purchasers of access lines or interconnected VoIP service lines with a service address or place of primary use within the county or 911 service area on a monthly basis by all telecommunications providers of such services. The fee may be listed as a separate item on customers' monthly bills.  (3) The telecommunications providers shall remit such fee to the county treasurer's office or the administrator for the 911 service area based upon the 911 service area from which the fees were collected. In the event the telecommunications provider remits such fees based upon the emergency communications fee billed to the customer, a deduction shall be allowed for uncollected amounts when such amounts are treated as bad debt for financial reporting purposes. | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section D1** |
| This applies to wireline, wireless, VoIP, and pre-paid devices. |

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.**

|  |
| --- |
| 31-4804. EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS FEE.  (5) Use of fees. The emergency communications fee provided hereunder shall be used only to pay for the lease, purchase or maintenance of emergency communications equipment for basic and enhanced consolidated emergency systems, and next generation consolidated emergency systems (NG911), including necessary computer hardware, software, database provisioning, training, salaries directly related to such systems, costs of establishing such systems, management, maintenance and operation of hardware and software applications and agreed-to reimbursement costs of telecommunications providers related to the operation of such systems. Use of the emergency communications fee should, if possible, coincide with the strategic goals as identified by the Idaho public safety communications commission in its annual report to the legislature. However, the county or 911 service area governing board has final authority on lawful expenditures. All other expenditures necessary to operate such systems and other normal and necessary safety or law enforcement functions including, but not limited to, those expenditures related to overhead, staffing, dispatching, administrative and other day-to-day operational expenditures, shall continue to be paid through the general funding of the respective governing boards; provided however, that any governing body using the emergency communications fee to pay the salaries of dispatchers as of March 1, 2006, may continue to do so until the beginning of such governing body's 2007 fiscal year. |

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |

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.**

|  |
| --- |
| All funds are received at the local level. The only money received at the State level is through the 25 cent grant fund and prepaid monies. Both are given back out in a lump sum (prepaid) or grants (grant fund) for PSAP’s requesting funding to upgrade 911 hardware and software or to make systems Next Generation ready.  31-4819. ENHANCED EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS GRANT FEE.  (1) On and after July 1, 2013, there shall be an enhanced emergency communications grant fee established by virtue of authority granted by this chapter. The fee shall be twenty-five cents (25¢) per month per access or interconnected VoIP service line.  (a) Such fee shall be authorized by resolution of a majority vote of the board of commissioners of a countywide system or by the governing board of a 911 service area.  (b) Such fee shall be remitted to the Idaho emergency communications fund provided in section 31-4818(1), Idaho Code, on a quarterly basis by county, city or consolidated emergency communications systems. Annually, at the discretion of the commission, a budget shall be prepared allocating a portion of the available grant funds for administration of the grant program. The remaining grant funds shall be dedicated for and shall be authorized for disbursement as grants to eligible entities that are operating consolidated emergency communications systems for use to achieve the purposes of this chapter. Grant funds shall coincide with the strategic goals as identified by the commission in its annual report to the legislature. Grant funds may also be budgeted for and utilized for the establishment of next generation consolidated emergency systems (NG911) within the state.  (2) The commission, on an annual basis, shall prepare a budget allocating the grant funds available to eligible entities and the portion of the funds necessary for the continuous operation of the commission to achieve the purposes of this chapter.  (3) To be eligible for grant funds under this chapter, a county or 911 service area must be collecting the emergency communications fee in accordance with section 31-4804, Idaho Code, in the full amount authorized and must also be collecting the enhanced emergency communications grant fee in the full amount authorized in this subsection.  (4) If a county or 911 service area has authorized the collection of the enhanced emergency communications grant fee pursuant to this chapter, such county or 911 service area shall retain the full amount of the emergency communications fee that was set by the board of commissioners or governing board pursuant to section 31-4803, Idaho Code. The county or 911 service area is then also exempt from remitting to the Idaho public safety communications commission one percent (1%) of the total emergency communications fee received by the county or 911 service area as required in section 31-4818(3), Idaho Code. The remaining funds from the enhanced emergency communications grant fee collected shall then be remitted by the county or 911 service area to the Idaho public safety communications commission. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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, 2020, describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of the grant.** | | | |
| Pursuant to Idaho Code §31-4803, a county must get voter approval to institute an emergency communications fee in an amount no greater than one dollar ($1.00) per month per “telephone line”. The Act has been amended in recent years to include assessing the fee on both wireless and Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) service and now uses the term “access line” to indicate that all technology that is able to provide dial tone to access 9-1-1 is mandated to collect the fee.  In 2008, the Idaho Legislature promulgated the implementation of an Enhanced Emergency Communications Grant Fee that was signed into law by the Governor and became Idaho Code §31-4819. This additional fee can be imposed by the boards of commissioners of Idaho counties in the amount of $0.25 per month per access line to be contributed to the Enhanced Emergency Communications Grant Fund. The funds are distributed via a grant process governed by the IPSCC. Fourty Idaho counties have begun assessing the enhanced fee. | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section E2** |
| CAD may or may not be considered "dispatching" by the county attorney in 31-4804(5) as well as "Lease, purchase, maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks. CAD to CPE interfaces are allowed. |

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 | $1.00 or $1.25 | .99 to local, .01 to IPSCC Operations, if collecting $1.25, .99 to local, .01 to ECC Operations and .25 to Grant Fund |
| Wireless | $1.00 or $1.25 | 99 to local, .01 to IPSCC Operations, if collecting $1.25, .99 to local, .01 to ECC Operations and .25 to Grant Fund |
| Prepaid Wireless | 2.5% Point of sale each transaction | 99% to local, 1% to IPSCC Operations |
| Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) | $1.00 or $1.25 | .99 to local, .01 to IPSCC Operations, if collecting $1.25, .99 to local, .01 to ECC Operations and .25 to Grant Fund |
| Other |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section F1** |
|  |

1. **For the annual period ending December 31, 2020, please report the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees or charges described in Question F 1.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Service Type** | **Total Amount Collected ($)** |
| Wireline | $20,359,044.00 |
| Wireless |  |
| Prepaid Wireless | $1,572,963.32 |
| Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) |  |
| Other | $2,428,206.87 |
| **Total** | $24,360,214.19 |

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section F2** |
| Total Wireline, Wireless, and VoIP number is based on the 1% the IPSCC receives from the counties. The 1% number was multiplied to arrive at the total $1.00 number. This is due in part to the audit authority residing at the County level and not at the state level. The State can only ask for this number and only 23 responses were received from 52 PSAPs.  Wirline total is for wireline, wireless and VoIP totals (can't be broken out based on how the total was calculated).  Other total is for the special grant fee ($.25 additional election by counties). |

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

|  |
| --- |
| None |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. **For the annual period ending December 31, 2020, 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.** | | |
|  | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section F4** |
| Addendum for 4. No fees combined at the State level. 40 counties participate in the state grant and have received money in this manner from the state to augment for equipment and upgrades. Unknown how many PSAPs also augment funds from their county general fund base on poor responses to the survey sent out. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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 | 90 |
| Local 911 Fees | Unknown |
| General Fund - State | 0 |
| General Fund - County | Unknown |
| Federal Grants | 0 |
| State Grants | 10 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section F5** |
|  |

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. **In the annual period ending December 31, 2020, 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*)** | | |
|  | See Addendum | | |
|  |  | | |
|  |  | | |
|  |  | | |
|  |  | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section G1** |
| The counties are mandated by statues other than the Emergency Communications Act to perform annual audits on all county funds. The emergency communications funds or 9-1-1 funds are accounted for separately under an emergency communications fund but are included in the county audit process. A third party auditor conducts the annual audits for the counties at the county level. The counties are governed by a wide array of state statutes and administrative rules in the process and content of the audits. All of the funds collected are mandated for use by counties in accordance with Idaho Code §31-4804(5). No audit-driven report has been received by the IPSCC indicative or conclusive of any misuse of funds at the local levels. All Special Grant Funds are made available or used solely for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism Idaho Code §31-4804(5). Special Grant Funds are audited and closed out at the end of the grant cycle for proper use of fees in accordance with the Idaho Code. |

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, 2020.** *(Enter “None” if no actions were taken.)* | | |
| The counties are mandated by statues other than the Emergency Communications Act to perform annual audits on all county funds. The emergency communications funds or 9-1-1 funds are accounted for separately under an emergency communications fund but are included in the county audit process. A third party auditor conducts the annual audits for the counties at the county level. The counties are governed by a wide array of state statutes and administrative rules in the process and content of the audits. All of the funds collected are mandated for use by counties in accordance with Idaho Code §31-4804(5). No audit-driven report has been received by the IECC indicative or conclusive of any misuse of funds. However, the IPSCC does not have state level audit authority for the local 911 programs or fees. | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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, 2020.** *(Enter “None” if no actions were taken.)* | | |
|  | | |

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:** | | |
| Idaho Statutes TITLE 31 CHAPTER 48 EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS ACT  §31-4801 (2). Therefore, it is hereby declared that the intent and purpose of the provisions of this act are to:  (a) Provide authority to counties and 911 service areas to impose an emergency communications fee on the use of telephone lines, wireless, VoIP or other communications services that connect an individual or entity dialing or accessing 911 to an established public safety answering point;  (b) Provide that the emergency communications fee in section 31-4803, Idaho Code, shall be exclusively utilized by the counties or 911 service areas electing to impose it to finance the initiation, maintenance, operation, enhancement and governance of consolidated emergency systems as well as enhanced consolidated emergency systems or next generation consolidated emergency systems;  (c) Provide for the agreed-to reimbursement to telecommunications providers for their implementation of enhanced consolidated emergency communications systems by counties or 911 service areas that have implemented enhanced consolidated emergency communications systems;  (d) Create the Idaho public safety communications commission that will have the duty to provide the governance structure through which public safety communications stakeholders can collaborate to advance consistency and common objectives, to provide integrated facilitation and coordination for cross-jurisdictional consensus building, to assist in the standardization of agreements for sharing resources among jurisdictions with emergency response communications infrastructure, to suggest best practices, performance measures and performance evaluation in the integrated statewide strategic planning and implementation of interoperability among public safety communications professionals and entities that serve people in Idaho regardless of jurisdiction, to manage the Idaho public safety interoperable communications and data systems fund as established by section 31-4820, Idaho Code, and to pursue budget authorizations as set forth in this chapter. | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. **In the annual period ending December 31, 2020, 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**  **($)** | $650,727 | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section I2** |
| Special Grant Funds used to connect 13 PSAPs with IP connections across the state (Lewis County Grant request). The IPSCC also paid out $10,000.00 for consultant services to study fee requirements and to assist the Funding Committee in document preparration for briefings. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **For the annual period ending December 31, 2020, 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 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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:  Bonneville County ESInet | | | 10 |  |  |
| 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** |
| One "regional" ESInet up and running with 10 (up from 6 last report) total PSAPs participating. There are no other ESInets in Idaho for them to connect to at this time. |

1. **Please provide a description of any NG911 projects completed or underway during the annual period ending December 31, 2020.**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Total PSAPs**  **Accepting Texts** |
| 1. **During the annual period ending December 31, 2020, how many PSAPs within your state implemented text-to-911 and are accepting texts?** | 47 |
| **Question** | **Estimated Number of PSAPs**  **that will Become Text Capable** |
| 1. **In the next annual period ending December 31, 2021, how many PSAPs do you anticipate will become text capable?** | 48 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section I5** |
| We only have one PSAP that does not have text-to-911 at this time. It is forecast to be up by end of calendar 2021. |

|  |
| --- |
| **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, 2020, did your state expend funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs?** | Yes | No | Unknown |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section J1** |
| Only 23 PSAPs responded to the survey and not all reported the amount spent on Cyber; however, some did indicate they had programs that are inplace. The monies for this were from the local 911 funds as the state only regulates the Special Grant Fund. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Total PSAPs** |
| 1. **During the annual period ending December 31, 2020, how many PSAPs in your state either implemented a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program?** | Unknown |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section J2** |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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.**

|  |
| --- |
| At the close of 2018 48 of 48 PSAPs were Phase II compliant. Of the 48 PSAPs 90% are IP ready through the use of the consolidated grant fund in the State of Idaho. One regional ESInet is now operational connecting 10 PSAPs in the state.  The report to the Idaho Legislature can be found at: https://ioem.idaho.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/57/2020/02/IPSCC-2021-Annual-Report\_013020.pdf  The State NG911 plan may be found at:  https://ioem.idaho.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/57/2020/05/Idaho-State-911-Plan-20200507\_Final.pdf  The state and counties in Idaho enjoy a form of shared governance of authority and control over 9-1-1 related funding. A political climate of local control and independence is prevalent in our citizens and units of local government, and there are drastic differences in the state geography, resource availability, and population density. Since the IPSCC was created in 2016, the Commission has worked with local government and their state associations to find solutions to bring E9-1-1 services to the rural areas throughout Idaho. We believe that the Enhanced Emergency Communication Grant Fund we can be successful in making sure that all of our citizens are able to access the vital public safety services through 9-1-1 regardless of where they choose to live, work and recreate in our state. We also realize that without new funding through the NET 9-1-1 Act or other mechanisms even more stress will be added to a local and state economy and funding system that is already stretched to its limits. Movement to Next Generation 9-1-1 will be difficult if not impossible in the absence of additional appropriations. |

**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)