**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]](#footnote-2)

**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.

1. **Filing Information**

**A1. Name of State or Jurisdiction**

|  |
| --- |
| **State or Jurisdiction** |
| Michigan |

**A2. Name, Title and Organization of Individual Filing Report**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Title** | **Organization** |
| Ms. Joni Harvey | State 911 Administrator | Michigan State Police |

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

1. **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, 2021. 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]](#footnote-3)** | **Number of PSAPs** |
| Primary | 136 |
| Secondary | 5 |
| **Total** | 141 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section B1** |
| There are five secondary PSAPs in the State of Michigan, however, they are all operated by private EMS services and receive no direct funding through the fees and surcharges included in this report. |

**B2. Please provide the total number of active telecommunicators[[3]](#footnote-4) in your state or jurisdiction that were funded through the collection of 911 and E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2021. 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 | 1,746 |
| Part Time | 198 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section B2** |
| Of the Primary PSAPs that reported data in 2021, there were 245 open full-time positions and 54 open part-time positions reported. |

**B3. For the annual period ending December 31, 2021, please provide an estimate of the total cost to provide 911/E911 service in your state or jurisdiction.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Amount ($)** | 305,223,374.24 |

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |

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

**B4. Please provide the total number of 911 voice calls that your state or jurisdiction received during the period January 1, 2021 to December 31, 2021.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of Service** | **Total 911 Voice Calls** |
| Wireline | 799,694 |
| Wireless | 5,388,267 |
| VoIP | 416,529 |
| Other (report 911 texts separately below in B.4a) | 0 |
| **Total** | 6,604,490 |

**B4a. Please provide the total number of 911 texts that your state or jurisdiction received during the period January 1, 2021 to December 31, 2021.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Texts to 911 | 9,488 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section B4** |
|  |

1. **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.**

|  |
| --- |
| The Michigan Emergency 911 Service Enabling Act (Act 32 of 1986, as amended) provides funding in the following ways:  Michigan's State 911 charge is currently $0.25 per communications device per month. After 2010, any changes to the State 911 surcharge or the distribution percentages shall be made by the legislature. MCL 484.1401a.  Sellers of prepaid wireless communications devices are mandated to remit 5% per retail transaction, collected from their customer, to the Michigan Department of Treasury. MCL 484.1401c. As of March 1, 2022 the 5% per transaction will be moved to 6% per retail transaction.  Each of the 83 Michigan counties has the abilty to assess a county-wide surcharge on all communications devices/each line billed to an address within their respective county. In 2021, 72 counties collected 911 surcharges ranging from $0.20 to $3.00 per month under MCL 484.1401(b) or MCL 484.1401(e ).  Communications providers are able to recover their costs through a 911 technical charge of up to $0.80 per month on customer bills. See MCL 484.1401(d). Currently, all of Michigan is set at $0.50 per line.  http://www.legislature.mi.gov/documents/mcl/pdf/mcl-act-32-of-1986.pdf |

**C1b. If YES to C1, during the annual period January 1, 2021 to December 31, 2021, 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.**

|  |
| --- |
| The funding mechanism was ammended during the time period, 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 to the Michigan Department of Treasury beginning March 1, 2022. The change was made on December 17, 2021. |

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

**C2. 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** |
|  |

**C3. Describe how the funds collected are made available to localities.**

|  |
| --- |
| For state collected funds:  Michigan counties received 65% of the total Michigan State 911 charge and the prepaid device 911 charge, remitted based on MCL 484.1401(a) and MCL 484.1401(c) as directed by MCL 484.1408(4a). The full distribution of the State 911 Funds is listed as section E1 below.  Michigan PSAPs may potentially all receive 5.5% of the total Michigan State 911 charge and the prepaid device 911 charge under MCL 464.1408(4c) for the purposes of training PSAP personnel.  For county collected funds:  Communications providers remit county 911 surcharge monies directly to the respective Michigan counties imposing the surcharge. MCL 484.1401(b) |

1. **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.).**

|  |
| --- |
| The Michigan State 911 Committee (SNC) has issued a list of Allowable and Disallowable 911 Surcharge Expenditures. In accordance with P.A. 379 of 2008, any changes made to the document language must be transmitted to the Michigan Legislature, MCL 484.1401(b)(14). The use limitations contained in the list are applicable to both the State 911 fees and Local 911 fees.  (https://www.michigan.gov/documents/ListingofAllowable\_14259\_7.pdf)    MCL 484.1401(b) permits that a local (countywide) 911 surcharge may be assessed by the county board of commissions in an amount not to exceed $0.42 per month. Additional surcharge not to exceed a total of $3.00 may be assessed on a countywide basis if approved by votes in that county under a ballot proposal. |

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

**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.**

|  |
| --- |
| The Michigan State 911 Committee (SNC) has developed a list of Allowable and Disallowable 911 Surcharge Expenditures. In accordance to P.A. 379 of 2008, any changes made to the document's language must be transmitted to the Michigan Legislature, MCL 484.1401(b)(14).  (https://www.michigan.gov/msp/-/media/Project/Websites/msp/911/911-Funding/State-Surcharge-Funding-Information/911-Allowable-Exp-2009.pdf?rev=12cdcaba27374f6aa2e511c945f06ad3&hash=18D6E0699C87B94E8FB4B69B2DD062C0) |

**D2b.** **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**

**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.**

|  |
| --- |
| 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  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."  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." |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **E2. Please identify the uses of the collected funds.[[4]](#footnote-5) *Check all that apply*.** | | | |
| **Type of Cost** | | **Yes** | **No** |
| **PSAP operating costs, including technological innovation that supports 911** | Lease, purchase, maintenance, replacement, and upgrade of customer premises equipment (CPE) (hardware and software) |  |  |
| Lease, purchase, maintenance, replacement, and upgrade of computer aided dispatch (CAD) equipment (hardware and software) |  |  |
| Lease, purchase, maintenance, replacement, and upgrade of PSAP building/facility |  |  |
| NG911, cybersecurity, pre-arrival instructions, and emergency notification systems (ENS) |  |  |
| **PSAP personnel costs** | Telecommunicators’ Salaries |  |  |
| Training of Telecommunicators |  |  |
| **PSAP administrative costs** | Program Administration |  |  |
| Travel Expenses |  |  |
| **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 |  |  |
| Providing for the interoperability of 911 systems with one another and with public safety/first responder radio systems |  |  |
| **Grant programs** |  | **If YES, see E2a.** |  |
| **E2a. During the annual period ending December 31, 2021, describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of such grants.** | | | |
| The NG911 grant that 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.    The State funds match being utilized for this program are coming from the technical surcharge as well as the state surcharge that is contributing to the network costs.  Under MCL 484.1408(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 Michigan Public Service Commission (MPSC) Docket U-14000 and for IP-based 911 (NG911) under MPSC docket U-20146. | | | |

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

1. **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** | **Fee/Charge Imposed** | **Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance**  *Check one for each Service Type.* | | |
| **State** | **County or Local Authority** | **Combination of State and County/Local** |
| **Wireline – monthly fee ($)** | $0.25 |  |  |  |
| **Wireless – monthly fee ($)** | $0.25 |  |  |  |
| **Prepaid Wireless – provide *either* flat fee ($) or percentage (%) per retail transaction** *(leave inapplicable cell blank)* | $ |  |  |  |
| 5% |
| **Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) – monthly fee ($)** | $0.25 |  |  |  |
| **Other – monthly fee ($)** | $N/A |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section F1** |
| 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 service purchased  VoIP $0.00-$3.00 (Local varies by county) |

**F2. For the annual period ending December 31, 2021, please report the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees or charges described in Question F1.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Service Type** | **Total Amount Collected ($)** |
| Wireline | $136,862,589.71 |
| Wireless | Included in wireline above |
| Prepaid Wireless | $15,402,291.03 |
| Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) | Included in wireline above |
| Other | N/A |
| **Total** | $152,264,880.74 |

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section F2** |
| State 911 Fund: $25,418,810.30 Figure represents what has been reported by the local agencies. The funds represent what is collected from Communications Suppliers to date and remitted to the counties. The State 911 Office has been working on collecting payment from delinquent supplier accounts since the mandate became effective in 2018.  Local 911 Fund: $94,386,668.15 Figure represents what the local agencies reported on their annual reporting form. |

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

|  |
| --- |
| Local property tax millages, local municipality, local governmental general funds, and revenues from "other" sources such as tower rentals, fees charged back to local public safety entities for dispatching services. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| **F4. For the annual period ending December 31, 2021, 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.* |  |  |
| **F4a.** **If YES, please describe the federal, state or local funds and amounts that were combined with 911/E911 fees.** | | |
| In addition to the State and Local funds reported above:  County Millages: $ 60,590,694.35    Local/County General Funds: $ 95,267,008.89  Other Receipts: $ 18,536,089.75 (grants, tower rentals, contracts for service, etc.) | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **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 | 14.89 |
| Local 911 Fees | 25.80 |
| General Fund - State | 0 |
| General Fund - County | 25.15 |
| Federal Grants | .33 |
| State Grants | 0 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section F5** |
| Local millages make up 19.58% and other receipts make up 14.24% as described above. In addition, $1,092,803.89 was spent in Federal Grant money from the 2019 911 Grant Program this amount does not include the State Funds match only the Federal grant dollars used, of this $0.00 was administrative costs, $70,032.19 was associated with consulting services for the GIS repository upgrade, $16,766.92 was associated with consulting services for the Address Point Gap fill project, and $1,006,004.78 was spent on upgrading call processing equipment. The details of the project are described in Section I4. |

1. **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, 2021, 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*. | |  |  |
| **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, 2021, 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?** *Check one*. | |  |  |
| **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.** | |  |  |
| **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** |
| Specific totals for expenditures on radio and infrastructure and equipment is not collected. We will amend our annual report data collection to include this information in the future. |

**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 fees or charges designated for “public safety,” “emergency services,” or other similar purposes where a portion of those fees or charges supports 911 services?** *Check one.*

* Yes …………………..
* No ………………..…..

**If YES to G3, please answer Questions G3a – G3c below.** *(If NO to G3, leave 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?** *Check one.* |  |  |
| **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 *either* dollar amount or percentage.** *(Leave inapplicable cell blank.)* | $ | |
| % | |
| **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?** *Check one.* |  |  |
| **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?** *Check one.* |  |  |
| **G3c(i). If NO to G3c, please explain.** | | |
|  | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section G3** |
| 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 FY2018-2019 audit was completed in September 2021 with no diversion findngs. The OAG audit for the E911 fund for FY2020-2021 began in June 2022 and is currently in progress.  Local 911 Fund: Independent local audit and annual reporting process to the State 911 Committee (SNC) as set out in MCL 484.1406(2)-(4). |

1. **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?** *Check one.* |  |  |
| **H1a.** **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, 2021.** *(Enter “None” if no actions were taken.)* | | |
| 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 FY2018-2019 audit was completed in September 2021 with no diversion findings. The FY 2020-2021 began in June 2022 and is currently in progress.  Local 911 Fund: Independent local audit and annual reporting process to the State 911 Committee (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, facility security/readiness. The following Michigan counties were reviewed in 2021:  Detroit Service District\* Charlevoix, Cheboygan, Emmet\*\* Ionia \*\* Hillsdale\*\* Alger\*\* Midland\*\* Conference of Western Wayne\*\* Arenac\*\*\* Midland\*\*\* Macomb\*\*\*\* Muskegon\*\*\*\* Downriver Mutual Aid Service District\*\*\*\* Newaygo\*\*\*\* Montmorency\*\*\*\* Kent\*\*\*\* Iron\*\*\*\* Huron\*\*\*\* Lenawee\*\*\*\* Mason\*\*\*\* Oceana\*\*\*\*  \*The Detroit Service District was started in 2019, however, the compliance review was still in progress at the end of 2021.  \*\* The following counties were started in 2020, however, the compliance reviews were completed and approved by the SNC in 2021.  \*\*\* The following counties were started in 2020, however, the compliance review was still in progress at the end of 2021.  \*\*\*\*The following counties were started in 2021, however, the compliance review was still in progress at the end of 2021. | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **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?** *Check one.* |  | |  | |
| **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, 2021?** *Check one; check N/A if Question H2 response above is NO*. |  |  | |  |
| **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, 2021.** *(Leave blank if not applicable / no actions were taken.)* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section H2** |
|  |

1. **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.* |  |  |
| **I1a. If YES, please cite any specific legal authority:** | | |
| For State 911 Funds: The State 911 surcharge shall be 25 cents. The State 911 charge shall reflect the actual cost of operating, maintaining, upgrading, and other reasonable and necessary expenditures for the 911 system in Michigan. The State 911 charge may be reviewed and adjusted as provided under subsection (5) of MCL 484.1401(5).  For County 911 Funds: MCL 484.1401(b)(3) The charge assessed under this section and section 401e shall not exceed the amount necessary and reasonable to implement, maintain, and operate the 911 system in the county.  While not explicitly listed as allowable in the language of the State's Allowable and Disallowable list for State and County 911 funds, NG911 projects and services are considered as equivalent projects to landline and wireless 911 systems. | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | | **Yes** | **No** |
| **I2. In the annual period ending December 31, 2021, has your state or jurisdiction expended funds on NG911 programs?** *Check one.* | |  |  |
| **I2a. If YES, please enter the dollar amount that has been expended during the annual period.** | | | |
| **Amount**  **($)** | $17,776,746.18 | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section I2** |
| The amount provided is for delivery of calls through Peninsula Fiber Network (PFN); an IP-based 911 NG911 network. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **I3. For the annual period ending December 31, 2021, 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 |  |  |  |  |  |
| I3b. Local (*e.g.*, county) ESInet(s) |  |  | 134 |  |  |
| I3c. Regional ESInets |  |  | [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:  Upper Peninsula 911 Authority | | | 8 |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 2:  Great Lakes Consortium | | | 8 |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 3:  Northeast | | | 5 |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 4:  SMPA | | | 6 |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 5:  NEMO | | | 6 |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 6:  Washtenaw | | | 6 |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 7:  Oakland | | | 18 |  |  |
| **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:** | | | | | |
| Border PSAP 4 Yes  Downriver Mutual Aid 12 Yes  Kent 2 Yes  Neguanee/MSP 3 Yes  Conference of Eastern Wayne 4 Yes  Conference of Western Wayne 11 Yes | | | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section I3** |
| 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 this time there are 131 PSAP 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. |

**I4. Please provide a description of any NG911 projects completed or underway during the annual period ending December 31, 2021.**

|  |
| --- |
| In 2021, there were 15 Michigan counties who actively deployed an NG911 network. There was also one county plus one service district that are in process or waiting to begin.  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 $3,939,670.00 in grant funds to complete three projects. A description of each of the projects follows:  Primary Project 1 – Customer Premise Equipment 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 customer premise equipment (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.  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.  Primary Project 3 - 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 is in need of an application code upgrade. Some of the coding technology is no longer supported and there are improvements that exist to newer coding that will streamline some of the workflows and increase performance of the system. These enhancements can 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 would involve the following tasks:  • 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 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.  Primary Project 4 - 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 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:  • 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:  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. |

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

**I5. As of December 31, 2021, 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, 2021** | 134 |

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

**I6. By the end of the *next* annual period ending December 31, 2022, 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, 2022** | 136 |

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

1. **Cybersecurity Expenditures**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Check the appropriate box** | | **If Yes,**  **Amount Expended ($)** |
| **J1. During the annual period ending December 31, 2021, did your state expend funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs?** | Yes | No | Data not collected, Peninsula Fiber Network (PFN) meets i3 standards and is covered in the cost reported above. |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Total PSAPs** |
| **J2. During the annual period ending December 31, 2021, how many PSAPs in your state either implemented a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program?** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section J2** |
| Individual agency data has not been collected. All counties actively deployed with Peninsula Fiber Network (PFN) meets i3 standard. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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?**[[5]](#footnote-6) *Check one.* |  |  |  |

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

1. **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.**

|  |
| --- |
| Each year, the State 911 Committee (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 2021 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/annual\_report\_to\_the\_michigan\_legislature.pdf?rev=b218b2feca38484aac09b17f5a96c363  The 2022 Annual Report to the Michigan Legislature is due August 1, 2022 and will be posted on the State 911 Committee website once submitted. |

1. **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.

**L1. Describe the impact of any underfunding of 911 services in your state or taxing jurisdiction during the annual period ending December 31, 2021.**

|  |
| --- |
| 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 in December 2021 to include an increase of prepaid state 911 surcharges from 5% to 6% beginning March 1, 2022, and 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 in Michigan (this should occur in FY2022). Without this increase and the one-time allocation, after Q1 of 2023, the state 911 surhcarge 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. |

**L2. Describe how any fee diversion affected 911 underfunding in your state or taxing jurisdiction during the annual period ending December 31, 2021.** *Indicate N/A if your state or taxing jurisdiction did not divert.*

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

**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. *See* Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021, Public Law 116-260, Division FF, Title IX, section 902. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
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/nena-adm-000.24-2021_final_2.pdf>. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
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 telephone 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. *See* 47 CFR § 9.23(b)(1)–(5). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. National Institute of Standards and Technology, Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity (2018), <https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/cswp/nist.cswp.04162018.pdf>. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)