

SIXTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS  
ON STATE COLLECTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF  
911 AND ENHANCED 911 FEES AND CHARGES  
FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 2023 TO DECEMBER 31, 2023

Submitted Pursuant to  
Public Law No. 110-283

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Jessica Rosenworcel, Chairwoman

December 30, 2024

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

| Heading  | Paragraph # |
|--|-------------|
| I. INTRODUCTION.....   | 1           |
| II. KEY FINDINGS .....   | 2           |
| III. BACKGROUND.....   | 3           |
| IV. DISCUSSION .....   | 8           |
| A. Summary of Reporting Methodology .....  | 9           |
| B. Overview of State 911 Systems .....   | 11          |
| C. Description of Authority Enabling Establishment of 911/E911 Funding Mechanism .....                       | 16          |
| D. Description of State Authority That Determines How 911/E911 Fees Are Spent.....                           | 18          |
| E. Description of Uses of Collected 911/E911 Fees .....  | 20          |
| F. Description of 911/E911 Fees Collected .....  | 23          |
| G. Diversion or Transfer of 911/E911 Fees for Other Uses .....   | 29          |
| 1. Diversion Analysis .....  | 35          |
| a. States/Jurisdictions Self-Identifying as Diverting/Transferring Funds.....                                | 35          |
| b. States/Jurisdictions Identified by the Bureau as Diverting/Transferring Funds. ....                       | 36          |
| 2. Public Safety Radio Expenditures.....   | 43          |
| 3. Multi-Purpose Fees.....   | 46          |
| H. Oversight and Auditing of 911/E911 Fees.....  | 49          |
| I. Description of Next Generation 911 Services and Expenditures.....   | 51          |
| J. Cybersecurity Expenditures.....   | 55          |
| K. Measuring Effective Utilization of 911/E911 Fees.....   | 57          |
| L. Underfunding of 911.....  | 59          |
| Appendix A–Summary of State and Other Jurisdiction Responses Regarding Collections During 2023 Annual Period |             |
| Appendix B1–Overview of State and Other Jurisdiction Total Collected 911/E911 Fees – 2009 to 2016 Reports    |             |
| Appendix B2–Overview of State and Other Jurisdiction Total Collected 911/E911 Fees – 2017 to 2024 Reports    |             |
| Appendix C–State and Other Jurisdiction 911/E911 Fees by Service Type  |             |
| Appendix D–Information Collection Questionnaire  |             |

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1. The Chairwoman, Federal Communications Commission (Commission),<sup>1</sup> hereby submits this Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges, as mandated by the New and Emerging Technologies 911 Improvement Act of 2008 (NET 911 Act)<sup>2</sup> and as prepared by the staff in the Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau (Bureau).<sup>3</sup> This is the sixteenth annual report on the collection and distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 (E911) fees and

---

<sup>1</sup> See 47 U.S.C. § 155(a) (stating, *inter alia*, that “[i]t shall be [the Chair’s] duty . . . to represent the Commission in all matters relating to legislation and legislative reports”).

<sup>2</sup> New and Emerging Technologies 911 Improvement Act of 2008, Pub. L. No. 110-283, 122 Stat. 2620 (2008) (NET 911 Act).

<sup>3</sup> See 47 CFR § 0.191(k) (providing delegated authority to the Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau to develop responses to legislative inquiries).

charges by the states, the District of Columbia, U.S. territories, and Tribal authorities, and covers the period January 1, 2023 to December 31, 2023.<sup>4</sup> This report also reflects the eleventh annual collection of data elements relating to the number of 911 call centers and telecommunicators, 911 call volumes, 911 expenditure categories, implementation of Next Generation 911 (NG911), and cybersecurity for 911 systems. This year's report is the third to include data collection specifically related to underfunding of 911 and its impact.

## II. KEY FINDINGS

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

- In calendar year 2023, states and other reporting jurisdictions collected 911/E911 fees or charges totaling \$4,029,325,858.29.
- Twenty-six states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported collecting 911/E911 fees at the state level, three states reported collecting fees at the local level, and twenty states collected fees at both the state and local level.
- The Bureau identified three states (Nevada,<sup>5</sup> New Jersey, and New York) as diverting or transferring 911/E911 fees for purposes other than 911/E911 in 2023.
  - Nevada, New Jersey, and New York used a portion of their 911/E911 funds to support non-911 related public safety programs.
  - New Jersey and New York used a portion of their 911/E911 funds for either non-public safety or unspecified uses.
  - The total amount of 911/E911 funds diverted by all reporting jurisdictions in calendar year 2023 was \$215,690,474.68, or approximately 5.35% of all 911/E911 fees collected.
- For the third year, the data collection for the report includes a question on the impact of underfunding on 911 services. Many responding states and jurisdictions reported that underfunding results in degradation of 911 service and staffing challenges for Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs), and that underfunding contributes to delays in 911 system maintenance, equipment replacement, and deployment of new technology such as NG911.
- Forty states, the District of Columbia, Guam, and Puerto Rico reported or indicated expenditures on NG911 programs in calendar year 2023. The total amount of reported NG911 expenditures in 2023 was \$532,531,107.81.
- Thirty-six states and jurisdictions reported having Emergency Services IP Networks (ESInets) operating in 2023. Of that total: (1) twenty-five states and jurisdictions reported having statewide ESInets; (2) thirteen reported having regional ESInets within the state; and (3) eleven reported local-level ESInets. Eleven states reported having more than one type of ESInet operating in 2023.

---

<sup>4</sup> The period January 1, 2023 to December 31, 2023 is hereinafter referred to as calendar year 2023.

<sup>5</sup> As noted in Section IV.G.1.a below, while Nevada did not divert 911 fees at the state level, one or more local Nevada jurisdictions diverted 911 fees in 2023.

- Forty-eight states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico collectively reported that 3,633 PSAPs were text-to-911 capable as of the end of 2023.<sup>6</sup>
- While almost every state collects 911 fees from in-state subscribers, eight states, the District of Columbia, and Guam reported that they lack authority to audit service providers to verify that the collected fees accurately reflect the number of in-state subscribers served by the provider. Of the 44 states and jurisdictions that have such audit authority, 13 states and Puerto Rico reported that they had conducted audits in 2023.
- On the topic of cybersecurity preparedness, 24 states and the District of Columbia reported that they had made expenditures on 911-related cybersecurity programs for PSAPs in 2023. Twenty-five states, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands indicated that they spent no funds in 2023 on 911-related cybersecurity programs.

### III. BACKGROUND

3. *NET 911 Act.* Section 101 of the NET 911 Act added section 6(f)(2) to 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1, which required the Commission to report annually on the collection and distribution of fees in each state for the support or implementation of 911 or E911 services, including findings on the amount of revenues obligated or expended by each state “for any purpose other than the purpose for which any such fees or charges are specified.”<sup>7</sup> Pursuant to this provision, the Commission has reported annually to Congress since 2009 on the status of the collection and distribution of 911 fees and charges in each state and other jurisdiction.<sup>8</sup>

4. *Section 902, Consolidated Appropriations Act.* On December 27, 2020, Congress enacted the Don’t Break Up the T-Band Act of 2020, as part of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021.<sup>9</sup> Section 902 of the legislation required the Commission to take new steps to help address the diversion of 911 fees and charges by states and other jurisdictions for purposes unrelated to 911.<sup>10</sup> In particular, section 902 directed the Commission to adopt rules “designating purposes and functions for which the obligation or expenditure of 9-1-1 fees or charges, by any State or taxing jurisdiction authorized to impose such a fee or charge, is acceptable.”<sup>11</sup> Section 902 also amended 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(2) to replace the statutory language “any purpose other than the purpose for which any such fees or charges are specified” with “any purpose or function other than the purposes and functions designated in the final rules issued . . . as purposes and functions for which the obligation or expenditure of any such fees or charges is acceptable.”<sup>12</sup> In addition, section 902 added a new paragraph (4) to section 615a-1(f), requiring a state or taxing jurisdiction receiving a grant under section 158 of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. § 942) after December

---

<sup>6</sup> As of the November 26, 2024 edition, the Commission’s PSAP Text-to-911 Readiness and Certification Registry lists 3,301 text-capable PSAPs. See <https://www.fcc.gov/general/psap-text-911-readiness-and-certification-form> (web page last updated Nov. 27, 2024).

<sup>7</sup> NET 911 Act at § 6(f)(2); 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(2) (prior version in effect until December 27, 2020).

<sup>8</sup> These annual reports can be viewed at <https://www.fcc.gov/general/911-fee-reports>.

<sup>9</sup> Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021, Pub. L. No. 116-260, Division FF, Title IX, Section 902, Don’t Break Up the T-Band Act of 2020 (section 902).

<sup>10</sup> *Id.*

<sup>11</sup> Section 902(c)(1)(C) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(3)(A) (as amended)).

<sup>12</sup> Section 902(c)(1)(B) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(2) (as amended)).

27, 2020 to provide, as a condition of receiving such a grant, the information requested by the Commission to prepare its annual fee report.<sup>13</sup>

5. *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order.* On June 25, 2021, consistent with the section 902 statutory directive, the Commission released a Report and Order adopting rules that define which expenditures of 911 fees or charges by states and jurisdictions constitute fee diversion for purposes of section 902 and the Commission’s rules.<sup>14</sup> The rules adopted in the *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order* went into effect on October 18, 2021.<sup>15</sup> Under the new rules, acceptable expenditures of 911 fees or charges for purposes of section 902 and the Commission’s rules are limited to (1) “[s]upport and implementation of 911 services provided by or in the State or taxing jurisdiction imposing the fee or charge,” and (2) “[o]perational expenses of public safety answering points within such State or taxing jurisdiction.”<sup>16</sup> The rules include illustrative, non-exhaustive examples of acceptable and unacceptable uses of 911 fees or charges at the state and local level.<sup>17</sup> The rules also provide an elective safe harbor for states and taxing jurisdictions that designate multi-purpose fees or charges for “public safety,” “emergency services,” or other similar purposes where a portion of those fees or charges supports 911 services.<sup>18</sup> Additionally, the Commission adopted a process by which a state or taxing jurisdiction may petition for a determination that an obligation or expenditure of 911 fees or charges for a purpose or function other than the purposes or functions designated as acceptable in the Commission’s rules should be treated as acceptable.<sup>19</sup>

6. *911 Strike Force Report and Recommendations.* Section 902 also required the Commission to establish the “Ending 9-1-1 Fee Diversion Now Strike Force” (911 Strike Force) to study “how the Federal Government can most expeditiously end diversion” by states and taxing jurisdictions of 911 fees or charges.<sup>20</sup> As required by section 902, the 911 Strike Force studied three topics: (i) “the effectiveness of any Federal laws, including regulations, policies, and practices, or budgetary or jurisdictional constraints regarding how the Federal Government can most expeditiously end diversion by

---

<sup>13</sup> Section 902(c)(1)(C) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(4) (as amended)).

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

<sup>15</sup> *Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau Announces the Effective Date of Rules Adopted Pursuant to the 911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*, Public Notice, 36 FCC Rcd 12629 (PSHSB 2021) (*Effective Date of 911 Fee Diversion Rules Public Notice*).

<sup>16</sup> 47 CFR § 9.23(a)(1)-(2).

<sup>17</sup> 47 CFR § 9.23(b)(1)-(5), (c)(1)-(3).

<sup>18</sup> 47 CFR § 9.23(d).

<sup>19</sup> 47 CFR § 9.24(a).

<sup>20</sup> Section 902(d)(3)(A) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1 Statutory Notes (as amended)).

a State or taxing jurisdiction of 9-1-1 fees or charges”; (ii) “whether criminal penalties would further prevent diversion by a State or taxing jurisdiction of 9-1-1 fees or charges”; and (iii) “the impacts of diversion by a State or taxing jurisdiction of 9-1-1 fees or charges.”<sup>21</sup> The Commission also referred several additional issues to the 911 Strike Force for further study in its *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*, including seeking recommendations on the “precise dividing line” between acceptable and unacceptable expenditures of 911 fees or charges on public safety radios, and developing additional specific examples of the allowable use of 911 fees for public safety radio systems.<sup>22</sup> The 911 Strike Force submitted its report with recommendations and findings on these topics to Congress on September 23, 2021.<sup>23</sup>

7. *Information Request and Responses.* In April 2024, the Bureau sent questionnaires to the Governor of each state and territory and the Mayor of the District of Columbia requesting information on 911 fee collection and expenditure for calendar year 2023.<sup>24</sup> The Bureau received responsive information from all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.<sup>25</sup> The Bureau did not receive responses from American Samoa and the Northern Mariana Islands. We note, as a general matter, that some states and jurisdictions report incomplete information<sup>26</sup> or provide no responses to certain questions. Such omissions may affect this report’s overall calculations, results, and analyses.

---

<sup>21</sup> Section 902(d)(3)(B)(i)-(iii) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1 Statutory Notes (as amended)).

<sup>22</sup> See, e.g., *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*, 36 FCC Rcd at 10825, 10827, 10829, paras. 45, 50, 55 (referring to the 911 Strike Force for further guidance the issue of applying the standard for acceptable 911 expenditures to public safety radio equipment).

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

<sup>24</sup> See Appendix D – Annual Collection of Information Related to the Collection and Use of 911 and E911 Fees by States and Other Jurisdictions (FCC Questionnaire). The data collection incorporates recommendations made by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) in its April 2013 report on state collection and use of 911 funds. See GAO, “Most States Used 911 Funds for Intended Purposes, but FCC Could Improve Its Reporting on States’ Use of Funds,” GAO-13-376 (Apr. 18, 2013), <https://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-13-376>. GAO prepared this report pursuant to a directive in the Next Generation 9-1-1 Advancement Act of 2012. See Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012, Pub. L. No. 112-96, 126 Stat. 156, 242 (2012). The annual FCC Questionnaire includes a request to states and jurisdictions for data relating to Indian Tribes. See FCC Questionnaire at C1 (“Has your State, or any political subdivision, Indian Tribe, village or regional corporation therein . . . established a funding mechanism designated for or imposed for the purposes of 911 or E911 support or implementation . . .”).

<sup>25</sup> Copies of reports from all responding jurisdictions are available on the FCC website at <https://www.fcc.gov/sixteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

<sup>26</sup> Some states specifically point out that they must report incomplete data, and some even point out the impact. See, e.g., Texas Response at 2 (“The lack of information from the non-reporting entities skews the reported information for Texas including, but not limited to, the number of 9-1-1 calls/texts, PSAPs, telecommunicators; costs; and revenues.”); Georgia Response at 3-4, 23 (explaining that certain responses were “based on self-reported data received” from local PSAPs, and giving the varying percentages of PSAPs that had supplied data for each of those individual responses, e.g., the total estimated cost to provide 911 service in 2023 was based on data from 52.3% of primary PSAPs).

## IV. DISCUSSION

8. This report describes how states and other entities collected 911/E911 funds in calendar year 2023, how much they collected, and how they oversaw the expenditure of these funds.<sup>27</sup> The report describes the extent to which states diverted or transferred collected 911/E911 fees to funds or programs other than those that support or implement 911/E911 services or cover operational expenses of PSAPs. The report also examines the collection and expenditure of funds on NG911 and cybersecurity programs, and the impact of any underfunding on 911 services.

### A. Summary of Reporting Methodology

9. Section 6(f)(1) of the NET 911 Act affirms the ability of “a State, political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or village or regional corporation serving a region established pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, as amended” to collect fees or charges “applicable to commercial mobile services or IP-enabled voice services . . . for the support or implementation of 9-1-1 or enhanced 9-1-1 services, provided that the fee or charge is obligated or expended only in support of 9-1-1 and enhanced 9-1-1 services, or enhancements of such services.”<sup>28</sup> Section 6(f)(2) further requires the Commission to obtain information “detailing the status in each State of the collection and distribution of such fees or charges, and including findings on the amount of revenues obligated or expended by each State or political subdivision thereof.”<sup>29</sup>

10. For this year’s report to Congress, the Bureau’s information collection questionnaire asked each state or jurisdiction to confirm whether, in calendar year 2023, it spent 911/E911 funds solely for purposes and functions designated as acceptable under the Commission’s rule at 47 CFR § 9.23.<sup>30</sup> Although some state statutes expressly authorize the diversion or transfer of collected 911/E911 fees, the Bureau reviews the reported expenditures to determine whether such diversions or transfers are limited to “[s]upport and implementation of 911 services provided by or in the State or taxing jurisdiction imposing the fee or charge” and “[o]perational expenses of public safety answering points within such State or taxing jurisdiction.”<sup>31</sup> The report on 911/E911 fee diversion in Section G below provides additional detail regarding this year’s fee diversion analysis.

### B. Overview of State 911 Systems

11. To provide a broader context for the information provided on collection and use of 911 fees, the data collection sought information about the total number of PSAPs that receive funding derived from the collection of 911 fees, the number of active telecommunicators funded through the collection of 911 fees, the total number and type of 911 voice calls and 911 texts the state or jurisdiction received, and an estimate of the total cost to provide 911/E911 service.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> The FCC Questionnaire asked states to report 911 information on a calendar year basis, but some states instead reported their information on a fiscal year basis. Therefore, our analysis sometimes includes both calendar year and fiscal year data.

<sup>28</sup> NET 911 Act at § 6(f)(1) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(1)).

<sup>29</sup> NET 911 Act at § 6(f)(2) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(2)).

<sup>30</sup> FCC Questionnaire (Question G1). As noted, the rules adopted in the *911 Fee Diversion Report & Order* became effective October 18, 2021. *Effective Date of 911 Fee Diversion Rules Public Notice*, 36 FCC Rcd 12629.

<sup>31</sup> 47 CFR § 9.23(a).

<sup>32</sup> FCC Questionnaire at 2–4.

12. **Number and Type of PSAPs.** The questionnaire requested that states “provide the total number of active primary and secondary [PSAPs<sup>33</sup>] in your state or jurisdiction that received funding derived from the collection of 911/E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2023.”<sup>34</sup> Table 1 shows that 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands responded to this request, reporting a total of 4,628 primary PSAPs and 567 secondary PSAPs.<sup>35</sup>

**Table 1 – Number and Types of PSAPs That Receive Funding from the Collection of 911/E911 Fees**<sup>36</sup>

| State | Total Primary | Total Secondary | Total PSAPs |
|-------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|
| AK    | 22            | 2               | 24          |
| AL    | 106           | 16              | 122         |
| AR    | 94            | 0               | 94          |
| AZ    | 71            | 9               | 80          |
| CA    | 390           | 50              | 440         |
| CO    | 77            | 4               | 81          |
| CT    | 102           | 4               | 106         |
| DE    | 8             | 1               | 9           |
| FL    | 140           | 57              | 197         |

<sup>33</sup> A Primary PSAP is one to which 911 calls are routed directly from the 911 Control Office (such as a selective router or 911 tandem). A Secondary PSAP is one to which 911 calls are transferred from a Primary PSAP. See National Emergency Number Association (NENA), Master Glossary of 9-1-1 Terminology at 174 (June 22, 2021), [https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/standards-archived/nena-adm-000.24-2021\\_final\\_2.pdf](https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/standards-archived/nena-adm-000.24-2021_final_2.pdf) (defining Primary PSAP, Secondary PSAP, and E911 Control Office).

<sup>34</sup> FCC Questionnaire at 2 (Question B1).

<sup>35</sup> We note that because the Bureau’s data request focused on PSAPs that receive funding from 911 fees, the reported data do not necessarily include PSAPs that are funded through sources other than 911 fees. We also note that the sum of reported primary and secondary PSAPs does not equal the reported total due to discrepancies in certain states’ responses. See *infra* note 40 at the end of Table 1 for more information regarding the discrepancies.

<sup>36</sup> Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin provided substantive entries in Addendum Section B1 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/sixteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>. In Addendum Section B1, Alabama, Georgia, Michigan, Nevada, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Virginia indicate that some or all their secondary PSAPs are not funded (or that only primary PSAPs are funded) through collected 911 or E911 fees or surcharges. Alabama Response at 2; Georgia Response at 2; Michigan Response at 2; Nevada Response at 2; North Dakota Response at 2; Oklahoma Response at 2; Oregon Response at 2; Virginia Response at 2. New Jersey reports, “Although the State does not ‘distribute’ funding directly to the 247 PSAPs in the State, funding from collection of 911 fees are expended by the State on behalf of the PSAPs for core 9-1-1 network elements as well as nearly 1,400 voice circuits and 500 data circuits for an annual cost of \$13,822,000.00. In addition, there was an appropriation of \$10M for grants to assist PSAPs with GIS and Call Handling Equipment for the State’s migration to an i3, NG9-1-1 platform.” New Jersey Response at 2-3 (Addendum Section B1).



| State | Total Primary | Total Secondary               | Total PSAPs   |
|-------|---------------|-------------------------------|---------------|
| GA    | 155           | [No Response] <sup>[37]</sup> | 155           |
| HI    | 6             | 4                             | 10            |
| IA    | 111           | [No Response]                 | 111           |
| ID    | 48            | 4                             | 52            |
| IL    | 176           | 9                             | 185           |
| IN    | 91            | 26                            | 117           |
| KS    | 118           | 5                             | 123           |
| KY    | 117           | NA                            | 117           |
| LA    | 76            | Unk[nown]                     | 76            |
| MA    | 206           | 4                             | 210           |
| MD    | 24            | 71                            | 95            |
| ME    | 25            | [No Response]                 | 25            |
| MI    | 134           | 8 <sup>[38]</sup>             | 142           |
| MN    | 97            | 3                             | 97            |
| MO    | 165           | 4                             | 169           |
| MS    | 109           | 40                            | 149           |
| MT    | 58            | [No Response]                 | 58            |
| NC    | 114           | 11                            | 125           |
| ND    | 21            | [No Response]                 | 21            |
| NE    | 68            | [No Response]                 | 68            |
| NH    | 2             | 0                             | 2             |
| NJ    | 176           | 71                            | 247           |
| NM    | 42            | [No Response]                 | 42            |
| NV    | 12            | [No Response]                 | 12            |
| NY    | 134           | 34                            | 168           |
| OH    | 144           | 23                            | 167           |
| OK    | 125           | 0                             | 125           |
| OR    | 43            | [No Response]                 | 43            |
| PA    | 61            | 0                             | 61            |
| RI    | 1             | 1                             | 2             |
| SC    | 68            | 10                            | [No Response] |
| SD    | 32            | 1                             | 33            |
| TN    | 116           | 15                            | 131           |
| TX    | 455           | 60                            | 515           |
| UT    | 27            | 0                             | 27            |
| VA    | 121           | 0                             | 121           |

<sup>37</sup> In all tables in this report, brackets indicate information entered by the Bureau, e.g., where the state or jurisdiction has provided no response, or the response is unknown because it cannot be derived from the information provided in the state or jurisdiction's filing, or the state or jurisdiction did not file. Except as otherwise indicated, all unbracketed table entries in this report are taken verbatim from the responses provided by states and jurisdictions.

<sup>38</sup> Although Michigan indicates at Addendum Section B1 that it has eight secondary PSAPs and that none of them receives direct 911 fee funding, Michigan nevertheless lists eight secondary PSAPs in response to Question B1 regarding PSAPs that received funding derived from 911/E911 fees. Michigan Response at 2.

| State                      | Total Primary         | Total Secondary | Total PSAPs  |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| VT                         | 6                     | 0               | 6            |
| WA                         | 49                    | 13              | 62           |
| WI                         | 0                     | 0               | 0            |
| WV                         | 51                    | [No Response]   | 51           |
| WY                         | 28                    | 5               | 33           |
| <b>Other Jurisdictions</b> |                       |                 |              |
| AS                         | [DNF] <sup>[39]</sup> | [DNF]           | [DNF]        |
| DC                         | 1                     | 0               | 1            |
| Guam                       | 1                     | 1               | 2            |
| NMI                        | [DNF]                 | [DNF]           | [DNF]        |
| PR                         | 2                     | 1               | 3            |
| USVI                       | 2                     | 0               | 2            |
| <b>Total<sup>40</sup></b>  | <b>4,628</b>          | <b>567</b>      | <b>5,114</b> |

13. **Number of Telecommunicators.** Respondents were asked to provide the total number of active telecommunicators<sup>41</sup> in each state or jurisdiction that were funded through the collection of 911/E911 fees during calendar year 2023. Table 2 shows that 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands responded to this data request and reported a total of 40,117 full-time telecommunicators and 3,462 part-time telecommunicators that are funded through the collection of 911 fees. Four states reported they do not know how many telecommunicators in one or both categories are funded through 911/E911 funds.<sup>42</sup> Thirteen states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that telecommunicators are not funded by 911 fees, i.e., they explicitly stated this or provided responses such as “0” or “None.”

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

<sup>40</sup> The sum of Total Primary PSAPs and Total Secondary PSAPs yields 5,195 PSAPs, which is 81 more than the reported Total PSAPs shown in Table 1. One state had a discrepancy in adding Primary and Secondary PSAPs for its reported total, and one state provided Primary and Secondary PSAP numbers, but did not provide a total.

<sup>41</sup> For purposes of the FCC Questionnaire, a telecommunicator, also known as a call taker or a dispatcher, is a person employed by a PSAP who is qualified to answer incoming emergency voice, text, and multi-media calls and/or who provides for the appropriate emergency response either directly or through communication with the appropriate PSAP. FCC Questionnaire at 3 n.3; see also NENA, *NENA Knowledge Base* (Aug. 13, 2024), <https://kb.nena.org/wiki/Telecommunicator>.

<sup>42</sup> For example, Louisiana reports “unk[nown]” only for the number of part-time active telecommunicators, but does not provide a number for full-time active telecommunicators. Louisiana Response at 3. Meanwhile, Connecticut reports “Unk[nown]” for both full-time and part-time active telecommunicators. Connecticut Response at 3.

**Table 2 – Total Telecommunicators Funded by 911/E911 Fees<sup>43</sup>**

| State            | Number of Telecommunicators Funded by 911 Fees |                                   | Reported<br>“Unknown” | Not<br>Funded<br>by Fees |
|------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
|                  | Full-Time                                      | Part-Time                         |                       |                          |
| AK               | 353  | 24                                |                       |                          |
| AL               | 1,483  | [No Response]                     |                       |                          |
| AR               | 1,035  | 182                               |                       |                          |
| AZ               | 0  | 0                                 |                       | X                        |
| CA               | 0  | 0                                 |                       | X                        |
| CO               | 807  | 27                                |                       |                          |
| CT               | Unk[nown]                                      | Unk                               | X                     |                          |
| DE               | 288  | 8                                 |                       |                          |
| FL               | 1,186  | 43                                |                       |                          |
| GA <sup>44</sup> | 2,687  | 274                               |                       |                          |
| HI               | 0  | 0                                 |                       | X                        |
| IA               | 0  | 0                                 |                       | X                        |
| ID               | 637  | 0                                 |                       |                          |
| IL               | 3,137  | 312                               |                       |                          |
| IN               | 1,838  | 282                               |                       |                          |
| KS               | 0  | 0                                 |                       | X                        |
| KY               | 1,265  | 289                               |                       |                          |
| LA               | 840  | Unk[nown]                         | X                     |                          |
| MA               | 5,000  | Included in Full-Time<br>Response |                       |                          |
| MD               | 1,523  | 72                                |                       |                          |
| ME               | 0  | 0                                 |                       | X                        |
| MI               | 1,880  | 158                               |                       |                          |
| MN               | 0  | 0                                 |                       | X                        |
| MO               | 1,743  | 335                               |                       |                          |
| MS               | 922  | 196                               |                       |                          |
| MT               | U/A <sup>45</sup>                              | U/A                               | X                     |                          |
| NC               | 0  | 0                                 |                       | X                        |
| ND               | 312  | 27                                |                       |                          |
| NE               | 626  | 60                                |                       |                          |

<sup>43</sup> Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, District of Columbia, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming provided substantive entries in Addendum Section B2 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/sixteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

<sup>44</sup> At Addendum Section B2, Georgia states that “[t]he State’s submission is based on self-reported data received from 122 of 155 (78.7%) primary PSAPs.” Georgia Response at 3.

<sup>45</sup> Although Montana enters “U/A” for both full-time and part-time active telecommunicators at B2, Montana then states at Addendum Section B2 that “Montana has approx 192 call taking positions.” Montana does not indicate whether these telecommunicators are funded by 911 Fees. Montana Response at 3.

| State                      | Number of Telecommunicators Funded by 911 Fees         |               | Reported<br>“Unknown” | Not<br>Funded<br>by Fees |
|----------------------------|--|---------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
|                            | Full-Time  | Part-Time     |                       |                          |
| NH                         | 74   | 9             |                       |                          |
| NJ                         | 0  | 0             |                       | X                        |
| NM                         | 0  | 0             |                       | X                        |
| NV                         | 9  | [No Response] |                       |                          |
| NY                         | 4,206  | 301           |                       |                          |
| OH                         | 953  | 124           |                       |                          |
| OK                         | 565  | 155           |                       |                          |
| OR                         | 740  | 53            |                       |                          |
| PA                         | 2,100  | 280           |                       |                          |
| RI                         | 32 Telecommunicators and 7 Supervisors <sup>[46]</sup> | 0             |                       |                          |
| SC                         | 0  | 0             |                       | X                        |
| SD                         | 337  | 9             |                       |                          |
| TN                         | Unknown  | Unknown       | X                     |                          |
| TX                         | 847  | 21            |                       |                          |
| UT                         | 340  | 25            |                       |                          |
| VA                         | 0  | 0             |                       | X                        |
| VT                         | 75   | 24            |                       |                          |
| WA                         | 1,317  | 64            |                       |                          |
| WI                         | 0  | 0             |                       | X                        |
| WV                         | 748  | 101           |                       |                          |
| WY                         | 56   | 7             |                       |                          |
| <b>Other Jurisdictions</b> |  |               |                       |                          |
| AS                         | [DNF]  | [DNF]         | [DNF]                 | [DNF]                    |
| DC                         | 0  | 0             |                       | X                        |
| Guam                       | 23   | 0             |                       |                          |
| NMI                        | [DNF]  | [DNF]         | [DNF]                 | [DNF]                    |
| PR                         | 133  | [No Response] |                       |                          |
| USVI                       | 0  | 0             |                       | X                        |
| <b>Total</b>               | <b>40,117</b>  | <b>3,462</b>  | <b>4</b>              | <b>15</b>                |

14. **Number of 911/E911 Calls and Texts.** The Bureau asked respondents to provide an estimate of the total number of 911 calls the state or jurisdiction received for calendar year 2023. The FCC Questionnaire also included a question specifically asking for the number of texts to 911 received.<sup>47</sup> Forty-seven states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported a cumulative total of 216,288,911 voice 911 calls of all types during the 2023 annual period.<sup>48</sup> The total

<sup>46</sup> For calculation purposes, we count only Rhode Island’s reported 32 telecommunicators toward the Total.

<sup>47</sup> FCC Questionnaire at 4 (B4, B4a).

<sup>48</sup> Two states (Montana and Wisconsin) responded “Unknown,” “U/A,” or provided no response to all service type and total 911 voice call categories. Arizona provided no response for total number of 911 voice calls, but did report individual numbers for most voice service type categories.

number of reported 911 voice calls for the prior reporting period, 2022, has now been revised to 215,043,471, based on one state reporting in this year's Sixteenth Response that it had made a reporting error in last year's Fifteenth Response for its total 911 voice calls number. Based on this revised 2022 cumulative total of 215,043,471 voice calls to 911, the total number of such calls for the 2023 reporting period covered by this Sixteenth Report represents an increase of approximately 0.58%, or over 1.24 million more voice calls to 911, compared to 2022.<sup>49</sup> Of the total reported voice calls in 2023, respondents reported 165,201,095 calls from wireless phones, representing approximately 76.4% of the total reported call volume. The Bureau believes this likely understates the percentage of wireless 911 calls because Alaska, Delaware, Georgia, and Tennessee reported total 911 calls but did not break out service categories separately.<sup>50</sup> For this year's question about the number of texts to 911, 42 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported a combined total of 1,186,355 texts to 911 in 2023. Table 3 provides specific call volume information reported by each state or other jurisdiction for each service type. In addition, the Bureau has included an estimate of annual 911 calls on a per capita basis in each reporting state and jurisdiction.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> In the Fifteenth Report, respondents originally cumulatively reported a total of 217,654,456 voice calls to 911 for calendar year 2022. FCC, Fifteenth Annual Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges at 12-16, para. 14, Table 3 (2023), <https://www.fcc.gov/sites/default/files/15th-annual-911-fee-report-2023.pdf> (Fifteenth Report). However, in this year's Sixteenth Response filing, Tennessee reported an error in its Fifteenth Response entry last year for the total number of voice calls in 2022, which affects the cumulative total listed in last year's Fifteenth Report. In this year's Sixteenth Response at Addendum Section B4, Tennessee states, "There is an error in Tennessee's 2022 filing. In response to Question B4, Total 911 Voice Calls, we inadvertently included 3 of the quarterly totals in the annual total. The correct number for 2022 was 3,471,260." Tennessee Response at 4. Tennessee previously reported 6,082,245 total 911 voice calls for 2022. Tennessee Fifteenth Response at 4. Tennessee's reduction of 2,610,985 results in a lower cumulative total of 215,043,471 voice calls to 911 for all respondents in 2022.

<sup>50</sup> In addition, Guam at Question B4 reported 49,400 wireline 911 calls and reported the same 49,400 number at the Total calls box, leaving the other subcategories of 911 voice calls, including wireless calls, blank. Guam Response at 4. Therefore, any wireless voice calls to 911 in Guam are also not included in the 165,201,095 wireless 911 calls count.

<sup>51</sup> The Bureau's per capita estimates in this report are based on United States Census data for each jurisdiction. See United States Census Bureau, *State Population Totals and Components of Change: 2020-2023*, <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/popest/2020s-state-total.html> (June 25, 2024). The populations for Guam and the U.S. Virgin Islands are based on World Bank data because Census data are unavailable. See The World Bank, *Population, total - Guam*, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL?locations=GU> (last visited Nov. 8, 2024); The World Bank, *Population, total - Virgin Islands (U.S.)*, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL?locations=VI> (last visited Nov. 8, 2024).

**Table 3 – Total 911 Calls by Service Type and 911 Texts<sup>52</sup>**

| State | Type of Voice Service |                  |                |               | Voice Call Total | Texts to 911            | Estimated Annual 911 Calls Per Capita |
|-------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|
|       | Wireline              | Wireless         | VoIP           | Other         |                  |                         |                                       |
| AK    | unknown               | unknown          | unknown        | [No Response] | 159,188          | unknown                 | 0.22                                  |
| AL    | 100,636               | 2,587,901        | 200,812        | 744,043       | 3,633,392        | 18,352                  | 0.71                                  |
| AR    | 96,666                | 1,692,901        | 64,787         | [No Response] | 1,854,354        | 5,125                   | 0.60                                  |
| AZ    | 155,302               | 4,492,669        | 313,634        | [No Response] | [No Response]    | 16,100                  | [NA]                                  |
| CA    | 1,293,631 (5%)        | 23,315,779 (87%) | 1,579,993 (6%) | 529,657 (2%)  | 26,790,408       | 98,065                  | 0.69                                  |
| CO    | 172,214               | 2,873,455        | 213,652        | 0             | 3,259,321        | 17,088                  | 0.55                                  |
| CT    | 152,687               | 1,730,106        | 185,598        | [No Response] | 2,068,391        | 6,774                   | 0.57                                  |
| DE    | [No Response]         | [No Response]    | [No Response]  | [No Response] | 700,386          | 24,914                  | 0.68                                  |
| FL    | 948,289               | 13,258,233       | 858,029        | 980,945       | 16,045,496       | 76,801                  | 0.71                                  |
| GA    | Unknown               | Unknown          | Unknown        | Unknown       | 9,676,118        | 56,502                  | 0.88                                  |
| HI    | 206,556               | 1,111,139        | 45,752         | -             | 1,363,447        | 4,271                   | 0.95                                  |
| IA    | 94,767                | 1,224,772        | 18,252         | 1,575         | 1,339,366        | 6,726                   | 0.42                                  |
| ID    | 31,751                | 537,853          | 21,132         | 3,340         | 594,076          | 4,727                   | 0.30                                  |
| IL    | 920,451               | 5,516,619        | 858,678        | 0             | 7,295,748        | 14,465                  | 0.58                                  |
| IN    | 155,858               | 3,720,103        | 244,308        | [No Response] | 4,120,269        | 217,906 <sup>[53]</sup> | 0.60                                  |
| KS    | 70,348                | 1,038,109        | 523,927        | 0             | 1,632,384        | 16,658                  | 0.56                                  |
| KY    | 486,738               | 2,290,531        | 146,696        | 29,178        | 2,953,143        | 5,174                   | 0.65                                  |
| LA    | 254,049               | 2,746,619        | 143,487        | [No Response] | 3,144,155        | 37,616                  | 0.69                                  |
| MA    | 696,998               | 2,511,017        | 445,161        | [No Response] | 3,653,176        | 6,841                   | 0.52                                  |
| MD    | 772,958               | 3,310,236        | Unk            | N/A           | 4,164,284        | 20,245                  | 0.67                                  |
| ME    | 72,716                | 514,003          | 57,398         | [No Response] | 644,117          | 1,343                   | 0.46                                  |
| MI    | 368,320               | 5,187,067        | 487,378        | N/A           | 6,042,765        | 29,533                  | 0.60                                  |
| MN    | 216,935               | 2,685,455        | 213,926        | 45            | 3,116,361        | 23,152                  | 0.54                                  |
| MO    | 309,784               | 2,148,141        | 165,388        | [No Response] | 2,324,395        | 10,866                  | 0.38                                  |
| MS    | 196,316               | 1,727,303        | 104,334        | 610,893       | 2,638,846        | N/A                     | 0.90                                  |

<sup>52</sup> Alabama, Alaska, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Virginia, and Wisconsin provided substantive entries in Addendum Section B4 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/sixteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

<sup>53</sup> At Addendum Section B4, Indiana states, “Inbound text 30,955[;] Outbound text 186,951[.]” Indiana Response at 4.

| State                      | Type of Voice Service |               |                   |               | Voice Call Total          | Texts to 911           | Estimated Annual 911 Calls Per Capita |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|
|                            | Wireline              | Wireless      | VoIP              | Other         |                           |                        |                                       |
| MT                         | U/A                   | U/A           | U/A               | U/A           | U/A                       | U/A                    | [NA]                                  |
| NC                         | 301,483               | 6,291,845     | 616,641           | [No Response] | 7,209,969                 | 15,515 <sup>[54]</sup> | 0.67                                  |
| ND                         | 26,387                | 250,335       | 8,633             | 28            | 283,446                   | 4,200                  | 0.36                                  |
| NE                         | 52,692                | 877,698       | 76,680            | [No Response] | 1,007,070                 | 5,155                  | 0.51                                  |
| NH                         | 32,845                | 386,837       | 52,317            | 23,870        | 495,869                   | 1,019                  | 0.35                                  |
| NJ                         | 1,215,234             | 8,601,483     | 333               | Unknown       | 9,817,050                 | Unknown                | 1.06                                  |
| NM                         | 1,169,480             | 1,300,207     | 300,335           | 1,227,315     | 3,997,337                 | 0                      | 1.89                                  |
| NV                         | 54,992                | 371,943       | 44,727            | 1,505,148.0   | 1,986,810 <sup>[55]</sup> | 14,637                 | 0.62                                  |
| NY                         | 4,958,601             | 12,158,965    | [No Response]     | 2,215,080     | 19,409,704                | 67,058                 | 0.99                                  |
| OH                         | 532,507               | 5,132,812     | 376,449           | 116,813       | 6,302,368                 | 19,541                 | 0.53                                  |
| OK                         | 130,755               | 2,079,083     | 163,218           | 49,299        | 2,422,355                 | 10,194                 | 0.60                                  |
| OR                         | 110,945               | 1,895,336     | 147,220           | 49,971        | 2,203,472                 | 76,974                 | 0.52                                  |
| PA                         | 1,228,593             | 6,124,035     | 518,656           | 195,770       | 8,110,069                 | 43,015                 | 0.63                                  |
| RI                         | 32,694                | 411,044       | 52,935            | [No Response] | 496,673                   | 625                    | 0.45                                  |
| SC                         | 248,281               | 3,517,611     | 234,427           | [No Response] | 4,000,319                 | 26,301                 | 0.74                                  |
| SD                         | 24,135                | 302,905       | 11,059            | 4,131         | 342,230                   | 1,920                  | 0.37                                  |
| TN                         | Unknown               | Unknown       | Unknown           | Unknown       | 3,487,267                 | Unknown                | 0.49                                  |
| TX                         | 1,232,627             | 15,884,236    | 860,448           | 565,813       | 18,543,164                | 118,281                | 0.61                                  |
| UT                         | 14,095                | 1,002,445     | 46,085            | 23,898        | 1,086,523                 | 4,890                  | 0.32                                  |
| VA                         | 534,849               | 3,764,730     | 309,545           | [No Response] | 4,609,124                 | Unknown.               | 0.53                                  |
| VT                         | 27,680                | 193,048       | 28,500            | 4,221         | 253,449                   | 865                    | 0.39                                  |
| WA                         | 237,705               | 4,837,060     | 434,695           | [No Response] | 5,509,460                 | 29,507                 | 0.71                                  |
| WI                         | [No Response]         | [No Response] | [No Response]     | [No Response] | Unknown                   | Unknown                | [NA]                                  |
| WV                         | 570,096               | 1,048,533     | 145,478,<br>[sic] | 488,139       | 2,252,246                 | 5,511                  | 1.27                                  |
| WY                         | 28,551                | 180,812       | 14,853            | [No Response] | 224,216                   | 2,047                  | 0.38                                  |
| <b>Other Jurisdictions</b> |                       |               |                   |               |                           |                        |                                       |
| AS                         | [DNF]                 | [DNF]         | [DNF]             | [DNF]         | [DNF]                     | [DNF]                  | [NA]                                  |
| DC                         | 64,179                | 898,975       | 124,807           | 2,637         | 1,090,598                 | 9,905                  | 1.61                                  |

<sup>54</sup> At Addendum Section B4, North Carolina states, “This information was provided by the Board’s data analytics program to track the types of calls; the Board acknowledges the report Text to 911 number in B4a may be higher than the actual usage.” North Carolina Response at 4.

<sup>55</sup> At Addendum Section B4, Nevada states, “The above numbers do not include a large metropolitan PSAP, 2 rural PSAPs, and 3 secondary PSAPs. Most Nevada agencies do not have the capability to separate the call types to obtain an accurate number.” Nevada Response at 4.

| State                      | Type of Voice Service |                    |                   |                  | Voice Call Total   | Texts to 911       | Estimated Annual 911 Calls Per Capita |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|
|                            | Wireline              | Wireless           | VoIP              | Other            |                    |                    |                                       |
| Guam                       | 49,440                | [No Response]      | [No Response]     | [No Response]    | 49,440             | N/A                | 0.29                                  |
| NMI                        | [DNF]                 | [DNF]              | [DNF]             | [DNF]            | [DNF]              | [DNF]              | [NA]                                  |
| PR                         | 37,540                | 1,381,555          | 513               | 274,687          | 1,694,295          | 9,917              | 0.53                                  |
| USVI                       | 15,826                | 87,551             | N/A               | 87,425           | 190,802            | 34 <sup>[56]</sup> | 1.82                                  |
| <b>Totals<sup>57</sup></b> | <b>20,706,182</b>     | <b>165,201,095</b> | <b>11,460,876</b> | <b>9,733,921</b> | <b>216,288,911</b> | <b>1,186,355</b>   | <b>0.66</b>                           |

15. **Cost to Provide 911/E911 Service.** The Bureau asked respondents to provide an estimate of the total cost to provide 911 service during calendar year 2023, regardless of whether such costs are supported by 911 fees or other funding sources. As detailed in Table 4 below, 44 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands provided cost estimates totaling \$7,839,062,804.98.<sup>58</sup> Table 4 also includes the Bureau’s estimate of reported costs on a per capita basis for each reporting state and jurisdiction. Six states did not provide cost estimates, with some respondents noting that they lacked authority to collect 911 cost data from local jurisdictions. Some states that did submit estimates qualified their cost figures by noting that they had only partial information regarding the total cost to provide 911 service.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>56</sup> At Addendum Section B4, the U.S. Virgin Islands states, “The low text volume is due to system testing, but PSAPs are text ready. Other calls were received, however not classified as wireline or wireless.” U.S. Virgin Islands Response at 4.

<sup>57</sup> Alaska, Delaware, Georgia, and Tennessee did not break down calls by category and only provided totals. Conversely, Arizona provided numbers for some categories of calls, but did not provide a total. Several other states reported category data and totals with varying discrepancies. Therefore, the reported total of 216,288,911 for all 911 voice calls is approximately 9.2 million calls more than the actual sum of Wireline, Wireless, VoIP, and Other reported by states and jurisdictions, which is 207,102,074 voice 911 calls. The per capita figure in the Totals row is the average of the state per capita values above.

<sup>58</sup> For a comparison of total costs to total revenue from fees and charges, see *infra* Table 14.

<sup>59</sup> For example, Colorado, Georgia, Kansas, Michigan, Mississippi, and Nevada report cost estimates but indicate that they do not have cost data from certain PSAPs or local jurisdictions and, as a result, Kansas acknowledges that its actual costs could be higher than reported. Colorado Response at 3; Georgia Response at 3; Kansas Response at 3-4; Michigan Response at 3-4; Mississippi Response at 3; Nevada Response at 3.



**Table 4 – Estimated Cost to Provide 911/E911 Service<sup>60</sup>**

| State | Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911/E911 Service                       | Explanation of Reported Figure or Why Estimation Could Not Be Provided  | Annual Per Capita Expenditures |
|-------|--|---|--------------------------------|
| AK    | \$14,046,805.91  | [NA]  | \$19.15                        |
| AL    | \$130,372,190.53   | [NA]  | \$25.52                        |
| AR    | \$84,218,483.36  | [NA]  | \$27.45                        |
| AZ    | \$20,446,256.49  | [NA]  | \$2.75                         |
| CA    | \$197,093,000.00   | N/A   | \$5.06                         |
| CO    | \$121,743,925.40   | [NA]  | \$20.71                        |
| CT    | \$35,683,264.00  | [NA]  | \$9.86                         |
| DE    | \$9,203,284.43   | n/a   | \$8.92                         |
| FL    | \$380,475,598.00   | [NA]  | \$16.83                        |
| GA    | \$577,393,447.15   | The Georgia Emergency Communications Authority (GECA) does not capture the total cost to provide 911/E911 service throughout the state. 911 telephone fees are disbursed to local jurisdictions, but many jurisdictions supplement their 911 fees to cover their operational expenses. The State’s submission is based on self-reported data received from 81 of 155 (52.3%) primary PSAPs. | \$52.35                        |
| HI    | N/A  | Hawaii is a ‘Home Rule’ State and each county has its own cost accounting system which the E911 Board has no authority over. Their system is not set up to capture expenses associated with 911/E911 service only   | [NA]                           |
| IA    | \$166,753,366.92   | [NA]  | \$52.00                        |
| ID    | \$22,320,000.00  | Above is the total amount remitted to agencies directly from telcos in support of 911 services. The final authority, per Idaho statute, on how funds are spent is under the authority of the PSAP owning organization.  | \$11.36                        |
| IL    | ... Total cost to provide 911/E911 is \$218,991,238.87 <sup>[61]</sup> | Chicago costs and financial information were not provided and are not included in the above.  | \$17.45                        |
| IN    | \$286,719,714.24   | [NA]  | \$41.78                        |
| KS    | \$103,086,754.00   | [NA]  | \$35.06                        |
| KY    | \$162,686,094.00   | NA  | \$35.94                        |
| LA    | \$99,818,888.57  | [NA]  | \$21.82                        |
| MA    | The estimated amount to provide  | [NA]  | \$7.01                         |

<sup>60</sup> Colorado, Kansas, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Texas, Washington, and Wyoming provided substantive entries in Addendum Section B3 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/sixteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

<sup>61</sup> To conserve vertical space in this table and certain other tables, staff has provided excerpts of some lengthier responses in the tables themselves while providing the full text of those responses in footnotes. Illinois’ full response to Question B3 is: “Local 9-1-1 Authorities reported \$206,535,190.38 in 911 Expenses and the State paid \$12,456,048.49 for 911 network costs[;] Total cost to provide 911/E911 is \$218,991,238.87[.]” Illinois Response at 3.

| State | Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911/E911 Service    | Explanation of Reported Figure or Why Estimation Could Not Be Provided   | Annual Per Capita Expenditures |
|-------|---|--|--------------------------------|
|       | 911 Service is:<br>\$49,102,581 ... <sup>[62]</sup> |  |                                |
| MD    | \$177,429,053.00                                    | [NA]   | \$28.71                        |
| ME    | \$7,103,397   | The State of Maine provides for a statewide 911 system. The cost above is limited to the services we provide funded through the E911 surcharge.  | \$5.09                         |
| MI    | \$318,271,962.99                                    | [NA]   | \$31.71                        |
| MN    | \$48,835,266.00                                     | [NA]   | \$8.51                         |
| MO    | \$443,529,191.00                                    | [NA]   | \$71.58                        |
| MS    | \$54,530,183.22                                     | [NA]   | \$18.55                        |
| MT    | \$47M   | [NA]   | \$41.49                        |
| NC    | \$202,592,031.00                                    | [NA]   | \$18.70                        |
| ND    | \$30,700,000.00                                     | [NA]   | \$39.16                        |
| NE    | \$65,263,070.00                                     | The Nebraska Public Service Commission has jurisdiction over the 911 Wireless Surcharge funds, collection, and dissemination. The PSAP's have local control over their costs and general funds along with their 911 wireline surcharge monies. The amount reported in B3 is an estimate based on the total operating budget of the PSAPs as reported to the Public Service Commission. | \$32.99                        |
| NH    | \$18,426,904.33                                     | N/A  | \$13.14                        |
| NJ    | Unknown   | The State of New Jersey funds the statewide enhanced 9-1-1 infrastructure at an annual cost of approximately \$14M. The operational, equipment and personnel costs are the responsibility of the PSAP and not reported to the State 9-1-1 Office.  | [NA]                           |
| NM    | \$10,797,932.00                                     | [NA]   | \$5.11                         |
| NV    | \$40,786,025.80                                     | The above dollar amount does not include 1 large Primary PSAP and 2 Secondary PSAPs. The agencies that are not included are not collecting 911 fees and were unable to provide their general fund information in a timely manner   | \$12.77                        |
| NY    | \$1,276,892,251.68                                  | [NA]   | \$65.24                        |
| OH    | \$356,606,081.55                                    | [NA]   | \$30.26                        |
| OK    | \$104,802,192.91                                    | [NA]   | \$25.85                        |
| OR    | \$188,760,834.75                                    | [NA]   | \$44.59                        |
| PA    | \$445,988,758.07                                    | [NA]   | \$34.41                        |
| RI    | \$7,147,444.00                                      | [NA]   | \$6.52                         |
| SC    | unknown   | The state manages and distributes the wireless 911 funds. Wireline 911 funds are handled at the local level. The state does not have a mechanism in place to determine the total amount of 911/E911 expenditures at the local level  | [NA]                           |
| SD    | \$38,885,755.57                                     | [NA]   | \$42.30                        |
| TN    | Unknown   | Tennessee ECDs operate and report on a fiscal year basis from July 1 through June 30. Audits reflect annual costs that are recorded in ECD's books, but expenditures made for 911 service by contributing local  | [NA]                           |

<sup>62</sup> Massachusetts' full response to Question B3 is, "The estimated amount to provide 911 Service is: \$49,102,581[.] This estimated amount includes the costs associated with the Next Generation 911 service provider contract, MassGIS, Radio, and the mobile PSAP. This estimated amount does not include costs associated with grant programs, training programs, disability access programs, public education, administrative costs, or other costs for the administration and programs of the State 911 Department." Massachusetts Response at 3-4.

| State                      | Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911/E911 Service | Explanation of Reported Figure or Why Estimation Could Not Be Provided   | Annual Per Capita Expenditures |
|----------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|
|                            |  | governments are not included.  |                                |
| TX                         | \$269,353,292.00                                 | [NA]   | \$8.83                         |
| UT                         | \$91 million                                     | [NA]   | \$26.63                        |
| VA                         | Unknown  | For the annual period ending December [sic] 31, 2023, PSC Staff only sees funds that are collected by the Virginia Department [sic] of Taxation as part of the Wireless E9-1-1 Fund. We do not collect informatio [sic] on any other costs.  | [NA]                           |
| VT                         | \$4,755,333.00                                   | [NA]   | \$7.34                         |
| WA                         | \$451,135,106.00                                 | [NA]   | \$57.74                        |
| WI                         | Unknown  | In Wisconsin for the reporting period, county and municipal governments operate and administer the 911 systems and all public safety answering points. County and municipal governments do not report to any state agency the number of staff employed, the total cost to provide 911 services, or a statistical summary of the 911 service provided.<br>Each county in Wisconsin has entered into a contract with participating local exchange carriers to provide its 911 telecommunications network. These 911 contracts specify in detail the design of the telecommunications network supporting the local 911 service, authorizes a 911 surcharge on landlines based on population to pay for expenses related to the network, and identifies the obligations of the parties to build, operate, and maintain the 911 telecommunications network. See Wis. Stat. 256.35(3)(b).<br>No portion of the funds collected from the 911 surcharge is shared with any state, county, or municipal agency or department, or any other governmental entity. The 911 surcharge is limited to the recovery of the telecommunications network expenses for providing the 911 service, and is retained in full by the participating local exchange carriers (up to \$0.40 cents per exchange access line per month). County and municipal expenses related to terminating and responding to 911 calls are paid for through the respective county and municipal budgets.<br>The total amount of the 911 surcharge collection is not available. The participating local exchange carriers collect the 911 surcharge. Those local exchange carriers do not report the results of the 911 surcharge collection to any state, county, or municipal office. | [NA]                           |
| WV                         | \$370,922,521.19                                 | [NA]   | \$209.55                       |
| WY                         | \$11,210,090.05                                  | [NA]   | \$19.19                        |
| <b>Other Jurisdictions</b> |  |  |                                |
| AS                         | [DNF]  | [DNF]  | [NA]                           |
| DC                         | \$51,749,217.00                                  | [NA]   | \$76.22                        |
| Guam                       | \$2,587,596.00                                   | [NA]   | \$14.96                        |
| NMI                        | [DNF]  | [DNF]  | [NA]                           |
| PR                         | \$18,418,568.00                                  | [NA]   | \$5.75                         |
| USVI                       | \$3,427,854.00                                   | [NA]   | \$32.67                        |
| <b>Total</b>               | <b>\$7,839,062,804.98</b>                        | <b>Average State Per Capita Expenditure</b>  | <b>\$30.14</b>                 |
|                            |  | <b>National Per Capita Expenditure</b>   | <b>\$22.06</b>                 |

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

16. The questionnaire sought data on the funding mechanisms states use to collect fees. Fifty states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands affirmed that their state or jurisdiction has established a funding mechanism designated for or imposed for the purposes of 911 or

E911 support or implementation. Of those states that have an established funding mechanism, Table 5 identifies six states that reported enlarging or altering their funding mechanism, either at the state or municipal level, during calendar year 2023. For example, Texas states that “an unspecified but small number of 772 and Municipal ECDs [Emergency Communications Districts] increased their landline/VoIP fee,” but that the statewide wireless fee, statewide prepaid wireless fee, and statewide equalization surcharge did not change in 2023.<sup>63</sup> Alabama, Ohio, and Pennsylvania made fee changes in 2023 that take effect in 2024.<sup>64</sup>

**Table 5 – States That Amended or Enlarged 911/E911 Funding Mechanism**<sup>65</sup>

| State        | Description  |
|--------------|--|
| Alabama      | Under § 11-98-5, Code of Alabama 1975, no later than October 1, 2018 and each fifth year after, the state board is required to adjust the 911 charge an amount equal to the rate of growth, based on the Consumer Price Index for Urban Consumers (CPI-U) for that five-year period. During 2023, the rate of growth was determined, and the administrative rules process was used to establish the new 911 charge of \$2.23 and increased baseline distribution amounts to local districts. Service providers were required to begin remitting at this rate on January 1, 2024. |
| Florida      | The fee is now applied uniformly to all counties.  |
| Ohio         | On July 3, 2023 the Governor signed into law amended language to change the existing fee of 25 cents per wireless device to 40 cents. The new rate took effect on January 2, 2024 and applies to each wireless phone number, multi line telephone systems up to 100 lines and Voice over internet protocol for each voice channel provided to the subscriber through the system, not to exceed one hundred voice channels per network.   |
| Pennsylvania | Act 34 of 2023, (Fiscal Code) was signed into law on December 13, 2023. In accordance with section 102-K of Act 34 (72 P.S. § 102-K), the 911 surcharge rates under 35 Pa.C.S. § 5306.2(a) increased the uniform surcharge fee from \$1.65 to \$1.95 effective March 1, 2024.  |
| Texas        | During CY 2023, an unspecified but small number of 772 and Municipal ECDs increased their landline/VoIP fee (residential, business, and/or trunk).<br>The Texas Legislature sets by statute the statewide wireless and prepaid wireless fees, and CSEC sets the statewide equalization surcharge--none of which were changed during CY 2023. <sup>[66]</sup>   |

<sup>63</sup> Texas Response at 6. Texas provided this information in Addendum Section C1 rather than Question C1c. Texas explains that “772 ECDs” are “statutory ECDs established under Texas Health and Safety Code Chapter 772.” Texas Response at 2 (Addendum Section A).

<sup>64</sup> Alabama Response at 5; Ohio Response at 5; Pennsylvania Response at 5.

<sup>65</sup> South Dakota and Texas provided substantive entries in Addendum Section C1 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/sixteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>. South Dakota states: “FYI There was an increase to the surcharge collected however it falls outside of the date range specified. In March of 2024 the legislature increased the surcharge from \$1.25 to \$2.00 with a sunset in July of 2026. The increase takes affect [sic] on July 1st, 2024. I will report a ‘Yes’ on this question next year with explanation [sic].” South Dakota Response at 5.

<sup>66</sup> Descriptions in Table 5 originate from responses to Question C1c, which asks states and jurisdictions to provide a description of amendments, enlargements, or alterations to the funding mechanism, if applicable. Texas did not provide a substantive response at Question C1c, but did provide a description at Addendum Section C1, which Bureau staff has placed in Table 5 for Texas. Texas Response at 6.

| State     | Description  |
|-----------|--|
| Wisconsin | The 2023 Wisconsin Act 19, state biennial budget act was passed in July 2023 and made future changes to Wisconsin’s multi-purpose fee. The Act renamed the Police and Fire Protection fund to the 911 Fund which will take effect on July 1, 2024. See Wis. Stats. 25.99 ( <a href="https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/statutes/statutes/25/99">https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/statutes/statutes/25/99</a> ) |

17. The Bureau asked states to describe the type of authority arrangement for the collection of 911 fees, specifically whether 911/E911 funds are collected by the state (or equivalent jurisdiction), by local jurisdictions, or by a combination of the two. As described in Table 6 below, 26 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported at Question C2 that they collect all 911 fees on a statewide basis.<sup>67</sup> Three states reported that 911 fee collection occurs exclusively at the local level. Twenty states reported using a hybrid approach to 911 fee collection, in which state and local governing bodies share authority over fee collection from customers. For example, Colorado reports that “[t]he local emergency telephone charges are remitted by telecommunications providers directly to Colorado’s 58 local 9-1-1 governing bodies, which in turn fund a majority of Colorado’s 85 [PSAPs],” while the “state 9-1-1 surcharge is collected by the Colorado Public Utilities Commission” and the “wireless prepaid 9-1-1 charge is collected by the Colorado Department of Revenue,” with both the latter fees then distributed to 911 governing bodies.<sup>68</sup> North Dakota reports that “the fees from landline, VoIP, and wireless monthly contracts are imposed by local jurisdictions and remitted by the phone companies directly to those jurisdictions (53 counties),” while North Dakota’s “pre-paid fee revenue is centrally collected by the State Tax Department and remitted to a joint powers entity consisting of all local 911 jurisdictions for distribution or dedication to statewide 9-1-1 network costs.”<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> Although states and jurisdictions at Question C2 checked the response choices tallied here in Table 6 (i.e., specifically selecting state, local, or hybrid authority), some of these respondents then indicated elsewhere in their questionnaires that they might actually have additional collection authority beyond the single choice that was checked. For example, Maryland checked the Question C2 box indicating that only the “State” collects the fees, but indicated elsewhere in its questionnaire that its localities also collect 911 fees. Maryland Response at 4-7, 9-10.

<sup>68</sup> Colorado Response at 6.

<sup>69</sup> North Dakota Response at 6.

**Table 6 – Authority to Collect 911/E911 Fees<sup>70</sup>**

| Type of Collection | Number of States/Jurisdictions | States/Jurisdictions  |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| State              | 30                             | Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Indiana, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, U.S. Virgin Islands, Utah, Vermont, Virginia |
| Local              | 3                              | Alaska, Idaho, Nevada   |
| Hybrid             | 20                             | Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Texas, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming   |

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

18. The Bureau requested that states and jurisdictions identify the entity that has authority to approve the expenditure of funds collected for 911 purposes. As detailed in Table 7 below, 18 states, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands indicated that only a state entity has authority to approve expenditure of 911 fees. Six states and the District of Columbia indicated that only local entities have authority to approve expenditures. Twenty-five states indicated that authority is shared between state and local authorities.<sup>71</sup>

19. The Bureau also sought information on whether states have established a funding mechanism that mandates how collected funds may be used. Forty-nine states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands responded that they have a mechanism mandating how 911 fees may be spent, whereas one state, Idaho, reported it has no such mechanism.

<sup>70</sup> Arkansas, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Maine, Nebraska, North Dakota, Tennessee, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming provided substantive entries in Addendum Section C2 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/sixteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>. Wisconsin left all three Question C2 checkbox options blank and is therefore not included in this table. Wisconsin states at Addendum Section C2, “None of the above apply for 2023. No portion of the funds from the 911 surcharge are collected at the state, county, or municipal level. The participating local exchange carriers collect the 911 surcharge. See B3a response above.” Wisconsin Response at 6.

<sup>71</sup> Twenty-four of these jurisdictions checked the “hybrid” box at Question D1, while one additional state checked boxes for both state and local authority (indicating a hybrid of state and local authorities collect fees), but left the “hybrid” box unchecked.

**Table 7 – State Authority for Approval of 911/E911 Fee Expenditures<sup>72</sup>**

| <b>State</b> | <b>State, Local, or Hybrid Authority to Approve Expenditures</b> | <b>State Funding Mechanism Mandating How Funds Can Be Used</b> |
|--------------|--|--|
| AK           | Local  | Yes  |
| AL           | Hybrid   | Yes  |
| AR           | Hybrid   | Yes  |
| AZ           | State  | Yes  |
| CA           | State  | Yes  |
| CO           | Local  | Yes  |
| CT           | State  | Yes  |
| DE           | Hybrid   | Yes  |
| FL           | Hybrid   | Yes  |
| GA           | Hybrid   | Yes  |
| HI           | State  | Yes  |
| IA           | Hybrid   | Yes  |
| ID           | Local  | No   |
| IL           | Hybrid   | Yes  |
| IN           | State  | Yes  |
| KS           | Hybrid   | Yes  |
| KY           | Hybrid   | Yes  |
| LA           | Local  | Yes  |
| MA           | State  | Yes  |
| MD           | Hybrid   | Yes  |
| ME           | State  | Yes  |
| MI           | Hybrid   | Yes  |
| MN           | State  | Yes  |
| MO           | Hybrid   | Yes  |
| MS           | [Hybrid] <sup>[73]</sup>   | Yes  |
| MT           | State  | Yes  |
| NC           | State  | Yes  |

<sup>72</sup> California, Kansas, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, South Carolina, Texas, and Utah provided substantive entries in Addendum Section D1 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/sixteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

<sup>73</sup> Mississippi checked boxes for both state and local authority, indicating a hybrid of state and local authorities, but left the “hybrid” box unchecked. We have counted Mississippi as a hybrid state for Question D1.

| <b>State</b>               | <b>State, Local, or Hybrid Authority to Approve Expenditures</b> | <b>State Funding Mechanism Mandating How Funds Can Be Used</b> |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| ND                         | Hybrid   | Yes  |
| NE                         | Hybrid   | Yes  |
| NH                         | State  | Yes  |
| NJ                         | State  | Yes  |
| NM                         | State  | Yes  |
| NV                         | Local  | Yes  |
| NY                         | Hybrid   | Yes  |
| OH                         | Hybrid   | Yes  |
| OK                         | State  | Yes  |
| OR                         | State  | Yes  |
| PA                         | Hybrid   | Yes  |
| RI                         | State  | Yes  |
| SC                         | Hybrid   | Yes  |
| SD                         | State  | Yes  |
| TN                         | Hybrid   | Yes  |
| TX                         | Hybrid   | Yes  |
| UT                         | Hybrid   | Yes  |
| VA                         | Hybrid   | Yes  |
| VT                         | State  | Yes  |
| WA                         | Hybrid   | Yes  |
| WI                         | [No Response] <sup>[74]</sup>                                    | Yes  |
| WV                         | Hybrid   | Yes  |
| WY                         | Local  | Yes  |
| <b>Other Jurisdictions</b> |  |  |
| AS                         | [DNF]  | [DNF]  |
| DC                         | Local  | Yes  |
| Guam                       | State  | Yes  |

<sup>74</sup> At Question D1a, Wisconsin explains, “None of the above apply for 2023. In Wisconsin, the 911 surcharge is limited to the recovery of the telecommunications network expense for providing the 911 service. The collection from the 911 surcharge reimburses the participating local exchange carriers for their network costs. County and municipal expenses related to terminating and responding to 911 calls is paid for through the respective county and municipal budgets.” Wisconsin Response at 7.



| State         | State, Local, or Hybrid Authority to Approve Expenditures    | State Funding Mechanism Mandating How Funds Can Be Used |
|---------------|--|---|
| NMI           | [DNF]  | [DNF]   |
| PR            | State  | Yes   |
| USVI          | State  | Yes   |
| <b>Totals</b> | <b>State Only</b>  | <b>21</b>   |
|               | <b>Local Only</b>  | <b>7</b>  |
|               | <b>Hybrid</b>  | <b>25</b>   |
|               | <b>Has Funding Mechanism Mandating How Funds Can Be Used</b> | <b>53</b>   |

**E. Description of Uses of Collected 911/E911 Fees**

20. The Bureau asked responding states to provide a statement identifying with specificity “all activities, programs, and organizations for whose benefit your state, or political subdivision thereof, 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.”<sup>75</sup> As illustrated in Table 8 below, forty-five states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands responded to this question.

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

| State | Statement Describing Use of Funds  |
|-------|--|
| AK    | See above... <sup>(76)</sup><br>(j) If a city in an enhanced 911 service area established by a borough incurs costs described under (i) of this section for the enhanced 911 system, before the borough may use revenue from an enhanced 911 surcharge, the borough and city must execute an agreement addressing the duties and responsibilities of each for the enhanced 911 system and establishing priorities for the use of the surcharge |

<sup>75</sup> FCC Questionnaire at 7 (E1).

<sup>76</sup> Alaska’s statement in E1 to “See above” appears to refer to its entry at Question D2a, where Alaska states: “AS 29.35.131 (i) specifies that revenues collected may be used for costs directly attributable to the establishment, maintenance, and operation of an E911 system:

- (1) the acquisition, implementation, and maintenance of public safety answering point equipment and 911 service features;
- (2) the acquisition, installation, and maintenance of other equipment, including call answering equipment, call transfer equipment, automatic number identification controllers and displays, automatic location identification controllers and displays, station instruments, 911 telecommunications systems, teleprinters, logging recorders, instant playback recorders, telephone devices for the deaf, public safety answering point backup power systems, consoles, automatic call distributors, and hardware and software interfaces for computer-aided dispatch systems;
- (3) the salaries and associated expenses for 911 call takers for that portion of time spent taking and transferring 911 calls;
- (4) training costs for public safety answering point call takers in the proper methods and techniques used in taking and transferring 911 calls;
- (5) expenses required to develop and maintain all information necessary to properly inform call takers as to location address, type of emergency, and other information directly relevant to the 911 call-taking and transferring function, including automatic location identification and automatic number identification databases.” Alaska Response at 8-9.

| State | Statement Describing Use of Funds  |
|-------|--|
|       | <p>revenue. If the Department of Public Safety also provides services as part of the enhanced 911 system or uses the enhanced 911 system in that enhanced 911 service area, the department must be a party to the agreement.</p> <p>(k) For purposes of (i) of this section, 'call taker' means a person employed in a primary or secondary answering point whose duties include the initial answering of 911 or enhanced 911 calls and routing the calls to the agency or dispatch center responsible for dispatching appropriate emergency services and a person in a primary or secondary answering point whose duties include receiving a 911 or enhanced 911 call either directly or routed from another answering point and dispatching appropriate emergency services in response to the call; the term 'call taker' is synonymous with the term 'dispatcher' in that it is inclusive of the functions of both answering the 911 or enhanced 911 calls and dispatching emergency services in response to the calls.</p>   |
| AL    | <p>Funds collected for 911 or E911 have been received by the 85 Emergency Communications Districts (ECDs) in the State of Alabama and have been used to support the activities of those 911 districts by providing funding to maintain, and in some cases enhance, the 911 service provided to their populous. (See the complete list below.)</p> <p>List of ECDs</p> <p>Adamsville (Municipality); Auburn (Municipality); Autauga County; Baldwin County; Barbour County; Bessemer (Municipality); Bibb County; Birmingham (Municipality); Blount County; Bullock County; Butler County; Calhoun County; Chambers County; Cherokee County; Chilton County; Choctaw County; Clarke County; Clay County; Cleburne County; Coffee County; Colbert County; Conecuh County; Coosa County; Covington County; Crenshaw County; Cullman County; Dale County; Daleville (Municipality); Dallas County; DeKalb County; Elmore County; Enterprise (Municipality); Escambia County; Etowah County; Fayette County; Fort Payne (Municipality); Franklin County; Gardendale (Municipality); Geneva County; Greene County; Hale County; Henry County; Homewood (Municipality); Hoover (Municipality); Houston County; Hueytown (Municipality); Irondale (Municipality); Jackson County; Jefferson County; Lamar County; Lauderdale County; Lawrence County; Lee County; Limestone County; Lowndes County; Macon County; Madison County; Marengo County; Marion County; Marshall County; Midfield (Municipality); Mobile County; Monroe County; Montgomery (Municipality); Montgomery County; Morgan County; Mountain Brook; Perry County; Pickens County; Pike County; Pleasant Grove (Municipality); Randolph County; Russell County; Shelby County; St Clair County; Sumter County; Talladega County; Tallapoosa County; Tarrant (Municipality); Tuscaloosa County; Vestavia Hills (Municipality); Walker County; Washington County; Wilcox County; Winston County.</p> <p>Funds collected are utilized at the state level to execute the statutory obligations of the Alabama 911 Board. These obligations include providing and facilitating the statewide NG911 call delivery network, that consists of connectivity to all primary PSAPs, call routing mechanisms, and NG911 GIS database implementation. They also include administration of the mandatory public safety telecommunicator certification program and associated training, as well as providing grants and advisory services to emergency communication districts.</p>  |
| AR    | <p>1) The AR 911 Board distributed 83.75% of the public safety fee collected (wireless post-paid, VoIP, and prepaid) to each county and/or PSAP as established by each local jurisdiction for use at the discretion of each local jurisdiction according to A.C.A. § 12-10-323.</p> <p>2) The AR 911 Board reimbursed each county and/or PSAP as established by each local jurisdiction a portion of the annual maintenance cost on call handling equipment. The allowable reimbursement amount for each jurisdiction is determined based on the wireless and VoIP call percentage for each jurisdiction.</p> <p>3) The AR 911 Board reimbursed equipment upgrade costs to counties/PSAPs (if funds have not previously been expended by the county/PSAP) based on the wireless call percentage for the respective county/PSAP. (Note: During the 2009 legislative session, existing code was amended to increase the quarterly PSAP distribution amount to 83.5% of the total amount remitted to the AR ETS Board. As a result of this change, funding for reimbursement of 911 equipment costs would no longer be available. At the time of the 2009 legislative change, a snapshot of the funds available for reimbursement was taken, and the AR ETS Board agreed that to ensure that the funds held were distributed fairly and equitably between the PSAPs the fund would be divided between the counties/PSAPs based on population. A database file was established reflecting the amount that was available for each county/PSAP, and that file has been updated and maintained as each county/PSAP has submitted requests for reimbursement as 911 equipment upgrades have been completed.)</p> <p>4) ACT 442 of the 2013 Legislative Session created the Arkansas 911 Rural Enhancement Program Fund to assist in the advancement of goals for universal 911 service throughout the state. The Arkansas Calling Plan Fund was to receive a maximum of four million five hundred thousand dollars (\$4,500,000) per year to assist in funding the provision of calling plans in telephone exchanges in the state. Also there was created an AHCF allocation from the Arkansas Call Plan Fund to be known as the 'Arkansas 911 Rural Enhancement Program Fund'. The Arkansas 911 Rural Enhancement Program Fund received a maximum of three million dollars (\$3,000,000) per year to:</p> <p>(A) Advance the goals of universal service and help ensure that rural areas within the State of Arkansas had access to 911 services as comparable to 911 services in urban areas within the state; and</p> <p>(B) Provide funding to:</p> <p>(1) The statewide Smart911 system established in Acts 2012, No. 213;</p> <p>(2) The SmartPrepare System; and</p> <p>(3) 911 administrative systems for emergency management under the Arkansas Emergency Services Act of 1973, § 12-33 75-101 et seq</p> <p>Three million dollars (\$3,000,000) was to be transferred annually from the AHCF to the Arkansas Department of Emergency Management on a quarterly basis for the Arkansas 911 Rural Enhancement Program to fund:</p> <p>(A) The statewide Smart911 system in the amount of six hundred thousand dollars (\$600,000) annually;</p> <p>(B) The SmartPrepare System in the amount of two hundred twenty-five thousand dollars (\$225,000) annually;</p> <p>(C) The 911 administration system for emergency management under the Arkansas Emergency Services Act of 1973, § 12-75-101 et seq., in the amount of one hundred seventy-five thousand dollars \$175,000 annually; and</p> <p>(D) Arkansas counties for 911 public safety answering points in the amount of two million dollars (\$2,000,000) annually.</p> <p>The \$2,000,000 for the counties was to be distributed based on county population as follows:</p> |

| State | Statement Describing Use of Funds   |
|-------|---|
|       | <p>(1) The twenty-five (25) least-populated counties received equal portions of fifty percent of the available funds;<br/> (2) The next twenty-five (25) least-populated counties received equal portions of thirty-five percent (35%) of the available funds;<br/> and<br/> (3) The remaining twenty-five (25) counties shall receive equal portions of fifteen percent (15%) of the available funds.<br/> County population was calculated based on current data from the Geography Division of the United States Bureau of the Census</p>  |
| AZ    | [No Response]   |
| CA    | <p>Pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code Section 41136. The State of California provides funding for recognized Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) in the state of California that provide 9-1-1 services. Specifically, funding is used in support of:<br/> A basic system, defined as 911 systems, including, but not limited to, Next Generation 911, and the subsequent technologies, and interfaces needed to deliver 911 voice and data information from the 911 caller to the emergency responder, and the subsequent technologies and interfaces needed to send information, including, but not limited to, alerts and warnings, to potential 911 callers. Paying reimbursements and refunds authorized by this part.<br/> Paying the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration for the cost of the administration of this part.<br/> Paying the Office of Emergency Services for its costs in administration of the '9-1-1' emergency telephone number system.<br/> Paying bills submitted to the Office of Emergency Services by service suppliers or communications equipment companies for the installation of, and ongoing expenses for, the following communications services supplied to local agencies in connection with the '9-1-1' emergency phone number system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Network Costs; Legacy and Next Gen 9-1-1</li> <li>• Customer Premise Equipment (CPE) Costs</li> <li>• Database Costs (ALI)</li> <li>• Training costs for PSAPs, Max \$20,000 per PSAP per fiscal year</li> <li>• Review and analysis of new technology (NG9-1-1 etc.)</li> <li>• Deployment of Next Generation 9-1-1</li> <li>• Foreign language interpretation services for 9-1-1 emergency calls</li> <li>• Data Sharing between PSAPs and other advanced technologies in the 9-1-1 call flow</li> <li>• Geographic Information Systems</li> </ul>  |
| CO    | <p>We are unable to provide a full list of activities, programs, and organizations that receive funding from each of Colorado's 57 local 9-1-1 governing bodies, which have the authority to direct spending as they see fit, provided the spending is in compliance with § 29-11-104, C.R.S. No 9-1-1 funds are expended by the state, other than to pay the administrative costs of administering the state 9-1-1 surcharge and wireless prepaid 9-1-1 charge.</p>  |
| CT    | [No Response]   |
| DE    | <p>Per Delaware Code Title 16 Chapter 101 Subsection 10104. Disbursements from the Fund.</p> <p>(a) Disbursements from the Fund shall be made for the following purposes.</p> <p>(1) Nonrecurring costs, including but not limited to costs for purchasing and installing the customer premises terminal equipment ("CPE") required to establish or upgrade public safety answering points, purchasing E-911 network equipment or upgrading equipment as required to ensure proper functioning of the E-911 service and related software, developing wireless data bases, and initial training in the use of CPE equipment.</p> <p>(2) Recurring costs, including but not limited to costs for network access fees and other telephone charges, software, equipment, data base management, maintenance and improvement, public education, language translation services, ongoing training in the use of CPE equipment, and network and equipment maintenance.</p> <p>(3) Expenses of the Board and the Department of Safety and Homeland Security incurred under this chapter for the purposes of administering the Fund and expenses incurred in connection with the Board's responsibilities under Chapter 100 of this title.</p> <p>(b) Each county shall receive an amount from the Fund equal to \$0.50 per month, less the costs identified in § 10103(g) of this title, for each residence exchange access line or residential Basic Rate Interface ("BRI") ISDN arrangement from which the monthly surcharge is collected in that county or the amount received by that county in calendar year 2000 from telephone providers from E-911 surcharges, whichever is greater. Disbursements from the Fund shall be made to the counties by the fifteenth day of the month following the month in which the wireline residential surcharges are deposited into the Fund by the provider. The amount disbursed to a county for any calendar year shall be subject to a true up at the end of the such year to reflect the amount received by the county in calendar year 2000 from E-911 surcharges but only in the event that such amount is greater than the amount disbursed from the Fund to the county in the current calendar year. The counties shall use these revenues to offset the costs incurred by them in connection with the administration, staffing, street addressing, necessary capital equipment, and training necessary to support the provision of E-911 emergency reporting service. Costs incurred shall be verified by an annual audit as directed by the Board</p> |
| FL    | <p>Florida Statutes establish and implement a comprehensive statewide emergency number telecommunications system that provides users of dialing 911 within the state with rapid, direct access to public safety agencies. Pursuant to Florida Statutes, the State 911 Plan and administrative rules provide for the 911 fee revenue to be allocated to counties. Counties may use the fee revenue to contract 911 services, such as Next Generation 911 (NG911). The allocated fee revenue pays certain cost for county and local jurisdiction public safety answering points, NG911, E911, and 911 systems. 911 service includes the functions of database management, call-taking, location verification, and call-transferring. Department of Health certification, recertification, and training costs for 911 public safety telecommunications, including dispatching, are functions of 911 services. This statewide system and the State 911 Plan, including individual county 911 plans and 911 functions, ensure that the 911 systems are operational and that they are being upgraded and maintained in all counties throughout Florida. The Board administration receives funds for operating costs and expenses incurred for managing, administering, and overseeing the receipts and disbursements from the Fund and for other activities as defined in section 365.172(6), Florida Statutes.</p>   |
| GA    | <p>(f) (1) In addition to cost recovery as provided in subsection (e) of this Code section, money from the Emergency Telephone System Fund shall be used only to pay for:</p> <p>(A) The lease, purchase, or maintenance of emergency telephone equipment, including necessary computer hardware, software, and</p>   |

| State | Statement Describing Use of Funds  |
|-------|--|
|       | <p>data base provisioning; addressing; and nonrecurring costs of establishing a 9-1-1 system;</p> <p>(B) The rates associated with the service supplier's 9-1-1 service and other service supplier's recurring charges;</p> <p>(C) The actual cost, according to generally accepted accounting principles, of salaries and employee benefits incurred by the local government for employees hired by the local government solely for the operation and maintenance of the emergency 9-1-1 system and employees who work as directors as that term is defined in Code Section 46-5-138.2, whether such employee benefits are purchased directly from a third-party insurance carrier, funded by the local government's self-funding risk program, or funded by the local government's participation in a group self-insurance fund. As used in this paragraph, the term 'employee benefits' means health benefits, disability benefits, death benefits, accidental death and dismemberment benefits, pension benefits, retirement benefits, workers' compensation, and such other benefits as the local government may provide. Said term shall also include any post-employment benefits the local government may provide;</p> <p>(D) The actual cost, according to generally accepted accounting principles, of training employees hired by the local government solely for the operation and maintenance of the emergency 9-1-1 system and employees who work as directors as that term is defined in Code Section 46-5-138.2;</p> <p>(E) Office supplies of the public safety answering points used directly in providing emergency 9-1-1 system services;</p> <p>(F) The cost of leasing or purchasing a building used as a public safety answering point. Moneys from the fund shall not be used for the construction or lease of an emergency 9-1-1 system building until the local government has completed its street addressing plan;</p> <p>(G) The lease, purchase, or maintenance of computer hardware and software used at a public safety answering point, including computer-assisted dispatch systems and automatic vehicle location systems;</p> <p>(H) Supplies directly related to providing emergency 9-1-1 system services, including the cost of printing emergency 9-1-1 system public education materials; and</p> <p>(I) The lease, purchase, or maintenance of logging recorders used at a public safety answering point to record telephone and radio traffic.</p> <p>(2) (A) In addition to cost recovery as provided in subsection (e) of this Code section, money from the Emergency Telephone System Fund may be used to pay for those purposes set forth in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, if:</p> <p>(i) The local government's 9-1-1 system provides enhanced 9-1-1 service;</p> <p>(ii) The revenues from the 9-1-1 charges or wireless enhanced 9-1-1 charges in the local government's Emergency Telephone System Fund at the end of any fiscal year shall be projected to exceed the cost of providing enhanced 9-1-1 services as authorized in subparagraphs (A) through (I) of paragraph (1) of this subsection and the cost of providing enhanced 9-1-1 services as authorized in subparagraphs (A) through (I) of paragraph (1) of this subsection includes a reserve amount equal to at least 10 percent of the previous year's expenditures; and</p> <p>(iii) Funds for such purposes are distributed pursuant to an intergovernmental agreement between the local governments whose citizens are served by the emergency 9-1-1 system proportionately by population as determined by the most recent decennial census published by the United States Bureau of the Census at the time such agreement is entered into.</p> <p>(B) Pursuant to subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, the Emergency Telephone System Fund may be used to pay for:</p> <p>(i) The actual cost, according to generally accepted accounting principles, of insurance purchased by the local government to insure against the risks and liability in the operation and maintenance of the emergency 9-1-1 system on behalf of the local government or on behalf of employees hired by the local government solely for the operation and maintenance of the emergency 9-1-1 system and employees who work as directors as that term is defined in Code Section 46-5-138.2, whether such insurance is purchased directly from a third-party insurance carrier, funded by the local government's self-funding risk program, or funded by the local government's participation in a group self-insurance fund. As used in this division, the term 'cost of insurance' shall include, but shall not be limited to, any insurance premiums, unit fees, and broker fees paid for insurance obtained by the local government;</p> <p>(ii) The lease, purchase, or maintenance of a mobile communications vehicle and equipment, if the primary purpose and designation of such vehicle is to function as a backup 9-1-1 system center;</p> <p>(iii) The allocation of indirect costs associated with supporting the 9-1-1 system center and operations as identified and outlined in an indirect cost allocation plan approved by the local governing authority that is consistent with the costs allocated within the local government to both governmental and business-type activities;</p> <p>(iv) The lease, purchase, or maintenance of mobile public safety voice and data equipment, geo-targeted text messaging alert systems, or towers necessary to carry out the function of 9-1-1 system operations; and</p> <p>(v) The lease, purchase, or maintenance of public safety voice and data communications systems located in the 9-1-1 system facility that further the legislative intent of providing the highest level of emergency response service on a local, regional, and state-wide basis, including equipment and associated hardware and software that support the use of public safety wireless voice and data communication systems.</p> |
| HI    | <p>For Calendar Year 2023, The State of Hawaii Enhanced 911 Board has not funded any activities, programs, and organizations that would be in violation of Chapter 138 of Hawaii Revised Statutes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Purchase and maintenance of all necessary computer hardware and software to provide technical functionality for Enhanced 911 Services.</li> <li>- Maintenance and Telecommunications Expenses.</li> <li>- Training of personnel for any New and Emerging Technologies related to Enhanced 911 Services.</li> <li>- Enhanced 911 Communications Service cost allowed to be reimbursed in relation to Chapter 138 Hawaii Revised Statutes Section 138-4.</li> <li>- Enhanced 911 Board Administrative costs including travel, consulting, and telecommunications.</li> </ul>   |
| IA    | <p>The State collects wireless and prepaid surcharge remittances on a quarterly basis. The State passes 60% of the collected surcharge to the local 911 service boards based on a formula of square mileage the service board is responsible for, and call counts. Wireless surcharge is also used to fund the administration of the 911 Program by Homeland Security and Emergency Management.</p> <p>Local 911 Service Boards directly collect Wireline Surcharge.</p> <p>In all cases, 911 surcharge is to be used for the receipt and disposition of a 911 call.</p> <p>The State also pays recurring costs for transport costs between legacy selective routers and PSAPs. The State pays for ALI database</p>  |

| State | Statement Describing Use of Funds  |
|-------|--|
|       | <p>information on a quarterly basis. The state reimburses wireless carriers for up to 10% of the surcharge generated to recover their actual costs associated with Phase 1 delivery. This will sunset in 2026 per Iowa Code.</p> <p>The State has a contract with Comtech Telecommunications System for Next-Gen Core Services to the PSAPs, ESInet monitoring and management of NG911 in Iowa. This includes two call logic centers.</p> <p>The State utilizes the Iowa Communications Network for the ESInet.</p> <p>The State has also entered into a contract with GeoComm to provide end-to-end GIS services as part of Next Gen upgrades. County 911 Service Boards submit their data to the statewide portal as needed as part of the overall GIS project.</p> <p>The State has a contract with Zetron to provide Customer Premise Equipment (CPE) at little to no charge to PSAPs wishing to opt into a host/remote call-taking environment. However, local jurisdictions are able to select vendors for their internal PSAP systems (CAD, CPE, recorder etc.)</p> <p>HSEMD offered local jurisdictions GIS grants for the purpose of NG911 GIS data creation, remediation, and maintenance. The total available to counties was \$12,000 per PSAP once data accuracy benchmarks were reached.</p> <p>There is also \$100,000 statewide allocated to 911 Council member travel, Public Education, and telecommunicator training. Any unused State funds are passed through to the PSAPs for expenses associated with the receipt and disposition of 911 calls.</p>   |
| ID    | <p>Expended funds are 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</p>  |
| IL    | <p>The State's 9-1-1 fees support all 9-1-1 related activities throughout the State. The majority of the fees collected are passed through from the State to local, inter-governmental and county 9-1-1 Authorities to support their 9-1-1 operation. These funds may be used for 9-1-1 expenditures as legislatively defined and can include Telecommunicator salaries, 9-1-1 equipment costs, lease expenses, radio system infrastructure and mapping expenses, etc. The State pays 9-1-1 System Providers directly for 9-1-1 network expenses incurred by the local and county 9-1-1 Systems.</p>   |
| IN    | <p>The Statewide 911 Board expended funds as follows: 1. To pay the board's expenses in administering [sic] this chapter and to 2. Develop, operate and maintain a statewide 911 system. The Statewide 911 system is the public safety ESInet operated on behalf of the board by an independent contractor. The public safety ESInet receives all wireless 911 calls from every carrier and routes the calls to the appropriate PSAP. The network is also used for Text to 911 services. The Statewide 911 Board distributes funds to the county auditor in each of the 92 counties. The counties fiscal body (county council) has the statutory authority for the appropriation of funds. The executive branch (county commissioners) have the statutory authority to approve claims for payment from the appropriated funds. IC 36-8-16-7-38 (see 2A above) restricts the use of the 911 funds at the local level.</p>   |
| KS    | <p>K.S.A. 12-5375 Collected [sic] 911 fees were utilized by the PSAPs for purchases totaling \$24,512,422.41 in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation of 911 services – 3.1% of total expenditures</li> <li>• Purchase of 911 equipment and upgrades – 13.5% of total expenditures</li> <li>• Maintenance and license fees for 911 equipment – 31.2% of total expenditures</li> <li>• Training of PSAP personnel – 1.9% of total expenditures</li> <li>• Monthly recurring charges billed by service suppliers – 46.9% of total expenditures</li> <li>• Installation, service establishment and nonrecurring start-up charges billed by the service supplier – 1.2% of total expenditures</li> <li>• Charges for capital improvements and equipment or other physical enhancements to the 911 system – 2.2% of total expenditures</li> <li>• The original acquisition and installation of road signs designed to aid in the delivery of emergency service – 0.0% of total expenditures</li> </ul> <p>Additionally, the Council expended \$13,230,980, in state operation funds on the following statewide projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statewide NG911 System – 86.7%</li> <li>• Council Admin and other expenses – 2.9%</li> <li>• NG911 Program Support Services – 6.3%</li> <li>• GIS and program technical support – 4.1%</li> </ul>  |
| KY    | <p>The expenditure of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes by the Kentucky 911 Services Board is controlled by a statutory formula. The organizations that receive the greatest share of funds are the local PSAPs, which have been certified by the Board as meeting the statutory and regulatory standards required to receive (and appropriately deliver) a wireless 911 call. 85% of the \$40 million collected annually is sent directly to PSAPs through a statutory formula to pay for operational costs, including payments to vendors for services or equipment, personnel costs and more as prescribed by regulation. These organizations represent the core of 911 service, answering the public's 911 calls and dispatching the appropriate emergency response. Certified PSAPs currently stand at 117, including all 16 state police posts throughout the state.</p> <p>7.5 percent of funds received are deposited into a grant fund, awarded at the Board's discretion for PSAP consolidation and through an annual competitive process for equipment and/or services as allowed by 202 KAR 6:090. The Board has also used this grant program to direct PSAPs in need of 911 controller upgrades to Host/Remote solutions which allow for the consolidation of PSAP equipment while promoting autonomy in the physical PSAP.</p> <p>5% of wireless funds expended by the Board go to restricted Next Generation 911 Technology fund for Board-funded, statewide NG911 projects and services.</p> <p>2.5% portion of funds collected from the state's wireless 911 fee goes to pay the 911 Services Board administrative budget. Board members are not compensated but reimbursed for travel expenses. This fund pays for staff salaries and basic office expenses. They are also used for contracts for 1) statewide mapping, 2) geo-audits of local PSAPs (QA), 3) legal expenses, 4) financial audits of the Board, PSAPs and wireless providers and 4) consulting services for the development of and migration to a statewide ESI Network (NG 911).</p> |
| LA    | <p>Within Louisiana Revised Statutes 33:9101 through 33:9129, parish governing bodies were granted the authority to create Communications Districts by ordinance. Once created, Communications Districts became political subdivisions of the state. By statute,</p>   |

| State | Statement Describing Use of Funds   |
|-------|---|
|       | <p>these districts were created for the express purpose of implementing and maintaining the 9-1-1 emergency reporting systems. It also gave districts the authority to provide for other communication enhancements, which will enable law enforcement and public safety agencies to decrease response time and improve effectiveness, when citizens call for help in an emergency. Furthermore, provisions of the statutes allow for the funding of Next Generation 9-1-1, Enhanced 9-1-1, 9-1-1 call taking, dispatch, and telecommunication systems for first responders and for other lawful purposes of communications districts.</p> <p>As outlined within the existing statutes, LA R. S. 33:9105 the 9-1-1 emergency telephone systems in the state shall be designed to have the capability of utilizing at least one of the following four methods in response to emergency calls:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) 'Direct dispatch method', that is a telephone service to a centralized dispatch center providing for the dispatch of an appropriate emergency service unit upon receipt of a telephone request for such services and a decision as to the proper action to be taken.</li> <li>(2) 'Relay method', that is a telephone service whereby pertinent information is noted by the recipient of a telephone request for emergency services, and is relayed to appropriate public safety agencies or other providers of emergency services for dispatch of an emergency service unit.</li> <li>(3) 'Transfer method', that is a telephone service that receives telephone requests for emergency services and directly transfers such requests to an appropriate public safety agency or other provider of emergency services.</li> <li>(4) 'Referral method', that is a telephone service that, upon the receipt of a telephone request for emergency services, provides the requesting party with the telephone number of the appropriate public safety agency or other provider of emergency services.</li> </ol> <p>The governing authority of the district shall select the method that it determines to be the most feasible for the parish. The enactment of Act 550 of 1983 confirmed that Louisiana had elected to implement its 9-1-1 systems on a parish-by-parish basis. Furthermore, the incorporation of four general methods of operation was a recognition that the needs and abilities of the parishes varied.</p> <p>Funding of 9-1-1 systems in Louisiana is primarily through the imposition of an emergency telephone service fee on each telephone subscriber. The fee is reflected on the subscriber's phone bill and is collected by the service provider, who remits the surcharge fee to the Communications District. As a political subdivision of the state of Louisiana, Communications Districts have the authority to also levy property tax or sales tax when so authorized by a vote of a majority of the persons voting within the district in accordance with law. In order to provide additional funding for the district, the governing authority may receive federal, state, parish, or municipal funds, as well as funds from private sources and may expend such funds for the purposes as outlined within the statute.</p> |
| MA    | <p>Funds collected have been made available for the following activities, programs, and communities in Massachusetts for network, database and CPE; PSAP personnel; PSAP facilities; PSAP CAD and technology; dispatcher training; training materials, emergency medical dispatch reference protocol systems, and PSAP equipment. These funds have been made available to the communities by the Department directly purchasing, installing and maintaining next generation 911 customer premises equipment used by communities at local and regional PSAPs and through the Department developing and administering grant programs to assist PSAPs and regional emergency communications centers in providing next generation 911 service and fostering the development of regional PSAPs, regional secondary PSAPs and regional emergency communications centers. Funds collected have also been expended for the Department's training and public education programs, for Department's disability access programs, and for administrative costs required to support all programs. These activities and programs support 911 and next generation 911 services by providing funding for PSAPs to meet the minimum training and certification requirements for E911 telecommunicators, including emergency medical dispatch requirements, and are used for the support of 911.</p>   |
| MD    | <p>The Maryland 9-1-1 Trust Fund may be used by any county (including the independent jurisdiction of Baltimore City) for enhancements to 9-1-1 in a process defined in Maryland Public Safety Article §1-309, and is typically used for PSAP telephone equipment, logging recorders, emergency standby electrical power, security, cybersecurity, mapping, furniture, system maintenance, recurring network charges and training. Application for funds must be made by the county PSAP director, and approved by the majority of voting members present at a public session of the Maryland 9-1-1 Board. The Maryland 9-1-1 Board is defined under Maryland Public Safety Article §1-305 and §1-306.</p> <p>County Funds are passed through the state to each county and the independent jurisdiction of Baltimore City in the same percentage collected from the vendor on a quarterly basis. These funds are used to offset operational and maintenance costs for each PSAP.</p>  |
| ME    | <p>The State of Maine has a statewide 911 system. In 2014 the system was upgraded to an end-to-end NENA i3 aligned NG911 system. In 2020, the system went through a total refresh. The Emergency Services Communication Bureau administers the program, which includes a contract for NG911 Services. This contract provides for a single NG911 system that serves every municipality and Indian Reservation in the state. It includes all network and database services, customer premise equipment at each of the 25 municipal, state or county Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs), and 24 x 7 support and maintenance. There is no funding that flows through to the PSAPs or to municipalities, counties or state agencies for other purposes.</p> <p>For calendar year 2023, funds were expended or obligated for the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative expenses of the Emergency Services Communication Bureau--the state agency responsible for implementing and managing the statewide 911 system</li> <li>• Statewide Contract for NG911 Services--serves all 25 PSAPs</li> <li>• Quality Assurance Program</li> <li>• Consulting Services for 911 crisis response protocol and procedures planning, and NG911 planning</li> <li>• Community Addressing and Mapping Support necessary for NG911</li> <li>• Training and related expenses for 911 Call Takers and Dispatchers including topics such as NG911 software certification and Basic Dispatcher</li> <li>• Emergency Medical Dispatch Protocols--training, software, certification, licensing and administrative costs</li> <li>• Emergency Fire Dispatch Protocols--training, software, certification and administrative costs</li> <li>• Reimbursement of telephone companies for ALI/LIS data base provisioning</li> <li>• Grants to support consolidation of dispatch only emergency communications centers (secondary PSAPs) into Primary PSAPs</li> </ul>  |
| MI    | <p>Under MCL 484.1408(4) Statutory distribution of the state 911 fee is distributed as follows:<br/> 65% goes to counties to fund 911 operations.<br/> 25.56% is used to pay the 911 service providers for the delivery of calls to the PSAPs under Michigan Public Service Commission</p>  |

| State  | Statement Describing Use of Funds   |  |          |   |        |                             |        |
|--|---|--|----------|---|--------|-----------------------------|--------|
|  | <p>(MPSC) Docket U-14000 and for IP-based 911 (NG911) under MPSC docket U-20146.<br/>           5.5% is for PSAP training funds.<br/>           1.5% funds the Michigan State Police PSAPs.<br/>           2.44% funds the State 911 Office.<br/>           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.’<br/>           MCL 484.1408(4)(a) also authorizes the SNC to require repayment of the use of funds considered unreasonable or unnecessary, ‘...A county shall use money received by the county under this subdivision for 911 services as allowed under this act. A county shall repay to the fund any money expended under this subdivision for a purpose considered unnecessary or unreasonable by the committee or the auditor general.’</p>   |  |          |   |        |                             |        |
| MN   | <p>Funds may be used by PSAPs to maintain and enhance public safety for public safety responders and citizens of Minnesota as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lease, purchase, lease-purchase, or maintain enhanced 911 telephone equipment</li> <li>• Lease, purchase, lease-purchase, or maintain enhanced 911 recording equipment</li> <li>• Lease, purchase, lease-purchase, or maintain enhanced 911 computer hardware</li> <li>• Computer hardware/software for database provisioning, addressing, mapping and any other software necessary for automatic phone and location identification</li> <li>• Trunk lines</li> <li>• Master Street Address Guide and Statewide geospatial dataset creation/aggregation/standardization</li> <li>• Dispatcher operational skills and equipment proficiency training</li> <li>• Equipment in the PSAP for community alert systems</li> <li>• Equipment necessary in the PSAP used to notify and communicate with emergency services requested by the 911</li> </ul>  |  |          |   |        |                             |        |
| MO   | <p>The Missouri 911 Service Board utilizes its fundss [sic] to provide grants and loans to local PSAPs to enhance 911 service in their area, this only includes equipment. Local 911 fees are utilized to support their 911 operations.</p>   |  |          |   |        |                             |        |
| MS   | <p>[No Response]</p>  |  |          |   |        |                             |        |
| MT   | <p>Wireless Provider E9-1-1 Cost Recovery and local and tribal governments PSAP operational expenditures</p>  |  |          |   |        |                             |        |
| NC   | <p>The NC 911 Board provides funding of the collected 911 fee totally for the support of E911 within the State of North Carolina. Funds collected were allocated during the calendar year 2023 to: 114 primary PSAPs and 11 secondary PSAPs for the costs of providing E911 services in their jurisdictions; two CMRS providers for cost recovery of providing E911; 23 PSAP grants for the enhancement of their 911 systems; 8 Statewide projects to benefit all PSAPs in North Carolina; and the administrative fund of the NC 911 Board to pay for the costs of administering the 911 fund. In each allocation of collected 911 funds, the North Carolina General Statutes clearly state that the expenditures must be in support of providing E911 services. Those expenditures are reviewed and approved by the 911 Board staff and reviewed by the North Carolina State Auditor.</p>  |  |          |   |        |                             |        |
| ND   | <p>[No Response]</p>  |  |          |   |        |                             |        |
| NE   | <p>911 surcharge revenues collected on landline and VoIP service funds are utilized under the discretion of the local authority for the purchase, installation, maintenance, and operation of telecommunications equipment and telecommunications-related services required for the provision of 911 service. The Public Service Commission does not have access to information regarding specific local expenditures.</p> <p>The Nebraska Public Service Commission utilizes 911 surcharge revenues collected on wireless service to (1) provide direct funding to 68 public safety answering points to pay costs incurred to provide 911 service across the state; (2) reimburse wireless service providers to implement enhanced 911 service in the State of Nebraska; (3) pay the cost to establish and maintain Text-to-911 service; (4) pay the costs for a statewide ESInet and NG 911 Core Services, (5) pay the cost of selective routing and database management services provided to PSAPs by local exchange carriers, (6) pay the cost of developing statewide GIS data to enhance 911 call routing and location accuracy, (7) pay consulting costs associated with the transition to next-generation 911 (‘NG911’), (8) pay for a statewide MIS reporting service available to all Nebraska PSAPs, and (9) pay administrative costs.</p>   |  |          |   |        |                             |        |
| NH   | <p>The Division of Emergency Services and Communications operates New Hampshire’s statewide 911 system, along with affiliated GIS/mapping, database, special projects, technical support, administrative, and radio communications maintenance roles. The mission of the Division of Emergency Services and Communications is ‘to locate, communicate, and connect people in an emergency with the help they need’.</p> <p>The vision of the Division of Emergency Services and Communications is to ‘Achieve seamless emergency communications for all through [sic] emerging technology and collaborative information sharing.’</p> <p>The Division of Emergency Services and Communications provides instant access to police, fire and emergency medical assistance from any wired, cellular or VoIP telephone in the state. The Division provides all network connections, equipment and training on its use at the local dispatch centers. For those local dispatch centers that choose to use it, the Division provides CAD software or interfaces with software for call handling.</p> <p>The Division also provides mapping and addressing services to the cities and towns, including all roads, streets, highways, and interstates as well as building addresses. The New Hampshire E911 system provides a [sic] internationally-accredited, state-of-the-art emergency service response to residents and visitors to the state.</p> |  |          |   |        |                             |        |
| NJ   | <p>9-1-1 SYSTEM and EMERGENCY RESPONSE FEE (thousands) The revenue from the mobile telecommunications service and telephone exchange service fee in calendar year 2023 totals \$131,187,673.63 The estimated revenue from the mobile telecommunications service and telephone exchange service fee in fiscal year 2024 totals \$128.0 million. In accordance with the enabling legislation (P.L. 2004, c.48), these funds will be deposited into the 9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Trust Fund account and applied to offset a portion of the cost of related programs listed below:</p> <p>Department of Law and Public Safety</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">Emergency Operations Center and Hamilton TechPlex Maintenance.....</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 3,473</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness.....</td> <td style="text-align: right;">14,982</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">Rural Section Policing.....</td> <td style="text-align: right;">87,002</td> </tr> </table>   | Emergency Operations Center and Hamilton TechPlex Maintenance..... | \$ 3,473 | Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness..... | 14,982 | Rural Section Policing..... | 87,002 |
| Emergency Operations Center and Hamilton TechPlex Maintenance..... | \$ 3,473  |  |          |   |        |                             |        |
| Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness.....                  | 14,982  |  |          |   |        |                             |        |
| Rural Section Policing.....  | 87,002  |  |          |   |        |                             |        |

| State | Statement Describing Use of Funds   |
|-------|---|
|       | <p>Urban Search and Rescue..... 1,000<br/> Division [sic] of State Police - Remaining Operating Budget..... 337,742</p> <p>Department of Military and Veterans' Affairs<br/> Military Services - National Guard Support Services..... 6,102</p> <p>Department of the Treasury<br/> Office of Emergency Telecommunications Services (OETS)..... 920<br/> Public Safety Answering Point Upgrades and Consolidation..... 10,000<br/> Statewide 9-1-1 Emergency Telecommunications System..... 13,822</p> <p>Total, State Appropriations..... \$ 475,043</p>  |
| NM    | <p>The E-911 Program provides funding for the purchase, lease, installation and maintenance of E911 equipment, telecommunicator training, database preparation, database updates, compliance with federal communications commission (FCC) requirements for phase I and phase II wireless E911 service, and E911 network costs as necessary for an E911 system. The E-911 Bureau establishes grant agreements with 41 PSAP's (Public Service Answering Points) through their fiscal agent. 42 PSAPs include municipilii [sic] and county operated PSAPs, tribal PSAPs, and State Police PSAPs.</p>   |
| NV    | <p>Monthly Carrier System Charges, Equipment upgrades, CAD maintenance, recording system maintenance, body cams, training, 911 system upgrade assessments, and 911 group memberships.</p>   |
| NY    | <p>The Enhanced Emergency Telephone System Surcharge and Wireless Emergency Communications Surcharge are managed entirely within the local unit of government. OIEC does not have the authority to require reporting by local governments and therefore cannot identify with specificity all activities, programs, and organizations supported by the county surcharges.</p>  |
| OH    | <p>State collected funds from the 25 cent cell phone surcharge are used as follows:<br/> 1% kept by Department of Taxation to process fund collection and disbursement<br/> 2% to fund ESINet Steering Committee and DAS Ohio 9-1-1 Program Office<br/> 97% Disbursed to county by formula originally developed by the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio. These funds are used for 9-1-1 equipment, training, personnel, etc. as per Ohio Revised Code 128.57<br/> *Local funding (levies, sales tax, general funds, etc.) make up the bulk of funding for local 9-1-1 operations</p>   |
| OK    | <p>Both Wireline and Wireless fees can be used for services, equipment and operations of the 9-1-1 Emergency Telephone System. The fee can be used for equipment and services needed to connect the voice call to the 9-1-1 center and provide accurate location data to the Emergency Telecommunicator. This includes connections fees, trunk lines, 9-1-1 equipment, GIS services, etc. The fee can also be used for operations of the 9-1-1 Emergency Telephone system which can include ancillary systems to manage the emergency telephone call and the salary and benefits of the 9-1-1 call takers, technical or administrative staff. A Public Safety Answering Point must meet four Statutory requirements in order to receive wireless funding (§63-2864.4). They include; providing Phase II wireless services; meet NENA standards for call taking and caller location services; comply with reports and audits; comply with the requirements of the 9-1-1 Management Authority Act or procedures established by the Authority.</p>   |
| OR    | <p>The 9-1-1 tax collected by the Department of Revenue which funds the 0.6%, 2.4%, 35%, and 60% (remaining) described in section C, question number 3, may only be spent by the state or the local jurisdiction on behalf of the Primary PSAP in order to provide access to 9-1-1 for the citizens of and visitors to the State of Oregon</p>  |
| PA    | <p>Per 35 Pa.C.S. § 5304, each county is to ensure the provision of a 911 system in the county's respective jurisdiction. Pennsylvania counties are the primary recipients and beneficiaries of funds collected for 911 purposes. A county may provide a 911 system to the county's jurisdiction through participation in a regional 911 system. Of the 911 revenue collected, at least eighty-three (83) percent is directed to Pennsylvania counties via quarterly formula based payments. Fifteen (15) percent shall be used to establish, enhance, operate or maintain statewide interconnectivity of 911 systems including next generation 911 service in Pennsylvania. Up to two (2) percent of revenue collections may be retained by the PA Emergency Management Agency to pay for agency expenses directly related to administering the provisions of the 911 legislation. All 911 surcharge revenue is restricted to 911 use only for 911 system operations, systems, and services.</p>   |
| RI    | <p>As noted in question 2, monthly surcharges on devices with connectivity to the Rhode Island E-911 Uniform Emergency Telephone System are authorized in accordance with state law, to wit: RIGL §39- 21.1-14, RIGL §39-21.2-4. Effective October 1, 2019 all surcharge revenue is deposited into a restricted receipt account as the exclusive revenue source of the Rhode Island E-911 agency. The expenditure of funds is authorized by the Rhode Island State Legislature, State of Rhode Island Budget Office, and the Rhode Island Department of Public Safety.<br/> Statutory language provides that 100% of funds allocated to RI E-911 collected are deposited into a restricted receipt account. RIGL §39-21.1-14(d).<br/> The FY 2023 budget running from July 1, 2022 thru June 30, 2023 was \$8,468,710. Personnel costs accounted for 75.5% of our budget amounting to \$6,394,455 and operating costs accounting for 24.5% amounting to \$2,071,255. The FY 2024 budget running from July 1, 2023 thru June 30, 2024 is \$9,269,543 with personnel costs amounting to \$6,746,264 and operating costs amounting to \$2,523,279.<br/> Due to the fact that Rhode Island is unique, (strictly a transfer agency), the nodes of our state funded network extend into the local PSAP's for real time call information for proper dispatching.</p> |
| SC    | <p>[No Response]</p>  |
| SD    | <p>Local PSAPs are allowed to expend 911 surcharge funds on personnel costs, CAD, radio, mapping, recorders, workstation equipment, training, consoles, HVAC, building rental maintenance, 911 trunks, and uniforms. Most costs within the walls of the PSAP or directly related to operating 911 are allowable. The purchase, upkeep and utilization of this equipment allows the PSAPs to provide efficient and effective handling of 911 related needs.</p>  |
| TN    | <p>All 911 funds collected in Tennessee are deposited in the state treasury in a separate interest-bearing fund known as the 911</p>  |



| State | Statement Describing Use of Funds   |
|-------|---|
|       | <p>Emergency Communications Fund. Disbursements from this fund are limited solely to the operational and administrative expenses of the TECB and the purposes as expressed in the state emergency communications laws, Tenn. Code Ann. § 7-86-101, et seq. See Tenn. Code Ann. § 7-86-303(d).</p> <p>Authorized operational and administrative expenditures include distribution of the base amount to each ECD, implementation and maintenance of an IP-based NG911 program, and funding to the Tennessee Regulatory Authority for the Tennessee relay services/telecommunications devices access program, which provides assistance to those Tennesseans whose disabilities interfere with their use of communications services and technologies.</p> <p>The TECB annually distributes to each emergency communications district a base amount equal to the average of total recurring annual revenue the district received from distributions from the board and from direct remittance of 911 surcharges for fiscal years 2010, 2011, and 2012. See Tenn. Code Ann. § 7-86-303(e). One-sixth of the base amount for each district is distributed by the TECB bi-monthly. The base amounts for each district in the state can be found on the TECB website, <a href="http://www.tn.gov/commerce/section/e911">http://www.tn.gov/commerce/section/e911</a>.</p>   |
| TX    | <p><b>ACTIVITIES</b></p> <p><b>STATEWIDE 9-1-1 SERVICE:</b> Planning, developing, provisioning, and/or enhancement of 9 1-1 service.</p> <p><b>9-1-1 PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION:</b> Provide for the timely and cost-effective coordination and support of statewide 9-1-1 service by CSEC, including regulatory proceedings, contract management and monitoring, and requirements contained in Health and Safety Code § 771.051.</p> <p><b>EMERGENCY MEDICAL DISPATCH:</b> Support the regional emergency medical dispatch resource center program to ‘provide life-saving and other emergency medical instructions to persons who need guidance while awaiting the arrival of emergency medical personnel ... not to dispatch personnel or equipment resources but to serve as a resource to provide pre-arrival instructions that may be accessed by selected public safety answering points that are not adequately staffed or funded to provide those services.’ (Health and Safety Code § 771.1 02(a)). (Overseen and funded by CSEC with appropriated 9-1-1 and equalization surcharge and administered via Interlocal Agreement by Montgomery County Hospital District.)</p> <p><b>TRAUMA CARE SYSTEM:</b> Support the emergent, unexpected needs of approved licensed providers of emergency medical services (EMS), registered first responder organizations, or licensed hospitals.</p> <p>In 2023, the 88th Texas Legislature recreated the Next Generation 9-1-1 Telemedicine Medical Services Pilot Project. (Overseen and funded by CSEC with appropriated equalization surcharge; and administered via Interagency Agreement by Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center.)</p> <p><b>PROGRAMS</b></p> <p><b>9-1-1 NETWORK OPERATIONS, EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT AND NG 9-1-1 IMPLEMENTATION:</b> CSEC contracts with Regional Planning Commissions (RPCs) or, on their behalf for the efficient operation of the state 9-1-1 emergency telecommunications system; provides the RPCs with contract authorization and funding for the replacement of equipment supporting Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) participating in the state’s 9-1-1 program; and provides for the planning, development, transition and implementation of a statewide Next Generation 9-1-1 (NG9-1-1) system to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of 9-1-1 service.</p> <p>This program supports emergency communications and public health and safety by providing the network, equipment, database, and administration necessary to provide 9 1-1 telecommunications service.</p> <p><b>NEXT GENERATION 9-1-1 IMPLEMENTATION:</b> CSEC provides for the planning, development, transition, and implementation of a State-Level Next Generation 9-1-1 (NG9-1-1) system to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of 9-1-1 service. Functional activities include implementation of (1) a CSEC State-level digital 9-1-1 network, otherwise referred to as the emergency services internet protocol network (ESInet); (2) 9-1-1 geospatial database and data management; (3) NG9-1-1 applications and network security provisions; and (4) standards-based system operations and procedures.</p> <p>For the CSEC state 9-1-1 Program, CSEC is developing and implementing a separate and distinct Next Generation 9-1-1 Program to establish standards and rules for the participating RPCs; including establishing standards for interconnectivity and interoperability with other NG9-1-1 systems. Additionally, CSEC is revising its existing RPC monitoring program as NG9-1-1 evolves to include: Programmatic Financial Audits; RPC 9-1-1 Information Security (InfoSec) Compliance; and NG9-1-1 Data Quality. (Target completion date for both is 2023.)</p> <p>This program supports emergency communications and public health and safety by providing a planned transition to NG9-1-1 to ensure existing 9-1-1 centers and public safety providers are able to provide emergency communications and service to the public with advances in communications devices and systems.</p> <p><b>NEXT GENERATION 9-1-1:</b> Utilizing the NG9-1-1 Fund, funded with federal funds, support the deployment and reliable operation of next generation 9-1-1 service, including the costs of equipment, operations, and administration. Money in the fund may be distributed to CSEC and ECDs and must be used in accordance with federal law. (NG9-1-1 Fund expires on December 31, 2028.)</p> <p><b>ORGANIZATIONS</b></p> <p><b>COMMISSION ON STATE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS (CSEC):</b> Established as a state agency under Texas Health and Safety Code Chapter 771, CSEC is the state’s authority on emergency communications and administers the CSEC state 9-1-1 Program in which 9-1-1 service is provided by 20 Regional Planning Commissions (RPCs). CSEC is directly involved in the RPCs’ provisioning of 9-1-1 service and in the planning, development, transition, and implementation of a State-Level Next Generation 9-1-1 (NG9-1-1) system.</p> <p><b>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSIONS:</b> Established under Texas Local Government Code, Chapter 391. Political subdivisions with whom CSEC is required to contract for the provision of 9-1-1 service. RPCs use state appropriated funds via grants from CSEC to purchase goods and services used to provide provision 9-1-1 service by PSAPs. By state law, use of 9-1-1 fees by an RPC for administration expenses of the CSEC state 9-1-1 Program is capped at \$10,000,000 for the biennium.</p> <p><b>STATUTORY 772 EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION DISTRICTS:</b> The 772 ECD expenditures include ongoing contracts or expenses for Selective Routing, Automatic Location Identification, Customer Premises Equipment, Geographic Information Systems and Mapping, NG9-1-1 transition migration, IP and/or wireless networks, security, legal, regulatory, advocacy, accounting, auditing, emergency notification, training, employer/employee related amounts, and memberships or conferences that support 9-1-1 services</p> |

| State            | Statement Describing Use of Funds  |
|------------------|--|
|                  | <p>and/or enhancements and sponsored by organizations such as the National Emergency Number Association, the Texas Emergency Number Association, and the ATIS Emergency Services Interconnection Forum (ESIF).</p> <p><b>MUNICIPAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION DISTRICTS (INCL. DALLAS COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE):</b> Municipal ECD expenditures are substantially used to purchase, install, maintain 9-1-1 equipment; and staff and operate PSAPs (including consolidated PSAPs/emergency communications centers), including personnel salaries, training of call-takers, dues and subscriptions to professional organizations which enhance the development of 9-1-1 service. Additionally, 9-1-1 funds are used to pay for 9-1-1 network and 9-1-1 database maintenance costs, and reimbursing service providers costs incurred in providing 9-1-1 service. Funds are also used for location services, public education, emergency warning sirens/systems, emergency medical dispatch training and certification, and general support of a Municipal ECDs 9-1-1 division. 9-1-1 funds are often only a minor part of the funding needed to provide 9-1-1 service or operate an emergency communications center.</p> <p><b>9-1-1 ENTITIES GENERALLY</b></p> <p>(Application of the following varies by 9-1-1 entity, including each entity's determination as to whether telecommunicators/dispatchers are part of the costs of providing 9-1-1 service. E.g., for the CSEC state 9-1-1 Program, and most 772 ECDs, telecommunicators/dispatchers salaries/benefits and dispatch costs are not considered costs of providing 9-1-1 service. CSEC and the 772 ECDs do use 9-1-1 funds to pay for telecommunicator training.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operating Costs, Personnel Costs, Administrative Costs, Dispatch Costs</li> <li>• 911 Employees' salaries/benefits, training</li> <li>• Lease/Purchase, installation, operation, and maintenance of PSAP CPE</li> <li>• CAD system, mapping, radios, 911 PR activities, 9-1-1 furniture and equipment. Training, Administrative Assistant (assists with operational functions), IT positions (maintain, install, troubleshoot, and document all 911 technologies). Purchase, installation, operation, maintenance, and upgrade expenses of the 9-1-1 emergency services.</li> <li>• 911 public education program</li> <li>• Maintenance and support of the Emergency Callworks E911 Phone system</li> <li>• City's GIS department to maintain accurate CAD and 911 maps for call and responder routing</li> <li>• Monthly recurring expenses for phone/truck lines for 911 service</li> <li>• Quality assurance associated expenses as relates to 911 service</li> </ul> <p>The City of Dallas uses the collected fees to operate and maintain the operations of the Primary and Secondary 911 Emergency Call Center (PSAPs) for the Dallas Police and Fire Rescue Departments. This includes all telephone circuits, computers and computer accessories, call processing and CAD hardware and software, call recording hardware and software, agent and call statistic reporting software, call and agent statistical dashboards, managed services and the salaries of the staff.</p> <p>City of Denison [sic] uses 9-1-1 fees for employees' salaries, training, equipment maintenance.</p> <p>Town of Highland Park uses all funds and fees directly to supporting 9-1-1. Examples include: maintenance for our phone system and recording system; cyber security; and very limited compensation for personnel.</p> <p>The City of Plano PSC expends funds only for the City of Plano PSC in support of providing E9-1-1 services and NG9-1-1 services. (Salaries, educational supplies and curriculum, travel expenses for 911 educational events, expenses for 911 related training ans [sic] associated travel expenses, computer equipment and software purchases/maintenance for 911, monthly recurring expenses for phone/trunk lines for 911, quality assurance associated expenses)</p> <p>City of Sherman 911 fees collected are used for the operation and maintenance of the emergency telephone/call handling system for public safety in the City of Sherman. The primary activities include personnel, supplies, maintenance and repairs to the 911 system, training, lease and service fees.</p> <p>City of Richardson 911 fees are used to pay for the 911 PSAP equipment, maintenance, support, and telecommunicator salaries.</p> <p>City of Longview E911 fees fund the operation of Public Safety Communications Admin and training teams, cover maintenance and operational fees on our 911 Calltaking system, professional development for all 911 calltakers, and our public education program.</p> <p>City of Wylie reported that per city ordinance, 9-1-1 service fees shall be utilized to provide for the purchase, installation, operation, and maintenance expenses of 9-1-1 services, including required personnel. The 9-1-1 service fee may only be imposed upon service users' local exchange access lines and equivalent local exchange access lines as defined in rulemaking by the Commission on State Emergency Communications. All 9-1-1 funds have been made available or used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism, or otherwise used for the implementation or support of 9-1-1.</p> |
| UT               | <p>Regulations covering the oversight of the Unified Statewide 911 Emergency Service Account are found in Utah Code: 63H-7a-301, et. seq. Utah Communications Authority receives \$.25 per line for the purpose of Next Generation 9-1-1 planning, implementation, and maintenance. \$.01 of that is directly paid to the Utah Geospatial Resource Center for the purpose of GIS and statewide mapping efforts.</p> <p>The E911 fee that UCA received paid for the following activities, programs, and organizations to support 911 and E911 services or enhancements of such services in 2023:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-monthly reoccurring charges for all PSAPs on the UCA statewide NG911 contract.</li> <li>-Text to 911 services for all 27 PSAPs</li> <li>-Funds were dispursed [sic] to qualifying Utah PSAPs per Utah Code: 63H-7a-304.5, for specific performance compliance.</li> </ul>  |
| VA <sup>77</sup> | The Wireless E-911 Fund provides funding for the Virginia Department of Emergency Management's 9-1-1 and Geospatial Services   |

<sup>77</sup> In addition to wireless E911 surcharges, Virginia also collects a landline E911 tax and a Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) E911 tax. Virginia Response at 6, 10-11; *see generally* Virginia Tax, Communications Taxes, <https://www.tax.virginia.gov/communications-taxes> (last visited Dec. 16, 2024). Virginia indicates that it is unable to provide data on these fees or their use. Virginia Response at 3, 6. Based on the materials currently available, the  
(continued....)

| State | Statement Describing Use of Funds  |
|-------|--|
|       | <p>Bureau (NGS). The NGS is a consolidated, centralized program for delivery of services to local government public safety and geospatial services. The NGS's responsibilities fall into two primary categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public safety communications support, which includes support of the 9-1-1 Services Board, providing technical assistance to all PSAPs, planning for the future of E9-1-1 and supporting the operation of the Virginia Emergency Operation Center (VEOC).</li> <li>• Geospatial support, through Virginia Geographic Information Network (VGIN) staff and services focused on public safety, 9-1-1, and enterprise GIS support for commonwealth localities; includes civic address and boundary layers support for Next Generation 9-1-1.</li> </ul> <p>The NGS's strategy is to focus on the following key components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A strong commitment to helping our constituents achieve their business-oriented success;</li> <li>• An effective collaborative approach that leverages the Commonwealth's economies of scale potentials that provides more cost effective solutions for small to mid-size state agencies and local government; and</li> <li>• A governance model that is coordinated among all interested stakeholders including the Boards and professional associations.</li> </ul> <p>The services offered by the NGS fall into one of three categories:</p> <p>Consultative Services – Providing professional, unbiased technical assistance and consultation to customers.</p> <p>Governance Services – Coordinating with stakeholders to develop and promulgate standards and best practices to ensure that investments made by the Commonwealth are managed in an efficient and effective manner.</p> <p>Collaborative Services – Leading or supporting efforts that increase collaboration among local and state agencies that improve efficiency and the delivery of services to the citizens of the Commonwealth</p>   |
| VT    | <p>The Enhanced 9-1-1 Board has statutory responsibility for the design, installation, and operation of Vermont's statewide 9-1-1 system. Our primary mission is to connect citizens with the appropriate emergency responders, including police, fire, and emergency medical service agencies, in order to help ensure citizens receive quick and effective assistance in the event of an emergency.</p>  |
| WA    | <p>RCW 38.52.520 specifies the duties of the Washington State 911 Coordination Office. These duties include: coordinating and facilitating the implementation and operation of 911 emergency communications systems throughout the state; considering the base needs of individual counties for specific assistance; specifying rules defining the purpose for which available state 911 funding may be expended; efforts to modernize their (counties) existing 911 emergency communications systems; and 911 operational costs.</p> <p>RCW 38.52.540 further specifies that 'monies in the [State 911 Fund] account must be used only to support the statewide coordination and management of the 911 system, for the implementation of wireless 911 statewide, for the modernization of 911 emergency communications systems statewide, and to help supplement, within available funds, the operational costs of the system, including adequate funding of counties to enable implementation of wireless 911 service and reimbursement of radio communications service companies for costs incurred in providing wireless 911 service pursuant to negotiated contracts between the counties or their agents and the radio communications service companies.' Additionally, 'the state 911 coordinator, with the advice and assistance of the 911 advisory committee, is authorized to enter into statewide agreements to improve efficiency of 911 services for all counties and shall specify by rule the additional purposes for which moneys, if available, may be expended from this account.'</p> <p>During the calendar year 2023, the State of Washington expended funds to maintain the current statewide NG911 Emergency Services IP Network (ESInet) and Next Generation Core Services (NGCS), county 911 operational equipment and replacement/modernization costs, statewide training programs for telecommunicators, as well as statewide 911 planning and collaboration.</p> <p>Operational funding provides assistance to qualifying local jurisdictions for the operation of county and state primary PSAPs including: salary and benefit support for telecommunicators, county 911 coordinators, MSAG, Mapping/GIS, Information Technology, public education and training; PSAP call-taking hardware/software and maintenance; and modernization/replacement of authorized PSAP equipment to NG911 standard.</p> <p>Statewide training programs include: telecommunicator training (basic and advanced), Public Safety Communications Center Supervisor, Telecommunicator Emergency Response Team, and Communications Training Officer program; funding to counties to support local telecommunicator training programs, county 911 coordinator training and national conference participation, and CTO training salary reimbursement.</p> |
| WI    | <p>Each county in Wisconsin have entered into a contract with participating local exchange carriers to provide its 911 telecommunications network. These 911 contracts specify in detail the design of the telecommunications network supporting the local 911 service, authorizes a 911 surcharge on landlines based on population to pay for expenses related to the network, and identifies the obligations of the parties to build, operate, and maintain the 9-1-1 telecommunications network. See Wis. Stat. 256.35(3)(b). The 911 network expenses are pooled and all landline telephone subscribers in a county pay the same amount for the 911 surcharge. The 911 contract identifies how much expense each participating local exchange carrier has incurred to provide and maintain the 911 telecommunications network, and in turn specifies how much money each participating carrier may take as compensation from the pooled 911 surcharge collection.</p> <p>Some counties have elected to purchase a separate telecommunications network for its wireless 911 service. The counties that have elected to purchase a separate wireless 911 network pay for that second network through the county and municipal budget.</p> <p>In calendar year 2023, no portion of the funds collected from the 911 surcharge was shared with any state, county, or municipal agency or department, or any other governmental entity. The 911 surcharge is limited to the recovery of the telecommunications network expense for providing the 911 service by the participating local exchange carriers. County and municipal expenses related to terminating and responding to 911 calls is paid for through the respective county and municipal budgets.</p>  |
| WV    | <p>These funds, when remitted to the WV-PSC for distribution to the County Commissions of the State, are remitted in accordance with the provisions of W.Va. Code §2-6-6b(b) and (c). The WV-PSC passes through all money it collects. The WV-PSC does not charge</p>  |

(Continued from previous page) \_\_\_\_\_

Bureau has insufficient information to make any finding regarding fee diversion for these landline and VoIP E911 taxes.

| State   | Statement Describing Use of Funds  |                     |              |                   |              |                 |              |   |              |   |           |                           |           |
|---|--|---------------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|---|--------------|---|-----------|---------------------------|-----------|
|   | <p>an administrative fee or otherwise retain any portion of the money. The telecommunications service providers retain a three-percent (3%) billing and collection fee before remitting the fees collected to the WV-PSC.</p> <p>The expenditure of 911/E911 fees collected directly by the County Commissions through landline or VoIP telecommunications service provider and 911/E911 fees redistributed to the counties by the WV-PSC is statutorily restricted. W. Va. Code specifies what Enhanced 911 fee revenues may be used for. This is found, for wireline fees, at W.Va. Code §7-1-3cc(b) and, for wireless fees, at W.Va. Code §§24-6-6b. Each county receives a quarterly disbursement of the funds collected by the WV-PSC.</p> <p>See Answer in question D.2a for allowable expenditures.</p>   |                     |              |                   |              |                 |              |   |              |   |           |                           |           |
| WY  | <p>Funds collected from the 911 emergency tax imposed pursuant to this chapter shall be spent solely to pay for public safety answering point and service suppliers' equipment and service costs, installation costs, maintenance costs, monthly recurring charges and other costs directly related to the continued operation of a 911 system including enhanced wireless 911 service. Funds may also be expended for personnel expenses necessarily incurred by a public safety answering point. 'Personnel expenses necessarily incurred' means expenses incurred for persons employed to: personnel [sic] expenses necessarily incurred by a public safety answering point. 'Personnel expenses necessarily incurred' means expenses incurred for persons employed to:</p> <p>(i) Take emergency telephone calls and dispatch them appropriately; or</p> <p>(ii) Maintain the computer database of the public safety answering point.</p>  |                     |              |                   |              |                 |              |   |              |   |           |                           |           |
| <b>Other Jurisdictions</b>                                  |  |                     |              |                   |              |                 |              |   |              |   |           |                           |           |
| AS  | [DNF]  |                     |              |                   |              |                 |              |   |              |   |           |                           |           |
| DC  | The Fund is dedicated to Office of Unified Communications to support the personnel, technology hardware, software and software maintenance, contractual support, outreach, training, supplies, and equipment costs necessary to provide emergency (911) and non-emergency (311) communications.  |                     |              |                   |              |                 |              |   |              |   |           |                           |           |
| Guam  | The Guam Fire Department (GFD), an agency of the Government of Guam has obligated and expended funds collected for E911 purposes. Through Public Law 23-77, §84121, (c), GFD was designated as the lead agency with the authority and responsibility to administer and operate the emergency 911 telephone communications system (E911). Thus, the E911 Division/Bureau was created within the Guam Fire Department. Furthermore, GFD is required, as part of its proposed annual budget, to submit personnel, supplies, equipment and other needs, to efficiently operate and maintain the E911 System. The funding needs are provided from the E911 Emergency System Reporting Funds. There are no other activities, programs, organizations or government agency that has obligated or expended funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes other than the Guam Fire Department.   |                     |              |                   |              |                 |              |   |              |   |           |                           |           |
| NMI   | [DNF]  |                     |              |                   |              |                 |              |   |              |   |           |                           |           |
| PR  | <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Operating Expenses:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 2,656,150</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Payroll Expenses:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 7,727,390</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Enhanced 9-1-1:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 1,495,341</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Distribution to 9-1-1 Response Agencies and Municipalities:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 6,409,091</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9-1-1 Administrative Fees (Due to Telephone Companies):</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 42,877</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other Operating Expenses:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 87,719</td> </tr> </table> <p>All disbursement made by the agency during the period from January 1 to December 31, 2023 were used for the operational purpose of our Bureau.</p>  | Operating Expenses: | \$ 2,656,150 | Payroll Expenses: | \$ 7,727,390 | Enhanced 9-1-1: | \$ 1,495,341 | Distribution to 9-1-1 Response Agencies and Municipalities: | \$ 6,409,091 | 9-1-1 Administrative Fees (Due to Telephone Companies): | \$ 42,877 | Other Operating Expenses: | \$ 87,719 |
| Operating Expenses:   | \$ 2,656,150   |                     |              |                   |              |                 |              |   |              |   |           |                           |           |
| Payroll Expenses:   | \$ 7,727,390   |                     |              |                   |              |                 |              |   |              |   |           |                           |           |
| Enhanced 9-1-1:   | \$ 1,495,341   |                     |              |                   |              |                 |              |   |              |   |           |                           |           |
| Distribution to 9-1-1 Response Agencies and Municipalities: | \$ 6,409,091   |                     |              |                   |              |                 |              |   |              |   |           |                           |           |
| 9-1-1 Administrative Fees (Due to Telephone Companies):     | \$ 42,877  |                     |              |                   |              |                 |              |   |              |   |           |                           |           |
| Other Operating Expenses:                                   | \$ 87,719  |                     |              |                   |              |                 |              |   |              |   |           |                           |           |
| USVI  | <p>As indicated in section C.1a, the VI Code allocates 40% of the monthly \$2.00 total Emergency Service Fund fee collected to VITEMA which is the Territorial agency responsible for operating and maintaining the two (2) primary PSAP 9-1-1 locations.</p> <p>For this reporting period the 9-1-1 service fee allocation represents \$758,490 dollars. The utilization by VITEMA for the breakdown of the funds are as follows:</p> <p>(58.18%) \$441,305 dollars for the two (2) primary PSAP telecommunications lines (voice and data) to service providers AT&amp;T, Viya, SmartNet, and ancillary services.</p> <p>(41.08%) \$311,605 dollars for software upgrades, equipment, repairs, and maintenance to the two (2) primary PSAP telecommunications systems.</p> <p>(.74%) \$5,580 dollars for training directly supporting the 9-1-1 dispatchers at the two primary PSAPs,</p> <p>One Hundred Percent (100%) of the monies expended during this period were for Operating Costs to support the two (2) primary PSAPs, as indicated in section E.2.</p> |                     |              |                   |              |                 |              |   |              |   |           |                           |           |

21. The Bureau also requested that states identify whether their 911 fee collections were used for specific expenditure categories, including (1) PSAP operating costs for customer premises equipment (CPE), computer aided dispatch (CAD) equipment, buildings and facilities, and NG911, cybersecurity, pre-arrival instructions, and emergency notification systems (ENS); (2) PSAP personnel costs (telecommunicator salaries and training); (3) PSAP administrative costs associated with program administration and travel expenses; and (4) costs for integration and interoperability of 911 systems and public safety/first responder radio systems, including lease, purchase, maintenance, and upgrade of CAD hardware and software to support integrated 911 and public safety dispatch operations. Cumulative responses are provided in Table 9, and individual state responses are provided in Table 10.

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

| Use of Fees   |  | Total States/<br>Jurisdictions <sup>78</sup> |
|---|--|--|
| Operating Costs   | CPE  | 53   |
|   | CAD  | 49   |
|   | Buildings and Facilities   | 33   |
|   | NG911, Cybersecurity, Pre-Arrival Instructions, ENS  | 49   |
| Personnel Costs   | Telecommunicators' Salaries  | 37   |
|   | Training of Telecommunicators  | 52   |
| Administrative Costs  | Program Administration   | 46   |
|   | Travel Expenses  | 46   |
| Costs for integration and interoperability of 911 systems and public safety/first responder radio systems | Lease, purchase, maintenance, and upgrade of CAD hardware and software to support integrated 911 and public safety dispatch operations | 47   |
|   | Providing for interoperability of 911 systems with one another and with public safety/first responder radio systems                    | 46   |

<sup>78</sup> Arizona and Texas checked both Yes and No boxes for certain categories. See Table 10 *infra*. For calculation purposes in Table 9, we counted these responses as Yes.

**Table 10 – Uses of Collected Fees<sup>79</sup>**

| State | PSAP Operating Costs, Including Technological Innovation That Supports 911            |   |  |  | PSAP Personnel Costs        |                               | PSAP Administrative Costs |                 | Costs for Integration and Interoperability of 911 Systems and Public Safety/First Responder Radio Systems                              |   |
|-------|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
|       | Lease, Purchase, Maintenance, Replacement, and Upgrade of CPE (hardware and software) | Lease, Purchase, Maintenance, Replacement, and Upgrade of CAD (hardware and software) | Lease, Purchase, Maintenance, Replacement, and Upgrade of PSAP Building/Facility | NG911, Cybersecurity, Pre-Arrival Instructions, and Emergency Notification Systems (ENS) | Telecommunicators' Salaries | Training of Telecommunicators | Program Administration    | Travel Expenses | Lease, Purchase, Maintenance, and Upgrade of CAD Hardware and Software to Support Integrated 911 and Public Safety Dispatch Operations | Providing for Interoperability of 911 systems with One Another and with Public Safety/First Responder Radio Systems |
| AK    | Yes   | Yes   | No   | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| AL    | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| AR    | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| AZ    | Yes   | No  | No   | [No Response]  | No                          | No                            | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes and No <sup>[80]</sup>  |
| CA    | Yes   | Yes   | No   | Yes  | No                          | Yes                           | No                        | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| CO    | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| CT    | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| DE    | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | No                          | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| FL    | Yes   | Yes   | No   | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| GA    | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| HI    | Yes   | Yes   | No   | Yes  | No                          | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| IA    | Yes   | Yes   | No   | Yes  | No                          | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| ID    | Yes   | Yes   | No   | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| IL    | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |

<sup>79</sup> California, Florida, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Nevada, Oklahoma, Vermont, and Washington provided substantive entries in Addendum Section E2 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/sixteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

<sup>80</sup> Arizona checked both Yes and No boxes for this category. For calculation purposes in Table 9 above, we counted Arizona's response as a Yes.

|       | PSAP Operating Costs, Including Technological Innovation That Supports 911            |   |  |  | PSAP Personnel Costs        |                               | PSAP Administrative Costs |                 | Costs for Integration and Interoperability of 911 Systems and Public Safety/First Responder Radio Systems                              |   |
|-------|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| State | Lease, Purchase, Maintenance, Replacement, and Upgrade of CPE (hardware and software) | Lease, Purchase, Maintenance, Replacement, and Upgrade of CAD (hardware and software) | Lease, Purchase, Maintenance, Replacement, and Upgrade of PSAP Building/Facility | NG911, Cybersecurity, Pre-Arrival Instructions, and Emergency Notification Systems (ENS) | Telecommunicators' Salaries | Training of Telecommunicators | Program Administration    | Travel Expenses | Lease, Purchase, Maintenance, and Upgrade of CAD Hardware and Software to Support Integrated 911 and Public Safety Dispatch Operations | Providing for Interoperability of 911 systems with One Another and with Public Safety/First Responder Radio Systems |
| IN    | Yes   | Yes   | No   | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | No                        | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| KS    | Yes   | Yes   | No   | Yes  | No                          | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| KY    | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| LA    | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| MA    | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| MD    | Yes   | Yes   | No   | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | No   | Yes   |
| ME    | Yes   | No  | No   | Yes  | No                          | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | No   | No  |
| MI    | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| MN    | Yes   | Yes   | No   | Yes  | No                          | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | No   | Yes   |
| MO    | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| MS    | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| MT    | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| NC    | Yes   | Yes   | No   | Yes  | No                          | Yes                           | No                        | No              | Yes  | No  |
| ND    | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| NE    | Yes   | Yes   | No   | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| NH    | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| NJ    | Yes   | Yes   | No   | No   | No                          | Yes                           | Yes                       | No              | Yes  | Yes   |
| NM    | Yes   | No  | No   | Yes  | No                          | Yes                           | No                        | Yes             | No   | No  |
| NV    | Yes   | Yes   | No   | Yes  | No                          | Yes                           | Yes                       | No              | Yes  | Yes   |
| NY    | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| OH    | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | No  |
| OK    | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |

|                            | PSAP Operating Costs, Including Technological Innovation That Supports 911            |   |  |  | PSAP Personnel Costs        |                               | PSAP Administrative Costs |                 | Costs for Integration and Interoperability of 911 Systems and Public Safety/First Responder Radio Systems                              |   |
|----------------------------|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| State                      | Lease, Purchase, Maintenance, Replacement, and Upgrade of CPE (hardware and software) | Lease, Purchase, Maintenance, Replacement, and Upgrade of CAD (hardware and software) | Lease, Purchase, Maintenance, Replacement, and Upgrade of PSAP Building/Facility | NG911, Cybersecurity, Pre-Arrival Instructions, and Emergency Notification Systems (ENS) | Telecommunicators' Salaries | Training of Telecommunicators | Program Administration    | Travel Expenses | Lease, Purchase, Maintenance, and Upgrade of CAD Hardware and Software to Support Integrated 911 and Public Safety Dispatch Operations | Providing for Interoperability of 911 systems with One Another and with Public Safety/First Responder Radio Systems |
| OR                         | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | No   | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| PA                         | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| RI                         | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | No  |
| SC                         | Yes   | Yes   | No   | Yes  | [No Response]               | Yes                           | Yes                       | No              | [No Response]  | No  |
| SD                         | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| TN                         | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| TX                         | Yes   | Yes and No <sup>[81]</sup>  | Yes and No   | Yes and No   | Yes and No                  | Yes and No                    | Yes                       | Yes and No      | Yes and No   | Yes and No  |
| UT                         | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| VA                         | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| VT                         | Yes   | No  | No   | Yes  | No                          | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | No   | No  |
| WA                         | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| WI                         | No  | No  | No   | No   | No                          | No                            | No                        | No              | No   | No  |
| WV                         | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| WY                         | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | No                        | No              | Yes  | Yes   |
| <b>Other Jurisdictions</b> |   |   |  |  |                             |                               |                           |                 |  |   |
| AS                         | [DNF]   | [DNF]   | [DNF]  | [DNF]  | [DNF]                       | [DNF]                         | [DNF]                     | [DNF]           | [DNF]  | [DNF]   |
| DC                         | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | No                          | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| Guam                       | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | No                        | No              | Yes  | Yes   |
| NMI                        | [DNF]   | [DNF]   | [DNF]  | [DNF]  | [DNF]                       | [DNF]                         | [DNF]                     | [DNF]           | [DNF]  | [DNF]   |

<sup>81</sup> Texas checked both Yes and No boxes for certain categories. For calculation purposes in Table 9 above, we have counted such Texas responses as a Yes.



|       | PSAP Operating Costs, Including Technological Innovation That Supports 911            |   |  |  | PSAP Personnel Costs        |                               | PSAP Administrative Costs |                 | Costs for Integration and Interoperability of 911 Systems and Public Safety/First Responder Radio Systems                              |   |
|-------|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| State | Lease, Purchase, Maintenance, Replacement, and Upgrade of CPE (hardware and software) | Lease, Purchase, Maintenance, Replacement, and Upgrade of CAD (hardware and software) | Lease, Purchase, Maintenance, Replacement, and Upgrade of PSAP Building/Facility | NG911, Cybersecurity, Pre-Arrival Instructions, and Emergency Notification Systems (ENS) | Telecommunicators' Salaries | Training of Telecommunicators | Program Administration    | Travel Expenses | Lease, Purchase, Maintenance, and Upgrade of CAD Hardware and Software to Support Integrated 911 and Public Safety Dispatch Operations | Providing for Interoperability of 911 systems with One Another and with Public Safety/First Responder Radio Systems |
| PR    | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes                         | Yes                           | Yes                       | Yes             | Yes  | Yes   |
| USVI  | Yes   | Yes   | No   | No   | No                          | Yes                           | No                        | No              | Yes  | Yes   |

22. The Bureau requested information on grants that each state or jurisdiction paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees in 2023 and the purpose of the grant. Twenty-one states reported that they paid for grants through the use of collected 911/E911 fees.<sup>82</sup> Table 11 provides states’ descriptions of their grants.

**Table 11 – State Grants or Grant Programs**

| <b>State</b> | <b>Grant Programs</b> | <b>Description and Purpose of Grants Paid for Through the Use of Collected 911/E911 Fees in 2023</b>  |
|--------------|-----------------------|---|
| AK           | No                    | [No Response]   |
| AL           | Yes                   | A total of \$3,146,080.53 was granted to 33 individual districts based on the demonstration of need for purchase of hosted CPE services and premise CPE systems, GIS-related services, computer aided dispatch systems, mobile disaster recovery systems, cybersecurity hardware, backup system equipment, responder alerting systems, radio equipment, 911 facility related costs, and NG9-1-1 recorders.  |
| AR           | No                    | [No Response]   |
| AZ           | No                    | [No Response]   |
| CA           | No                    | N/A   |
| CO           | No                    | [No Response]   |
| CT           | Yes                   | Capital Expense Grants, Subsidies and Consolidation/Transition Grants.  |
| DE           | No                    | n/a   |
| FL           | Yes                   | The Board awarded a total of 117 grants in 2023. Collected funds were used for the State Grant Program to fund \$30,688,104 supporting county E911 and NG911 equipment and services. Additionally, \$1,778,945 in funds were used to support the Rural County Grant Program to assist rural counties in maintaining and upgrading their E911 systems.   |
| GA           | No                    | [No Response]   |
| HI           | No                    | Wireline Fees are collected by the LEC (Local Exchange Carrier).  |
| IA           | Yes                   | The State offers local jurisdictions GIS grants for the purpose of NG911 GIS data creation, remediation, and maintenance. The total available to counties was \$12,000 per PSAP   |
| ID           | Yes                   | Emergency Communications Grant  |
| IL           | Yes                   | During calendar year 2023, the State awarded \$768,609.00 in grants to local 9-1-1 authorities to defer costs associated with PSAP consolidations and \$4,074,226.00 for Next Generation 9-1-1 Expenses.  |
| IN           | [No Response]         | [No Response]   |
| KS           | Yes                   | None during CY 2023   |
| KY           | Yes                   | The state paid \$2,456,999.54. Grants were for Next Generation 911 PSAP equipment, cyber-security, and GIS-related projects.  |
| LA           | No                    | [No Response]   |
| MA           | Yes                   | The State 911 Department has developed and administers grant programs to assist PSAPs and regional emergency communication centers, or RECCs, in providing enhanced 911 service and to foster the development of regional PSAPs, regional secondary PSAPs, and RECCs. M.G.L. Chapter 6A, Section 18B(i) requires that the State 911 Department fund the following grant programs: the PSAP and Regional Emergency Communications Center Training Grant (“Training Grant”); the PSAP and Regional Emergency Communication Center Support Grant (“Support Grant”); the Regional PSAP and Regional Emergency |

<sup>82</sup> One of these twenty-one states, Kansas, checked Yes to Question E2 on grant programs, but then stated at Question E2a, which asks for a description of the grants, “None during CY 2023.” Kansas Response at 9 (reiterating at Addendum Section E2 that “[n]o grants were awarded” and explaining the limited availability and use of such grants). The remainder of states and jurisdictions checked No for Question E2’s Grant Programs category, except that Indiana, Maryland, Mississippi, and Washington did not respond to this question.

| State | Grant Programs | Description and Purpose of Grants Paid for Through the Use of Collected 911/E911 Fees in 2023  |
|-------|----------------|--|
|       |                | Communication Center Incentive Grant ('Incentive Grant'); the Wireless State Police PSAP Grant; and the Regional and Regional Secondary PSAP and Regional Emergency Communications Center Development Grant ('Development Grant'). See MG.L. Chapter 6A, Sections 18B(i)(1)-(5). The statute also permits the State 911 Department to introduce new grants associated with providing enhanced 911 service in the Commonwealth. See MG.L. Chapter 6A, Section 18B(f). As permitted by the statute, in 2011, the State 911 Department introduced two new grants, 1) the Emergency Medical Dispatch ('EMD') Grant and 2) the Telecommunicator Emergency Response Taskforce (TERT) Grant. The statute provides that the State 911 Commission shall approve all formulas, percentages, guidelines, or other mechanisms used to distribute these grants. See M.G.L. Chapter 6A, Section 18B(a). The eligibility requirements, purpose, use of funding, including categories of use of funds, application process, grant review and selection process, and grant reimbursement process for each of these grants are set forth in the Grant Guidelines that are approved by the State 911 Commission. These Grant Guidelines are available on the State 911 Department website at <a href="http://www.mass.gov/e911">www.mass.gov/e911</a> .   |
| MD    | [No Response]  | 9-1-1 Trust Fund monies are distributed for enhancements to county 9-1-1 service as outlined in question E-1.  |
| ME    | Yes            | Though PSAP consolidation grants (dispatch only centers into PSAPs) are allowable by law, no grants were authorized or paid in 2023.   |
| MI    | No             | [No Response]  |
| MN    | Yes            | <p>According to Minn. Stat. §403.113, a portion of the fee collected must be used to fund implementation, operation, maintenance, enhancement, and expansion of enhanced 911 service, including acquisition of necessary equipment and the costs of the commissioner to administer the program. After payment of costs of the commissioner to administer the program, money collected shall be distributed as follows:</p> <p>(1) one-half of the amount equally to all qualified counties, and after October 1, 1997, to all qualified counties, existing ten public safety answering points operated by the Minnesota State Patrol, and each governmental entity operating the individual public safety answering points serving the Metropolitan Airports Commission, the Red Lake Indian Reservation, and the University of Minnesota Police Department; and</p> <p>(2) the remaining one-half to qualified counties and cities with existing 911 systems based on each county's or city's percentage of the total population of qualified counties and cities. The population of a qualified city with an existing system must be deducted from its county's population when calculating the county's share under this clause if the city seeks direct distribution of its share.</p> <p>(b) A county's share under subdivision 1 must be shared pro rata between the county and existing city systems in the county. A county or city or other governmental entity as described in paragraph (a), clause (1), shall deposit money received under this subdivision in an interest-bearing fund or account separate from the governmental entity's general fund and may use money in the fund or account only for the purposes specified in subdivision 3.</p> <p>(c) A county or city or other governmental entity as described in paragraph (a), clause (1), is not qualified to share in the distribution of money for enhanced 911 service if it has not implemented enhanced 911 service before December 31, 1998.</p> <p>(d) For the purposes of this subdivision, 'existing city system' means a city 911 system that provides at least basic 911 service and that was implemented on or before April 1, 1993. Also \$1M is appropriated annually to the Statewide Emergency Communications Board for interoperability initiatives and grants to local units of government.</p> |
| MO    | No             | The Missouri 911 Service did not award any grants of funds from 911 fees during the 2023 calendar year.  |
| MS    | [No Response]  | N/A  |
| MT    | Yes            | Wireless Provider E9-1-1 Cost Recovery   |
| NC    | Yes            | PSAP GRANT PROGRAM   |

| State | Grant Programs | Description and Purpose of Grants Paid for Through the Use of Collected 911/E911 Fees in 2023  |
|-------|----------------|--|
|       |                | <p>Alleghany County - PSAP upgrade/relocation, relocation of radio tower<br/> Ashe County - Radio Workstation Upgrade<br/> Brunswick County - VIPER Connection Backup Radio System<br/> Clay County - New Facility Project<br/> Cleveland County - Cleveland Co 911 Facility Project<br/> Cumberland County - Relocation of Cumberland Co 911 Comm. Ctr<br/> Franklin County - New Emergency Communication Center<br/> Johnston County - Radio &amp; Paging Infrastructure Upgrade<br/> Pitt County - CAD-to-CAD Cloud-based Subscription Service<br/> Perquimans County - EOL Radio Equipment Replacement<br/> Polk County - E-911 Renovation &amp; Relocation Project<br/> Sampson County - Regional 911 Center<br/> Stanly County - CAD Replacement<br/> Watauga County - Watauga Consolidation w/ Boone</p> <p>STATEWIDE PSAP PROJECTS<br/> Customer Relationship Management (CRM) System<br/> Cybersecurity PSAP ASMT/Remediation</p> <p>PSAP Call Data Collection<br/> Interpretive Services Contract</p> <p>NC PSAP Review (PSAP Assessment)<br/> Public Service Announcement Grant<br/> Orthography Image 22<br/> Orthography Image 23</p> |
| ND    | No             | [No Response]  |
| NE    | No             | [No Response]  |
| NH    | No             | N/A  |
| NJ    | Yes            | The FY-2024 State Budget included a \$10M appropriation to create a grant opportunity to assist in the upgrading of PSAP equipment and create incentives for consolidation of PSAPs.   |
| NM    | Yes            | The State utilizes a grant program to award E-911 funding to local governments. This includes funding awards for operational and capital budgets.  |
| NV    | No             | [No Response]  |
| NY    | Yes            | The New York State Public Safety Answering Points Operations Grant Program, funded by Tax Law § 186-f(6)(g), allows counties to receive State support for eligible public safety call-taking and dispatching expenses  |
| OH    | No             | No grants paid for by the state.   |
| OK    | Yes            | <p>The Oklahoma 9-1-1 Management Authority created a grant program to assist local jurisdictions with the resources necessary in providing a more uniform, high quality 9-1-1 service statewide. In 2023, local Oklahoma primary PSAPs were awarded a total of \$1,775,639 in state grant funds. Grant funds of were used to provide support for: (1) consolidation, including virtual consolidation of call centers; (2) creation, maintenance, or improvement of GIS data to meet or exceed the NENA and Oklahoma Geographic Information NG9-1-1 and Addressing Standard; (3) development or deployment of NG9-1-1 technology to meet the State NG9-1-1 deployment plan; (4) call taker and 9-1-1 administrator training and certification; and (5) Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) systems that are used to transfer and communicate 9-1-1 caller information between PSAPs. Funding for the State 9-1-1 grant program is provided by wireless fees collected by the Oklahoma Tax Commission.</p>   |
| OR    | No             | [No Response]  |

| State                      | Grant Programs | Description and Purpose of Grants Paid for Through the Use of Collected 911/E911 Fees in 2023  |
|----------------------------|----------------|--|
| PA                         | Yes            | Fifteen (15) percent of the revenue collected is set aside to be used to establish, enhance, operate or maintain statewide interconnectivity of 9-1-1 systems. In 2023, Pennsylvania used \$19.7 million of these funds to help implement NG911 service. In addition, PEMA awarded PSAPs \$29.7 million in grants to support regional ESInets along with shared phone, CAD and radio systems. These grants also supported NG911 GIS data development and PSAP migration costs for NG911 service.   |
| RI                         | No             | None   |
| SC                         | No             | [No Response]  |
| SD                         | Yes            | Funding was approved for a variety of hardware, software, equipment upgrades and other allowable PSAP expenditures. The purpose was to assist local entities with enhancements and funding they may not have had budget dollars for. The state also pays for managed emergency call handling equipment that is deployed in all 28 PSAP's and the network. In addition GIS dollars have been made available to assist counties and PSAP's in GIS clean-up and maintenance.  |
| TN                         | No             | [No Response]  |
| TX                         | Yes            | 'Yes' and 'No' responses provided above are to account for the distinctions among Texas 9-1-1 Entities in costs paid with 911/E911 fees. E.g., the CSEC state 9-1-1 program does not allow, except in limited circumstances, fees to be used [sic] to pay telecommunicators' salaries; several 772 ECDs likewise do not use 911/E911 fees to pay telecommunicators. The CSEC state 9-1-1 Program provides grants of legislatively appropriated 9-1-1 and equalization surcharge funds to 20 RPCs for the specific purpose of providing 9-1-1 service in each RPC's region. |
| UT                         | No             | N/A  |
| VA                         | Yes            | The PSAP Grant Program is a multi-million dollar grant program administered by the Virginia 9-1-1 Services Board. The purpose of the program is to financially assist Virginia primary Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) with the purchase of equipment and services that support the continuity and enhancement of wireless E9-1-1. Funding is made available through the Code of Virginia and administered by the Board.  |
| VT                         | No             | N/A  |
| WA                         | [No Response]  | [No Response]  |
| WI                         | No             | N/A  |
| WV                         | No             | [No Response]  |
| WY                         | No             | none   |
| <b>Other Jurisdictions</b> |                |  |
| AS                         | [DNF]          | [DNF]  |
| DC                         | No             | [No Response]  |
| Guam                       | No             | [No Response]  |
| NMI                        | [DNF]          | [DNF]  |
| PR                         | No             | [No Response]  |
| USVI                       | No             | [No Response]  |

## F. Description of 911/E911 Fees Collected

23. In order to provide an overview of the sources of 911 fees, the Bureau directed respondents to describe the amount of fees or charges imposed for the implementation and support of 911 and E911 services, and to distinguish between state and local fees for each service type (wireline, wireless, prepaid wireless, VoIP, and other services). Table 12 provides an overview of the number of states and localities that report that they levy a fee on each service type.

**Table 12 – Summary of State and Local Authorities That Levy 911/E911 Fees<sup>83</sup>**

| <b>Service Type</b>     | <b>State Only</b> | <b>Local Only</b> | <b>Both</b> | <b>No Response or No Fee</b> |
|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|------------------------------|
| <b>Wireline</b>         | 27                | 18                | 5           | 4                            |
| <b>Wireless</b>         | 35                | 9                 | 8           | 2                            |
| <b>Prepaid Wireless</b> | 36                | 4                 | 7           | 7                            |
| <b>VoIP</b>             | 29                | 12                | 5           | 8                            |
| <b>Other</b>            | 8                 | 4                 | 0           | 42                           |

24. Table 13 details the average fee by type of service.<sup>84</sup> Based on responding states' information, the average wireline 911 fee is \$1.04 per line per month; the average wireless 911 fee is \$1.05 per line per month; the average prepaid wireless percentage of retail transaction 911 fee is 3.29%; the average prepaid wireless flat 911 fee per transaction is \$0.93; and the average VoIP service 911 fee is \$1.07 per line per month.<sup>85</sup> Four states and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that they had no prepaid wireless service 911 fee or did not respond to the question. Five states, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that they had no VoIP service 911 fee or did not respond to the question.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> Question F1 asks for the amounts of any fees or charges imposed for each of the categories of wireline, wireless, prepaid wireless, VoIP, or other services. It then asks respondents to identify the "Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance" for each fee type by checking a box for one of three options—State, County or Local Authority, or Combination of State and County/Local. Some respondents list at Question F1 that a 911 fee was charged for a particular service type, but do not then identify which jurisdiction received the remittance for that fee. These respondents are included in the "No Response or No Fee" count in this table. *See, e.g.*, Michigan Response at 10-11 (leaving "Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance" choices blank for its listed fee amounts, but indicating at Addendum Section F1 that wireline, wireless, and VoIP fees may be collected by local authorities, while prepaid wireless may be collected by state authorities).

<sup>84</sup> *See infra* Appendix C for a detailed description of fees and charges that each reporting state and jurisdiction levied on wireline, wireless, prepaid wireless, VoIP, and other services during calendar year 2023.

<sup>85</sup> A few jurisdictions reported imposing a percentage fee or reported other information on wireline, wireless, and VoIP service rates. For example, Louisiana lists its wireline fee/charge as "[u]p to 5% of Tariff Rate on Exchange." Louisiana Response at 9-10. *See infra* Appendix C for additional examples. Table 13 provides separate rows within each service type for percentage-based responses.

<sup>86</sup> For example, Missouri did not provide an amount entry for any of the 911 fee categories at F1 except prepaid wireless services, and thus is included in the count of states that did not report a VoIP service fee. Missouri Response at 9-10.

**Table 13 – 911/E911 Fee Highlights by Service Type<sup>87</sup>**

| Service Type     | Fee Type                         | Average 911/E911 Fee | State With Lowest Average Associated Fee <sup>88</sup> | State With Highest Average Associated Fee | States/Jurisdictions With No Response or Associated Service Fee       |
|------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|--|---|---|
| Wireline         | Flat Fee per line per month      | \$1.04               | Arizona<br>\$0.20                                      | West Virginia <sup>89</sup><br>\$3.64     | Missouri  |
|                  | Percentage                       | 6.23%                | Vermont<br>2.4%  | Oklahoma<br>3-15% of the base tariff rate |   |
| Wireless         | Flat Fee per line per month      | \$1.05               | Arizona<br>\$0.20                                      | West Virginia<br>\$3.64                   | Missouri, Wisconsin   |
|                  | Percentage                       | 2.4%                 | Vermont<br>2.4%  | Vermont<br>2.4%                           |   |
| Prepaid Wireless | Flat Fee per Retail Transaction  | \$0.93               | California<br>\$0.30                                   | Alabama<br>\$1.86                         | Alaska, Hawaii, New Jersey, U.S. Virgin Islands, Wisconsin            |
|                  | Percentage of Retail Transaction | 3.29%                | Ohio<br>0.5%   | Arkansas<br>10.00%                        |   |
| VoIP             | Flat Fee per line per month      | \$1.07               | Arizona<br>\$0.20                                      | West Virginia<br>\$3.64                   | Alaska, Guam, Missouri, Montana, Ohio, U.S. Virgin Islands, Wisconsin |
|                  | Percentage                       | 1.48%                | Virginia<br>0.55%                                      | Vermont<br>2.4%                           |   |

<sup>87</sup> Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming provided substantive entries in Addendum Section F1 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/sixteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

<sup>88</sup> Some states and jurisdictions may report, for a particular fee type, a range of fees that includes a fee that is lower or higher than those shown in the “Lowest Average” or “Highest Average” columns in this table. However, the reported range of such state or jurisdiction fees may not, in fact, average out to be the lowest or highest average fee for the particular fee type.

<sup>89</sup> In Addendum Section F1, West Virginia provided wireline and VoIP fees by county. West Virginia Response at 13-16. We computed West Virginia’s average wireline and VoIP fees for this table.

25. The Bureau asked states to report the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees or charges by service type, including wireline, wireless, VoIP, prepaid wireless, and any other service-based fees. Table 14 shows that, in total, states and other jurisdictions reported collecting \$4,029,325,858.29 in 911/E911 fees or related charges for calendar year 2023. Table 14 also has a column of “Fees as a Percentage of Cost,” where the Bureau calculated each state and jurisdiction’s ratio of their total collected 911/E911 fees (Question F2) as a percentage of their total estimated cost to provide 911/E911 service (Question B3). Many states and jurisdictions have percentages less than 100%, indicating the reported collected 911/E911 fees do not entirely cover the reported estimated cost of providing 911 service. Conversely, we observe that a handful of states and jurisdictions, including Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Mexico, and Puerto Rico, report collecting significantly more in 911/E911 fees than their reported estimated cost of providing 911 service for 2023. Related to this column, Table 16 below lists respondents’ estimates of the proportional contributions of various funding sources for 911 service, including fees, state or county General Funds, and grants. Finally, Table 14 includes the Bureau’s estimate of annual fee collections on a per capita basis for each reporting state and jurisdiction. Although 911 fees are typically collected on a per customer basis rather than a per capita basis, the per capita estimate nonetheless provides a useful benchmark for comparing fee collections and expenditures across states and other jurisdictions.<sup>90</sup>

---

<sup>90</sup> As noted above for Table 3, per capita calculations are based on United States Census data and, where those data are unavailable, on World Bank data.



**Table 14 – Total Amount Collected in 911/E911 Fees by Service Type<sup>91</sup>**

| State | Wireline               | Wireless         | Prepaid         | VoIP                       | Other                         | Total Fees Collected | Total Estimated Cost | Fees as a Percentage of Cost <sup>92</sup> | Estimated Amount Collected Annually Per Capita |
|-------|------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--|--|
| AK    | \$881,575.89           | \$13,165,230.02  | \$0.00          | \$0.00                     | \$0.00                        | \$14,046,805.91      | \$14,046,805.91      | 100%                                       | \$19.15  |
| AL    | \$6,536,066.89         | \$85,739,006.87  | \$24,334,616.99 | \$13,746,448.11            | \$16,051.67                   | \$130,372,190.53     | \$130,372,190.53     | 100%                                       | \$25.52  |
| AR    | \$4,068,290.92         | \$39,354,593.32  | \$19,707,341.03 | N/A - Included in Wireless | [No Response]                 | \$63,130,225.27      | \$84,218,483.36      | 75%  | \$20.58  |
| AZ    | [No Response]          | [No Response]    | [No Response]   | [No Response]              | [No Response]                 | \$20,623,625.29      | \$20,446,256.49      | 101%                                       | \$2.78   |
| CA    | See Note <sup>93</sup> | See Note         | See Note        | See Note                   | See Note                      | \$184,515,000.00     | \$197,093,000.00     | 94%  | \$4.74   |
| CO    | \$511,095.50           | \$5,652,185.61   | \$15,752,802.68 | \$1,036,147.33             | \$70,613,324.55 <sup>94</sup> | \$93,565,555.67      | \$121,743,925.40     | 77%  | \$15.92  |
| CT    | [No Response]          | [No Response]    | [No Response]   | [No Response]              | [No Response]                 | \$35,683,264.00      | \$35,683,264.00      | 100%                                       | \$9.86   |
| DE    | [No Response]          | [No Response]    | [No Response]   | [No Response]              | [No Response]                 | \$10,463,899.12      | \$9,203,284.43       | 114%                                       | \$10.14  |
| FL    | \$4,385,613.21         | \$90,390,682.89  | \$23,536,483.62 | \$15,706,069.41            | [No Response]                 | \$134,018,849.13     | \$380,475,598.00     | 35%  | \$5.93   |
| GA    | Unknown                | Unknown          | \$43,199,495.12 | Unknown                    | \$203,273,971.55              | \$246,473,466.67     | \$577,393,447.15     | 43%  | \$22.35  |
| HI    | \$0.00                 | \$10,708,048.00  | \$0.00          | \$1,205,422.00             | \$0.00                        | \$11,913,470.00      | N/A                  | [No Value]                                 | \$8.30   |
| IA    | \$8,752,615.00         | \$31,309,397.47  | \$2,443,338.48  | [No Response]              | [No Response]                 | \$42,505,350.95      | \$166,753,366.92     | 25%  | \$13.25  |
| ID    | [No Response]          | [No Response]    | [No Response]   | [No Response]              | [No Response]                 | \$26,320,037.00      | \$22,320,000.00      | 118%                                       | \$13.40  |
| IL    | \$12,962,622.09        | \$157,318,958.69 | \$8,409,919.57  | \$31,960,167.97            | Other Local                   | \$230,547,467.08     | ... Total cost to    | 105%                                       | \$18.37  |

<sup>91</sup> Arkansas, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Nevada, New York, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Texas provided substantive entries in Addendum Section F2 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/sixteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

<sup>92</sup> The Bureau calculated the percentages in this column based on the information provided by respondents in the annual questionnaire at Questions B3 and F2.

<sup>93</sup> At Question F2a, California explains, “The total amount of fees collected in 2023 was not broken down into individual categories but remitted as a total based on the current surcharge rate applied to each access line.” California Response at 11.

<sup>94</sup> At Addendum Section F2, Colorado states, “‘Other’ is the total amount of emergency telephone charge revenue reported by Colorado’s local 9-1-1 governing bodies. Many of them do not track whether the funds were received from wireless, wireline, or VoIP customers, so they are provided in a combined fashion. Not all governing bodies responded to our data request, so the actual total may be higher. The amounts provided for the ‘wireline,’ ‘wireless,’ and ‘VoIP’ fields were the revenues generated by the state 9-1-1 surcharge.” Colorado Response at 11.

| State | Wireline                       | Wireless                      | Prepaid         | VoIP                           | Other   | Total Fees Collected | Total Estimated Cost   | Fees as a Percentage of Cost <sup>92</sup> | Estimated Amount Collected Annually Per Capita |
|-------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|---|----------------------|--|--|--|
|       |                                |                               |                 |                                | Government Resources<br>\$19,880,262.82 +<br>Fees and Penalties<br>\$15,535.94 =<br>\$19,895,798.76 |                      | provide 911/E911<br>is<br>\$218,991,238.87 <sup>95]</sup>                                |  |  |
| IN    | \$7,047,837.72                 | \$62,587,824.75               | \$14,301,553.15 | \$9,171,020.34                 | \$10,812.78   | \$93,119,035.14      | \$286,719,714.24   | 32%  | \$13.57  |
| KS    | Included in<br>Wireless Amount | \$33,029,970.00               | \$2,282,081.00  | Included in<br>Wireless Amount | \$0.00  | \$35,312,051.00      | \$103,086,754.00   | 34%  | \$12.01  |
| KY    | [No Response]                  | \$29,059,286.04               | \$10,547,359.69 | [No Response]                  | \$43,809,549.50 <sup>96]</sup>  | \$83,416,195.23      | \$162,686,094.00   | 51%  | \$18.43  |
| LA    | \$16,436,174.95                | \$51,445,895.67               | \$9,054,244.18  | [No Response]                  | \$25,801,781.57   | \$102,507,468.04     | \$99,818,888.57  | 103%                                       | \$22.41  |
| MA    | \$12,117,322.63                | \$112,529,364.38              | \$29,071,700.39 | \$13,367,836.07                | \$0.00  | \$167,086,223.47     | The estimated<br>amount to provide<br>911 Service is:<br>\$49,102,581 ... <sup>97]</sup> | 340%                                       | \$23.86  |
| MD    | \$31,413,315.23                | \$93,602,563.07               | \$5,417,148.78  | N/A                            | \$271,736.33  | \$130,704,763.41     | \$177,429,053.00   | 74%  | \$21.15  |
| ME    | \$748,251                      | \$4,201,717                   | \$906,177       | \$805,801                      | [No Response]   | \$6,661,954          | \$7,103,397  | 94%  | \$4.77   |
| MI    | \$131,707,502.43               | Included in<br>wireline above | \$14,626,859.81 | Included in<br>wireline above  | N/A   | \$146,334,362.24     | \$318,271,962.99   | 46%  | \$14.58  |
| MN    | \$11,194,843.52                | \$48,392,522.67               | \$6,047,635.06  | \$1,482,638.76                 | [No Response]   | \$67,117,640.01      | \$48,835,266.00  | 137%                                       | \$11.70  |
| MO    | [No Response]                  | [No Response]                 | \$3,714,314.53  | [No Response]                  | [No Response]   | [No Response]        | \$443,529,191.00   | 0%   | \$0.00   |

<sup>95</sup> Illinois' full response to Question B3 is: "Local 9-1-1 Authorities reported \$206,535,190.38 in 911 Expenses and the State paid \$12,456,048.49 for 911 network costs[:] Total cost to provide 911/E911 is \$218,991,238.87[.]" Illinois Response at 3. Illinois also reports at both Question B3a (regarding estimated 911 costs) and Addendum Section F2 (regarding amount of fees collected) that "Chicago costs and financial information were not provided and are not included in the above." Illinois Response at 3, 11.

<sup>96</sup> At Question F2a, Kentucky states, "VOIP and Wireline included in Other as reported by PSAPs to the KY 911 Services Board." Kentucky Response at 10.

<sup>97</sup> Massachusetts' full response to Question B3 is, "The estimated amount to provide 911 Service is: \$49,102,581[.] This estimated amount includes the costs associated with the Next Generation 911 service provider contract, MassGIS, Radio, and the mobile PSAP. This estimated amount does not include costs associated with grant programs, training programs, disability access programs, public education, administrative costs, or other costs for the administration and programs of the State 911 Department." Massachusetts Response at 3-4.

| State | Wireline             | Wireless         | Prepaid          | VoIP                 | Other           | Total Fees Collected           | Total Estimated Cost | Fees as a Percentage of Cost <sup>92</sup> | Estimated Amount Collected Annually Per Capita |
|-------|----------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|--|--|
| MS    | NA                   | \$18,570,624.31  | \$6,740,693.28   | NA                   | NA              | \$25,311,317.60 <sup>98</sup>  | \$54,530,183.22      | 46%  | \$8.61   |
| MT    | U/A                  | U/A              | U/A              | U/A                  | U/A             | \$15M                          | \$47M                | 32%  | \$13.24  |
| NC    | \$5,532,477.00       | \$60,896,480.00  | \$14,105,528.00  | \$12,805,571.00      | [No Response]   | \$93,340,056.00                | \$202,592,031.00     | 46%  | \$8.61   |
| ND    | [No Response]        | [No Response]    | \$1,060,000.00   | [No Response]        | \$16,800,000.00 | \$17,860,000.00                | \$30,700,000.00      | 58%  | \$22.78  |
| NE    | \$3,584,941 Estimate | \$12,154,791.00  | \$1,052,757.00   | Included in Wireline | \$0.00          | \$16,792,489.00                | \$65,263,070.00      | 26%  | \$8.49   |
| NH    | \$1,037,928.43       | \$9,930,817.11   | \$1,322,231.88   | \$2,472,049.84       | \$3,929.99      | \$14,766,957.25                | \$18,426,904.33      | 80%  | \$10.53  |
| NJ    | Not Available        | Not Available    | N/A              | Not Available        | N/A             | \$131,187,673.63               | Unknown              | [No Value]                                 | \$14.12  |
| NM    | [No Response]        | [No Response]    | [No Response]    | [No Response]        | [No Response]   | \$12,912,289.65                | \$10,797,932.00      | 120%                                       | \$6.11   |
| NV    | \$1,329,566.09       | \$5,441,606.10   | [No Response]    | \$33,196.00          | \$215,728.79    | \$10,004,935.78                | \$40,786,025.80      | 25%  | \$3.13   |
| NY    | [No Response]        | \$332,592,281.00 | [No Response]    | [No Response]        | \$46,661,551.83 | \$379,253,833.00 <sup>99</sup> | \$1,276,892,251.68   | 30%  | \$19.38  |
| OH    | \$295,045.13         | \$26,899,300.13  | \$3,574,105.47   | \$149,754.80         | \$0.00          | \$30,918,205.53                | \$356,606,081.55     | 9%   | \$2.62   |
| OK    | \$5,850,010.07       | \$35,984,454.51  | Inc. in Wireless | Inc. in Wireless     | \$0.00          | \$41,834,464.58                | \$104,802,192.91     | 40%  | \$10.32  |
| OR    | \$4,059,151.66       | \$69,344,776.88  | Unknown          | \$5,386,347.36       | \$1,828,292.11  | \$80,618,568.00                | \$188,760,834.75     | 43%  | \$19.04  |
| PA    | \$26,868,028.51      | \$215,828,938.39 | \$31,972,715.17  | \$49,031,817.96      | [No Response]   | \$323,701,500.03               | \$445,988,758.07     | 73%  | \$24.97  |
| RI    | [No Response]        | [No Response]    | [No Response]    | [No Response]        | [No Response]   | \$8,339,808.90                 | \$7,147,444.00       | 117%                                       | \$7.61   |
| SC    | [No Response]        | \$30,387,510.09  | \$7,979,828.40   | [No Response]        | [No Response]   | \$38,367,338.49                | unknown              | [No Value]                                 | \$7.14   |
| SD    | \$2,014,362.00       | \$7,943,420.00   | \$1,147,932.88   | \$365,320.00         | [No Response]   | \$11,471,034.88                | \$38,885,755.57      | 29%  | \$12.48  |
| TN    | Unknown              | Unknown          | \$28,424,428.74  | Unknown              | Unknown         | \$150,486,381.03               | Unknown              | [No Value]                                 | \$21.12  |
| TX    | \$90,982,797.00      | \$149,034,585.00 | \$14,750,408.00  | [No Response]        | \$24,001,405.00 | \$278,769,195.00               | \$269,353,292.00     | 103%                                       | \$9.14   |

<sup>98</sup> Mississippi explains at Question F2a, “Totals were collected from Mississippi CMRS Board[;] Wireline, VoIP, or other were not provided.” Mississippi Response at 12.

<sup>99</sup> As discussed in Section IV.G.1.b, *infra*, for our analysis of New York’s 911 fee collection and expenditures, the Bureau used fee revenue data from publicly available New York State tax records, rather than the F2 revenue amount that New York reported in its annual questionnaire. However, for simplicity, in this table and throughout this report we have used the F2 revenue figures that respondents submitted on their annual questionnaires to calculate the total amount of 911/E911 fees collected in calendar year 2023. We have not adjusted the total amount to reflect any external data on fees.

| State                      | Wireline  | Wireless   | Prepaid  | VoIP  | Other  | Total Fees Collected  | Total Estimated Cost | Fees as a Percentage of Cost <sup>92</sup> | Estimated Amount Collected Annually Per Capita |
|----------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|---|----------------------|--|--|
| UT                         | \$15,749,377.00   | \$26,293,116.00  | \$1,347,521.00   | See F2a <sup>100</sup>  | [No Response]                                      | \$43,390,014.00   | \$91 million         | 48%  | \$12.70  |
| VA                         | [No Response]   | [No Response]  | \$74,298,189.99  | [No Response]   | [No Response]                                      | [No Response] <sup>101</sup>  | Unknown              | [No Value]                                 | \$0.00   |
| VT                         | [No Response]   | [No Response]  | [No Response]  | [No Response]   | [No Response]                                      | [No Response]   | \$4,755,333.00       | 0%   | \$0.00   |
| WA                         | State:<br>1,892,779.90<br>County:<br>4,865,661.07<br>Total:<br>6,758,460.97 | State:<br>20,386,453.29<br>County:<br>57,632,155.29<br>Total:<br>78,018,608.58 | State:<br>2,994,281.74<br>County:<br>8,172,939.92<br>Total:<br>11,167,221.66 | State:<br>3,944,170.39<br>County:<br>10,532,340.36<br>Total:<br>14,476,510.75 | [No Response]                                      | State:<br>29,217,705.32<br>County:<br>81,203,096.64<br>Total:<br>110,420,801.96 | \$451,135,106.00     | 24%  | \$14.13  |
| WI                         | Unknown   | \$0.00   | \$0.00   | \$0.00  | \$0.00   | Unknown   | Unknown              | [No Value]                                 | \$0.00   |
| WV                         | \$14,861,494.66   | \$45,941,014.23  | \$1,954,026.25   | \$6,954,286.86  | \$1,999,530.72                                     | \$69,910,352.72   | \$127,504,148.60     | 55%  | \$39.50  |
| WY                         | [No Response]   | [No Response]  | \$476,108.27   | [No Response]   | [No Response]                                      | \$8,217,973.71  | 11210090.05          | 73%  | \$14.07  |
| <b>Other Jurisdictions</b> |   |  |  |   |  |   |                      |  |  |
| AS                         | [DNF]   | [DNF]  | [DNF]  | [DNF]   | [DNF]  | [DNF]   | [DNF]                | [DNF]                                      | [DNF]  |
| DC                         | \$975,684.76  | \$7,859,304.36   | \$338,293.14   | \$2,919,971.94  | (PBX)<br>\$261,406.88<br>(Centrex)<br>\$549,472.52 | \$12,904,133.60   | \$51,749,217.00      | 25%  | \$19.01  |
| Guam                       | EXPLAINED IN<br>F2a <sup>102</sup>  | EXPLAINED IN<br>F2a  | EXPLAINED IN<br>F2a  | EXPLAINED IN<br>F2a   | EXPLAINED IN<br>F2a                                | \$2,009,197.00  | \$2,587,596.00       | 78%  | \$11.62  |
| NMI                        | [DNF]   | [DNF]  | [DNF]  | [DNF]   | [DNF]  | [DNF]   | [DNF]                | [DNF]                                      | [DNF]  |
| PR                         | \$2,733,361.93  | \$11,804,492.43  | \$1,959,944.04   | \$8,600,639.39  | [No Response]                                      | \$25,098,437.79   | \$18,418,568.00      | 136%                                       | \$7.83   |

<sup>100</sup> At Question F2a, Utah states, “VoIP is included in the wireline and wireless figures and can’t be segregated.” Utah Response at 15.

<sup>101</sup> At Question F2a, Virginia states, “9-1-1 fees are collected by the Virginia Department of Taxation and departmental staff is only able to provide a combined figure of \$74,298,189.99 for pre-paid and post-paid wireless revenue.” Virginia Response at 11.

<sup>102</sup> At Question F2a, Guam states, “When Commercial Mobile Radio Service (CMRS) providers collect the surcharge from their subscribers and remit the amounts collected, the remittance does not detail collections for each service type, but rather the total amount collected from subscribers.” Guam Response at 10.

| State   | Wireline                | Wireless | Prepaid | VoIP    | Other   | Total Fees Collected | Total Estimated Cost      | Fees as a Percentage of Cost <sup>92</sup> | Estimated Amount Collected Annually Per Capita |
|---|-------------------------|----------|---------|---------|---------|----------------------|---------------------------|--|--|
| USVI  | See F2a <sup>103j</sup> | See F2a  | See F2a | See F2a | See F2a | See F2a              | \$3,427,854.00            | 0%   | \$0.00   |
| <b>Total Estimated Fees Collected<sup>104</sup></b>                 |                         |          |         |         |         |                      | <b>\$4,029,325,858.29</b> |  |  |
| <b>Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911</b>                          |                         |          |         |         |         |                      | <b>\$7,839,062,804.98</b> |  |  |
| <b>Total Estimated Fees as a Percentage of Total Estimated Cost</b> |                         |          |         |         |         |                      | <b>51%</b>                |  |  |
| <b>Average State Amount Collected Per Capita<sup>105</sup></b>      |                         |          |         |         |         |                      | <b>\$11.91</b>            |  |  |
| <b>National Amount Collected Per Capita</b>                         |                         |          |         |         |         |                      | <b>\$11.96</b>            |  |  |

<sup>103</sup> At question F2a, the U.S. Virgin Islands states, “The State Department of Finance collects the total fee amount and portions it out in accordance with the Virgin Islands Code.” U.S. Virgin Islands Response at 10-11.

<sup>104</sup> This figure is based on the sum of the amounts respondents reported as “Total” fees collected at Question F2. Some states did not break down collected fees by service type and only provided their totals. Other states provided service type data but not the total. Several states submitted service type fees that do not add up to their reported totals. Therefore, the reported total estimated fees collected figure of \$4,029,325,858.29 is \$499,800,312.84 more than the sum of the individual wireline, wireless, prepaid wireless, VoIP, and Other fees reported by respondents, which is \$3,529,525,545.45.

<sup>105</sup> The “Average State Amount Collected Per Capita” is “Total Fees Collected” divided by the census population of states and jurisdictions that submitted questionnaires for calendar year 2023, so the denominator excludes the populations of the jurisdictions that did not file this year, American Samoa and the Northern Mariana Islands. The “National Amount Collected Per Capita” is “Total Fees Collected” divided by the census population of the entire United States.

26. States were asked whether any 911/E911 fees were combined with any federal, state, or local funds, grants, special collections, or general budget appropriations that were designated to support 911/E911/NG911 services.<sup>106</sup> Of the 54 responding jurisdictions listed in Table 15 below, 21 states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported combining collected fees with other funds or grants to support 911 services, while 29 states, Guam, and Puerto Rico reported they did not.

**Table 15 – States Reporting Whether 911/E911 Fees Are Combined with Federal, State, or Local Funds, Grants, Special Collections, or General Budget Appropriations**<sup>107</sup>

| Responses Regarding Combination of Collected Fees with Any Federal, State, or Local Funds, Grants, Special Collections, or General Budget Appropriations That Were Designated to Support 911/E911/NG911 Services |     |    |   |
|--|-----|----|---|
| State  | Yes | No | If Yes, Description of Federal, State, or Local Funds Combined with 911/E911 Fees   |
| AK   | X   |    | The 911 surcharge is used to provide additional funding for the Local 911 Call Center, rather than solely funding it. The rest of the funding comes from General Revenue taxes at the Borough or Municipal level.   |
| AL   | X   |    | Some local emergency communication districts receive a variety of funding from county/municipal appropriations, federal/state grants, dispatch fees, and various service contracts. Self-reported data from 80 of our 85 Districts for the fiscal period of October 1, 2022 through September 30, 2023 indicates that Districts received additional funding to support their 911 services totaling \$25,718,694.97 over and above the 911 fees collected. |
| AR   |     | X  | [NA]  |
| AZ   | X   |    | American Rescue Plan Act funds  |
| CA   |     | X  | N/A   |
| CO   |     | X  | [NA]  |
| CT   |     | X  | [NA]  |
| DE   |     | X  | [NA]  |
| FL   | X   |    | [No Response]   |
| GA   |     | X  | [NA]  |
| HI   |     | X  | [NA]  |

<sup>106</sup> On April 1, 2024, the Bureau distributed a Sixteenth Questionnaire that inadvertently omitted labeling of the blank available for what was intended to be designated Question F4a. *See infra* Appendix D (Sixteenth FCC Questionnaire at 10). The Bureau intended Question F4a to read as follows (unchanged from the Fifteenth Questionnaire): “F4a. If YES, please describe the federal, state or local funds and amounts that were combined with 911/E911 fees.” Fifteenth FCC Questionnaire at 10. As shown in the rightmost column of Table 15, despite the Bureau’s omission, several states nevertheless responded to the intended question by providing a description in that blank.

<sup>107</sup> Florida, Idaho, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the U.S. Virgin Islands provided substantive entries in Addendum Section F4 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/sixteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>. Several of these states describe at Addendum Section F4 (rather than at the inadvertently unlabeled blank intended for Question F4a) the federal, state or local funds that are combined with 911/E911 fees to support 911/E911/NG911 services. *See, e.g.*, Florida Response at 11 (“The 911 fee collected does not support 911 operations in the state. Local county taxes provide additional financial support for 911 operations in the state.”); Ohio Response at 11 (“State collected funds are distributed to the 88 counties and combined with Local funding (levies, sales tax, general funds, etc.) to support local 9-1-1 operations.”).

| <b>Responses Regarding Combination of Collected Fees with Any Federal, State, or Local Funds, Grants, Special Collections, or General Budget Appropriations That Were Designated to Support 911/E911/NG911 Services</b> |            |           |   |
|---|------------|-----------|---|
| <b>State</b>  | <b>Yes</b> | <b>No</b> | <b>If Yes, Description of Federal, State, or Local Funds Combined with 911/E911 Fees</b>  |
| IA  | X          |           | 19% 911 Surcharge<br>33% County General Fund<br>21% Sheriff's Fund<br>27% Miscellaneous Other Sources   |
| ID  |            | X         | [NA]  |
| IL  |            | X         | [NA]  |
| IN  |            | X         | [NA]  |
| KS  | X          |           | Local government general fund monies are used extensively to fund 911 in Kansas. These funds are derived from property taxes and account for approximately 76% of total funding in CY 2023.   |
| KY  | X          |           | Essentially, the costs for providing 911 services are paid at the local level. 911 fees collected by the state on wireless phones are distributed to local governments in regular quarterly payments (and grants) to help pay for daily operational costs and capital purchases. State 911 fees are combined at the local level with local general fund appropriations and local 911 fees to support 911 services. No other state funds are appropriated for 'local' 911 services. (State general funds help pay for 911 services provided by the Kentucky State Police.) |
| LA  |            | X         | [NA]  |
| MA  |            | X         | [NA]  |
| MD  |            | X         | [NA]  |
| ME  |            | X         | [NA]  |
| MI  | X          |           | In addition to the state and local funds reported above:<br>Local Millages: \$62,145,855.77<br>Local/County General Funds: \$68,449,208.94<br>Other Receipts (grants, tower rentals, contract for service, etc): \$50,777,667.59  |
| MN  |            | X         | [NA]  |
| MO  | X          |           | [No Response]   |
| MS  | X          |           | Local budgets must supplement funds received from wireline fees collected to cover operation costs and a grant was awarded from the National Transportation Safety Administration to the state in 2020.   |
| MT  |            | X         | [NA]  |
| NC  | X          |           | E911 funds were combined with local general fund allocations from each of the 114 primary PSAPs and 11 secondary PSAPs to pay for expenses not allowed by NC General Statutes governing the 911 Board and 911 Fund to provide for E911 services. Examples of expenses not allowed from collected 911 fees are telecommunicator salaries, facility maintenance, and radio network infrastructure.  |
| ND  |            | X         | [NA]  |
| NE  | X          |           | Wireless 911 Surcharge funds are allocated to local governments to assist with local 911 operations. Local PSAPs use Wireless 911 Surcharge funds to supplement, locally collected Wireline 911 surcharge funds and local general funds to support PSAP operations.   |
| NH  | X          |           | N/A   |
| NJ  |            | X         | [NA]  |
| NM  |            | X         | No funding was combined with E911 fees for eligible expenses within the State's definition of E-911 system. However, federal, state, and local funding was use for  |

| <b>Responses Regarding Combination of Collected Fees with Any Federal, State, or Local Funds, Grants, Special Collections, or General Budget Appropriations That Were Designated to Support 911/E911/NG911 Services</b> |            |           |  |
|---|------------|-----------|--|
| <b>State</b>  | <b>Yes</b> | <b>No</b> | <b>If Yes, Description of Federal, State, or Local Funds Combined with 911/E911 Fees</b>   |
|   |            |           | PSAP operations, buildings, CAD, and radio in support of 911 services.   |
| NV  | X          |           | General funds were used to pay for salaries, benefits, services, and supplies for Dispatch centers. Telephone Surcharge funds were used for dispatch equipment: cad systems and or upgrades, recordings systems, phone lines, training, body worn cameras and in vehicle cameras for law enforcement per NRS 244A.7645.  |
| NY  | X          |           | Counties may combine their collected local surcharge funds with their State-awarded grant funds and state-distributed local surcharges. These combinations occur within county and local budgets and the amounts are not reported to the State. Accounting rules applicable to each funding source must nonetheless be observed  |
| OH  | X          |           | [No Response]  |
| OK  | X          |           | [No Response]  |
| OR  |            | X         | [NA]   |
| PA  | X          |           | [No Response]  |
| RI  |            | X         | [NA]   |
| SC  |            | X         | [NA]   |
| SD  |            | X         | [NA]   |
| TN  | X          |           | Local government contributions of cash to emergency communications districts are generally about 25% of the total revenues reported by the emergency communications districts. Unidentified amounts of additional support are provided by local governments, but are not reflected in the financial records of the emergency communications districts.   |
| TX  | X          |           | <p>CSEC issued reimbursements totaling \$34,893,680 out of the NG9-1-1 Fund in CY 2023. The NG9-1-1 Fund consists of \$150 million from Texas’s federal ARPA - CSFRF award appropriated by the Texas Legislature to the NG9-1-1 Fund administered by CSEC.</p> <p>Whether a Texas 9-1-1 Entity combined other funds (primarily local general revenues) with 911/E911 fees to support 9-1-1 service depends, in part, on the Entity’s determination of what costs are attributable to 9-1-1 service. The Commission’s adoption of ‘911 Fee Diversion Rules’ (47 C.F.R. § 9.23) in June 2021 clarified the eligible uses of 9-1-1 fees and also addressed multi-purpose fees (e.g., Texas statewide equalization surcharge). Utilizing non-911 local funds is specifically applicable to Municipal ECDs who, unlike the CSEC state 9-1-1 Program and 772 ECDs, are responsible for all costs directly associated with 9-1-1 service, in addition to the costs of emergency response/dispatch, law enforcement, fire, EMS.</p> <p>A majority of Texas 9-1-1 Entities do not include telecommunicator/dispatcher or dispatch costs in the costs of providing 9-1-1 service. For the CSEC state 9-1-1 Program, RPCs are precluded from paying such costs; there’s a limited exception applicable to the largest county in an RPC’s service area. Similarly, a majority of statutory 772 ECDs do not expend 9-1-1 fees for telecommunicator/dispatcher compensation and related costs; or only provide a portion of the funds needed for such costs. Many if not most Municipal ECDs consider telecommunicator/dispatcher costs to be a fundamental part of 9-1-1 service.</p> <p>By way of example, see below from several Municipal ECDs. CSEC included with questions F.4 and F.5 sent to the Texas 9-1-1 Entities the following: NOTE: 911 costs may include the costs listed in Section E.2. above, but not the costs of providing emergency response—law enforcement, fire, or EMS.)</p> |



| <b>Responses Regarding Combination of Collected Fees with Any Federal, State, or Local Funds, Grants, Special Collections, or General Budget Appropriations That Were Designated to Support 911/E911/NG911 Services</b> |            |           |   |
|---|------------|-----------|---|
| <b>State</b>  | <b>Yes</b> | <b>No</b> | <b>If Yes, Description of Federal, State, or Local Funds Combined with 911/E911 Fees</b>  |
|   |            |           | Dallas reported spending \$52,935,662 in local city funds to provide 9-1-1 service. Plano 9-1-1 fees were used to offset compensation costs for our call takers, public educator and three of our training coordinators (inclusive of quality assurance). These funds were re-allocated to the general fund, as all City of Plano salaries are paid from the general fund. Additional general fund monies were expended for materials and supplies, travel and training, and sundry items (i.e., awards/recognitions, associations, etc.) |
| UT  |            | X         | [NA]  |
| VA  |            | X         | [NA]  |
| VT  | X          |           | \$2,115,000 was transferred from the General Fund to the Enhanced 911 Special Fund.   |
| WA  |            | X         | [NA]  |
| WI  |            | X         | [NA]  |
| WV  |            | X         | [NA]  |
| WY  |            | X         | The state is not privy to the local budgets.  |
| <b>Other Jurisdictions</b>  |            |           |   |
| AS  | [DNF]      | [DNF]     | [DNF]   |
| DC  | X          |           | [No Response]   |
| Guam  |            | X         | [NA]  |
| NMI   | [DNF]      | [DNF]     | [DNF]   |
| PR  |            | X         | [NA]  |
| USVI  | X          |           | [No Response]   |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>23</b>  | <b>31</b> |   |

27. Lastly, the Bureau requested that states provide an estimate of the proportional contribution from each funding source towards the total cost to support 911 in the state or jurisdiction. As described in Table 16 below, eight states, as well as Guam and Puerto Rico, reported that state 911 fees were the sole source of revenue funding 911 services; eleven states indicated that 50 to 90% of funding came from state 911 fees; one state reported that 50 to 90% of funding came from local 911 fees; one state reported that the source of funding was split evenly between state and local jurisdictions' 911 fee collection; and one state reported that local fees were the sole source of funding.<sup>108</sup> Fourteen states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that state or local General Fund revenues accounted for 50 to 90% of 911 funding.

<sup>108</sup> Although states and jurisdictions reported certain percentages at Question F5, tallied in this summary, some responses appear internally inconsistent. For example, Minnesota reports at Question F5 that 100% of its 911 support came from state 911 fees, but also reports at Question F5 that "PSAPs receive general funds from the county/municipality in which they operate to augment the annual distribution they receive from the state through 911 fees." Minnesota Response at 12-13.

**Table 16 – State Estimates of Proportional Contributions from Each Funding Source<sup>109</sup>**

| State | State 911/E911 Fees | Local 911/E911 Fees   | General Fund - State | General Fund - County  | Federal Grants | State Grants  |
|-------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|--|----------------|---------------|
| AK    | [No Response]       | 100% <sup>[110]</sup> | [No Response]        | [No Response]  | [No Response]  | [No Response] |
| AL    | 83.5%               | 0.0%                  | 0.0%                 | 14.1%  | 1.9%           | 0.5%          |
| AR    | 70%                 | 5%                    | 0%                   | 25%  | 0%             | 0%            |
| AZ    | 75%                 | [No Response]         | [No Response]        | [No Response]  | 25%            | [No Response] |
| CA    | 100%                | [No Response]         | [No Response]        | [No Response]  | [No Response]  | [No Response] |
| CO    | [No Response]       | [No Response]         | [No Response]        | [No Response]  | [No Response]  | [No Response] |
| CT    | 100%                | [No Response]         | [No Response]        | [No Response]  | [No Response]  | [No Response] |
| DE    | 100%                | [No Response]         | [No Response]        | [No Response]  | [No Response]  | [No Response] |
| FL    | 31%                 | [No Response]         | [No Response]        | 66%  | [No Response]  | 3%            |
| GA    | 55%                 | [No Response]         | [No Response]        | 45%  | [No Response]  | [No Response] |
| HI    | -                   | -                     | -                    | -  | -              | -             |
| IA    | 19%                 | [No Response]         | [No Response]        | 33%  | [No Response]  | [No Response] |
| ID    | [No Response]       | 92%                   | 0%                   | [No Response]  | [No Response]  | 8%            |
| IL    | 90%                 | [No Response]         | [No Response]        | 8%   | [No Response]  | 2%            |
| IN    | 34%                 | 12%                   | 0%                   | 54%  | [No Response]  | [No Response] |
| KS    | 24%                 | [No Response]         | [No Response]        | 76%  | [No Response]  | [No Response] |
| KY    | 26%                 | 34%                   | 0%                   | 36%  | 1%             | 3%            |
| LA    | 8.8%                | 91.2%                 | [No Response]        | [No Response]  | [No Response]  | [No Response] |
| MA    | 100%                | [No Response]         | [No Response]        | [No Response]  | [No Response]  | [No Response] |
| MD    | 18%                 | 35%                   | [No Response]        | 47%  | [No Response]  | [No Response] |
| ME    | 100%                | [No Response]         | [No Response]        | [No Response]  | [No Response]  | [No Response] |
| MI    | 0                   | 0                     | N/A                  | 0  | N/A            | N/A           |
| MN    | 100%                | 0%                    | 0%                   | PSAPs receive general funds from the county/municipality in which they operate | 0%             | 0%            |

<sup>109</sup> Colorado, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Wisconsin provided substantive entries in Addendum Section F5 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/sixteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>. Iowa and Michigan provided funding source contribution percentages that do not total 100%. Iowa states at Addendum Section F5, “We do not track expenditures through the above specific categories. The way we track our 911 funding breaks down as follows: 19% 911 Surcharge[;] 33% County General Fund[;] 21% Sheriff’s Fund[;] 27% Miscellaneous Other Source.” Iowa Response at 12. Michigan states at Addendum Section F5, “Local Millages: 17%[;] Other Receipts: 14%.” Michigan Response at 13.

<sup>110</sup> Elsewhere, however, Alaska states, “The 911 surcharge is used to provide additional funding for the Local 911 Call Center, rather than solely funding it. The rest of the funding comes from General Revenue taxes at the Borough or Municipal level.” Alaska Response at 13.

|                            |                                |               |  |  |               |               |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|--|--|---------------|---------------|
|                            |                                |               |  | to augment the annual distribution they receive from the state through 911 fees. |               |               |
| MO                         | 3%                             | 92%           | [No Response]                            | 5%   | [No Response] | [No Response] |
| MS                         | [No Response]                  | [No Response] | [No Response]                            | [No Response]  | [No Response] | [No Response] |
| MT                         | 30%                            | [No Response] | [No Response]                            | 70%  | [No Response] | [No Response] |
| NC                         | 35%                            | [No Response] | [No Response]                            | 60%  | [No Response] | 5%            |
| ND                         | 3%                             | 45%           | 0%                                       | 52%  | 0%            | 0%            |
| NE                         | 10%                            | 10%           | 0%                                       | 80%  | [No Response] | [No Response] |
| NH                         | 100%                           | 0%            | 0%                                       | 0%   | 0%            | 0%            |
| NJ                         | Unknown                        | Unknown       | 0%                                       | Unknown  | 0%            | 0%            |
| NM                         | 100%                           | [No Response] | [No Response]                            | [No Response]  | [No Response] | [No Response] |
| NV                         | [No Response]                  | 30%           | [No Response]                            | 70%  | [No Response] | [No Response] |
| NY                         | 0.8%                           | 3.6%          | 1.6%                                     | 94%  | [No Response] | [No Response] |
| OH                         | 6.4%                           | 33.0%         | 0.2%                                     | 60.4%  | 0%            | 0%            |
| OK                         | 34.3%                          | 5.6%          | 0%                                       | 58.4%  | 0%            | 1.7%          |
| OR                         | 35%                            | 65%           | [No Response]                            | [No Response]  | [No Response] | [No Response] |
| PA                         | 72.6%                          | [No Response] | [No Response]                            | 27.4%  | [No Response] | [No Response] |
| RI                         | Effective October 1, 2019 100% | [No Response] | Effective, up until October 1, 2019 100% | [No Response]  | [No Response] | [No Response] |
| SC                         | 84%                            | 16%           | 0%                                       | ??   | 0%            | 0%            |
| SD                         | 38.2%                          | [No Response] | [No Response]                            | 61.1%  | [No Response] | 0.7%          |
| TN                         | 68.39%                         | 9.42%         | 0%                                       | 16.17%   | 0%            | 6.02%         |
| TX                         | [No Response]                  | [No Response] | [No Response]                            | [No Response]  | [No Response] | [No Response] |
| UT                         | 43.04%                         | N/A           | 5.34%                                    | 51.58%   | N/A           | 0.04%         |
| VA                         | 50%                            | 50%           | [No Response]                            | [No Response]  | [No Response] | [No Response] |
| VT                         | 63%                            | [No Response] | 37%                                      | [No Response]  | [No Response] | [No Response] |
| WA                         | 9%                             | 23%           | [No Response]                            | ~34% user agency fees<br>~34% other local funds                                  | [No Response] | [No Response] |
| WI                         | 0%                             | 15%           | 5%                                       | 70%  | 0%            | 10%           |
| WV                         | 64%                            | 36%           | N/A                                      | N/A  | N/A           | N/A           |
| WY                         | 66.54%                         | [No Response] | [No Response]                            | 33.46%   | [No Response] | [No Response] |
| <b>Other Jurisdictions</b> |                                |               |  |  |               |               |
| AS                         | [DNF]                          | [DNF]         | [DNF]                                    | [DNF]  | [DNF]         | [DNF]         |
| DC                         | 22.9%                          | [No Response] | 77.1%                                    | [No Response]  | [No Response] | [No Response] |
| Guam                       | 100%                           | [No Response] | [No Response]                            | [No Response]  | [No Response] | [No Response] |
| NMI                        | [DNF]                          | [DNF]         | [DNF]                                    | [DNF]  | [DNF]         | [DNF]         |
| PR                         | 100%                           | [No Response] | [No Response]                            | [No Response]  | [No Response] | [No Response] |
| USVI                       | 22%                            | N/A           | 78%                                      | N/A  | N/A           | N/A           |

28. On a related note, the FCC Questionnaire at F3 also asked respondents to identify any other sources of 911/E911 funding, beyond 911/E911 fees.<sup>111</sup> Most states and jurisdictions responded with specific information on the sources for their 911/E911 funding.<sup>112</sup>

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

29. As previously noted, “[t]o ensure efficiency, transparency, and accountability in the collection and expenditure of a fee or charge for the support or implementation of 9-1-1 or enhanced 9-1-1 services,” in 2008, Congress directed the Commission to annually submit a report detailing the status in each State of the collection and distribution of such fees or charges.<sup>113</sup> On December 27, 2020, Congress enacted section 902, which directed the Commission to adopt rules “designating purposes and functions for which the obligation or expenditure of 9-1-1 fees or charges, by any State or taxing jurisdiction authorized to impose such a fee or charge, is acceptable.”<sup>114</sup> Section 902 also amended 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(2) to replace the statutory language that the Commission’s annual report should include findings on the amount of revenues obligated or expended for “any purpose other than the purpose for which any such fees or charges are specified,”<sup>115</sup> with the language “any purpose or function other than the purposes and functions designated in the final rules issued [by the Commission] . . . as purposes and functions for which the obligation or expenditure of any such fees or charges is acceptable.”<sup>116</sup>

30. On June 25, 2021, the Commission issued the *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order* adopting rules that define which expenditures of 911 fees or charges by states and jurisdictions are “acceptable” and which constitute fee diversion for purposes of section 902 and the Commission’s rules.<sup>117</sup> The rules also provide an elective safe harbor for states and taxing jurisdictions that designate multi-purpose fees or charges for “public safety,” “emergency services,” or other similar purposes, where a portion of those fees or charges supports 911 services.<sup>118</sup> The rules adopted in the *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order* went into effect on October 18, 2021.<sup>119</sup> As required by section 902, the Commission has applied these rules in this year’s Sixteenth Report to Congress.<sup>120</sup>

31. Section 902 also required the Commission to establish the “Ending 9-1-1 Fee Diversion Now Strike Force” (911 Strike Force) to study “how the Federal Government can most expeditiously end diversion” by states and taxing jurisdictions.<sup>121</sup> The Commission referred several issues to the Strike Force, including seeking recommendations on the “precise dividing line” between acceptable and

---

<sup>111</sup> FCC Questionnaire at 10 (Question F3).

<sup>112</sup> State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/sixteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

<sup>113</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(2).

<sup>114</sup> Section 902(c)(1)(C) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(3)(A) (as amended)).

<sup>115</sup> NET 911 Act at § 6(f)(2) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(2)) (prior version, in effect until December 27, 2020).

<sup>116</sup> Section 902(c)(1)(B) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(2) (as amended)).

<sup>117</sup> *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*. The rules adopted in the *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order* may be found at 47 CFR § 9.21 *et seq.*

<sup>118</sup> 47 CFR § 9.23(d).

<sup>119</sup> *Effective Date of 911 Fee Diversion Rules Public Notice*, 36 FCC Rcd 12629.

<sup>120</sup> *See* sections 902(d)(2) and 902(f)(4) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1 Statutory Notes (as amended)).

<sup>121</sup> Section 902(d)(3)(A) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1 Statutory Notes (as amended)).

unacceptable expenditures of 911 fees on public safety radio expenditures, and developing additional specific examples of the allowable use of 911 fees for public safety radio systems.<sup>122</sup> On September 23, 2021, the 911 Strike Force submitted its final report with recommendations and findings to Congress.<sup>123</sup>

32. Under section 6(f)(2) of the NET 911 Act, the Commission is required to obtain information “detailing the status in each State of the collection and distribution of such [911/E911] fees or charges.”<sup>124</sup> In 2022, the Bureau revised the annual data-gathering questionnaire to help effectuate the Commission’s new rules under section 902. The questionnaire changes included a revision to Question G1, which now asks states and jurisdictions whether funds collected for 911/E911 purposes were obligated or expended solely for “acceptable purposes and functions” as provided under the Commission’s new rule at 47 CFR § 9.23.<sup>125</sup> Similarly, revised Question G1a now asks respondents to identify what amount of funds collected for 911/E911 purposes was obligated or expended for purposes or functions other than those designated as acceptable under 47 CFR § 9.23, including any funds transferred, loaned, or otherwise used for the state’s General Fund.<sup>126</sup> The 2022 revised questionnaire also added Questions G2 and G3, requesting information on public safety radio spending and multi-purpose fees, respectively.<sup>127</sup>

33. Pursuant to the rules adopted in the *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*, in calendar year 2023, three reporting states diverted or transferred 911 funds. As described in Table 17 below, Nevada self-identified in its questionnaire response that it, or local jurisdictions within the state, diverted funds.<sup>128</sup> New Jersey and New York did not self-identify in their questionnaire responses as diverting funds, but, consistent with previous reports, the Bureau has determined based on review of the information provided that these states diverted funds for non-911 related purposes within the meaning of the NET 911 Act. The three jurisdictions listed in Table 17 diverted an aggregate amount of

---

<sup>122</sup> See, e.g., *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*, 36 FCC Rcd at 10827, 10829, paras. 50, 55 (referring to the Strike Force for further guidance the issue of applying the standard for acceptable 911 expenditures to public safety radio equipment).

<sup>123</sup> *911 Strike Force Report and Recommendations*. The 911 Strike Force report included the following recommendation for the allowable use of 911 fees to support public safety radio systems: “[t]he allowable use of 911 fees should include the ability for local agencies and states to fund any communication system, technology or support activity that directly provides the ability to deliver 911 voice and data information between the ‘entry point’ to the 911 system and the first responder.” *911 Strike Force Report and Recommendations* at 10 (citations omitted).

<sup>124</sup> NET 911 Act at § 6(f)(2) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(2)).

<sup>125</sup> FCC Sixteenth Questionnaire at 11; see also FCC Fifteenth Questionnaire at 11; FCC Fourteenth Questionnaire at 10-11. The prior version of the questionnaire (e.g., FCC Thirteenth Questionnaire) at G1 and G1a reflected the version of 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(2) previously in effect, before the section 902 amendments. NET 911 Act at § 6(f)(2) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(2)) (prior version, in effect until December 27, 2020) (stating Commission’s annual report should include “findings on the amount of revenues obligated or expended by each State or political subdivision thereof for any purpose other than the purpose for which any such fees or charges are specified”).

<sup>126</sup> FCC Sixteenth Questionnaire at 11; see also FCC Fifteenth Questionnaire at 11; FCC Fourteenth Questionnaire at 11.

<sup>127</sup> FCC Sixteenth Questionnaire at 12-14; see also FCC Fifteenth Questionnaire at 12-14; FCC Fourteenth Questionnaire at 11-14.

<sup>128</sup> In its Response at Question G1, which asks whether 911/E911 funds were obligated or expended “solely for acceptable purposes and functions as provided under 47 CFR § 9.23,” Nevada checked the No box. Nevada Response at 11. As discussed below, the Bureau does not find that Nevada diverted fees at the state level in calendar year 2023, but concludes that one or more local jurisdictions in Nevada diverted a portion of 911 fees in 2023 under authority granted by a state statute.

\$215,690,474.68 or approximately 5.35% of all 911/E911 funds reported to have been collected by all responding states and jurisdictions in 2023.

34. As in previous reports, we have identified diversion or transfers of 911/E911 funds and categorized them as to whether the funds were directed to other public safety uses or to non-public safety uses such as state General Fund accounts.

**Table 17 – Total Funds Diverted or Otherwise Transferred from 911/E911 Uses<sup>129</sup>**

| State/<br>Jurisdiction   | Total Funds<br>Collected (Year End<br>2023) | Total Funds<br>Used for Other<br>Purposes | Percentage<br>Diverted | Type of<br>Transfer               |
|--|---|---|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>States/Jurisdictions Self-Identifying as Diverting/Transferring Funds</b>     |   |   |                        |                                   |
| Nevada   | \$10,004,935.78                             | [unknown]                                 | [unknown]              | Public<br>Safety                  |
| <b>States/Jurisdictions Identified by Bureau as Diverting/Transferring Funds</b> |   |   |                        |                                   |
| New Jersey   | \$131,187,673.63                            | \$106,445,673.63                          | 81.1%                  | Public<br>Safety and<br>Unrelated |
| New York   | \$261,977,940.16 <sup>[130]</sup>           | \$109,244,801.05                          | 41.7%                  | Public<br>Safety and<br>Unrelated |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>\$403,170,549.57</b>                     | <b>\$215,690,474.68</b>                   | <b>53.5%</b>           |                                   |
| <i>Percent Diverted From<br/>Total Funds Collected by All States</i>             |   |   |                        |                                   |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>\$4,029,325,858.29<sup>[131]</sup></b>   |   | <b>5.35%</b>           |                                   |

<sup>129</sup> Colorado, Georgia, Nevada, and Washington provided substantive entries in Addendum Section G1 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/sixteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

<sup>130</sup> See *infra* note 159.

<sup>131</sup> This figure reflects the combined total amount of 911/E911 fee revenue that all responding states and jurisdictions reported for calendar year 2023 in the FCC Questionnaire at F2. As discussed below, for our analysis of New York’s 911 fee collection and expenditures, the Bureau used fee revenue data from publicly available New York State tax records, rather than the F2 revenue amount that New York reported in its questionnaire. For simplicity, throughout this report we have used respondents’ submitted F2 figures to calculate the total amount of 911/E911 fees collected in calendar year 2023, and have not adjusted the total amount to reflect any external data on fees.

## 1. Diversion Analysis

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

35. *Nevada.* Nevada’s response this year indicates that local jurisdictions continued to divert a portion of their 911/E911 funds in 2023, based on a state statute authorizing such diversion. In its response for the Tenth Report, Nevada reported that in 2017, the state legislature “added an allowance to increase the E911 fee to help pay for body cameras for officers.”<sup>132</sup> Nevada also reported that the state legislature increased the maximum surcharge and expanded permissible uses for the surcharge to allow “purchase and maintenance of portable event recording devices and vehicular recording devices.”<sup>133</sup> The Bureau found in the Tenth, Eleventh, Twelfth, Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Reports that the expenditure of 911/E911 fees on police body cameras and vehicular recording devices constituted diversion of 911/E911 fees for non-911 public safety uses.<sup>134</sup> We make the same finding in this report. In this year’s filing covering 2023, Nevada has not submitted any information indicating that the state has revised its statute or otherwise prohibited local jurisdictions from using 911 fees for body cameras and vehicular recording devices.<sup>135</sup> In addition, Nevada’s response to Question G1, asking whether 911/E911 funds were obligated or expended in calendar year 2023 solely for acceptable purposes and functions under 47 CFR 9.23, is “No,” with Nevada going on to explain at G1a that, in 2023, “911 Funds were utilized for body-worn and in-vehicle cameras for law enforcement agencies per NRS 244A.7645.”<sup>136</sup>

---

<sup>132</sup> See FCC, Tenth Annual Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges at 45-46, para. 34 (2018), [https://www.fcc.gov/sites/default/files/10th\\_annual\\_911\\_fee\\_report\\_to\\_congress.pdf](https://www.fcc.gov/sites/default/files/10th_annual_911_fee_report_to_congress.pdf) (Tenth Report) (quoting Churchill County, Nevada Tenth Response at 4).

<sup>133</sup> See Tenth Report at 45-46, para. 34 (quoting Washoe County, Nevada Tenth Response at 4)

<sup>134</sup> Tenth Report at 45-46, para. 34; FCC, Eleventh Annual Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges at 41, para. 30 (2019), [https://www.fcc.gov/sites/default/files/11th\\_annual\\_911\\_fee\\_report\\_2019.pdf](https://www.fcc.gov/sites/default/files/11th_annual_911_fee_report_2019.pdf); FCC, Twelfth Annual Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges at 51, para. 29 (2020), <https://www.fcc.gov/sites/default/files/12thannual911feereport2020.pdf> (Twelfth Report); FCC, Thirteenth Annual Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges at 51, para. 38 (2021), <https://www.fcc.gov/sites/default/files/13th-annual-911-fee-report-2021.pdf> (Thirteenth Report); FCC, Fourteenth Annual Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges at 64-65, para. 37 (2022), <https://www.fcc.gov/file/24628/download> (Fourteenth Report); Fifteenth Report at 65, para. 35.

<sup>135</sup> Nevada Response at 5 (reporting “No” for whether the state amended, enlarged, or in any way altered the funding mechanism). Nev. Rev. Stat. § 244A.7645, which permits certain entities in Nevada counties to spend 911 fees on portable and vehicular event recording devices, was in effect and not revised in any relevant way during calendar year 2023.

<sup>136</sup> Nevada Response at 11-12 (G1, G1a). The exact amount of 911 fees that Nevada counties spent on body and/or vehicle cameras in 2023 is unclear. For example, at G1a, Nevada lists the amount of 911 fees spent on body and/or vehicle cameras in 2023 as \$1,716,454.64, but cautions at Addendum Section G1 that this amount “is not accurate due to some counties not reporting.” Nevada Response at 12. Meanwhile, at G2b, Nevada instead lists the amount spent on “Body Cameras/Vehicle Cameras and associated infrastructure” as \$651,895.98. Nevada Response at 13 (including a caution at Addendum Section G2 that “[n]ot all Nevada PSAPs collecting 911 fees provided the necessary information” on various expenses). The Nevada Response also reports 911 fee spending on body and/or vehicle cameras multiple additional times without specifying an amount. Nevada Response at 7, 10 (“Telephone Surcharge funds were used for . . . body worn cameras and in vehicle cameras for law enforcement per NRS 244A.7645.”), 22. The Nevada Response for 2023 does not specify which Nevada counties engaged in such 911 fee spending.

Accordingly, based on Nevada’s report, we find that one or more local jurisdictions in Nevada diverted a portion of the 911/E911 fees they collected in 2023 to a non-911 public safety use.

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

36. *New Jersey.* The Bureau has identified New Jersey’s statutory framework as resulting in diversion of 911 fees as far back as the Sixth Report.<sup>137</sup> This year, New Jersey again reports that it did not divert or transfer any collected funds.<sup>138</sup> However, in response to Question E1 in this year’s filing, New Jersey again states that in accordance with New Jersey statute (P.L. 2004, c.48), all fees collected are “deposited into the 9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Trust Fund account and applied to offset a portion of the cost of related programs.”<sup>139</sup> Specifically, New Jersey reports that the \$131,187,673.63 it collected in 911 fees in calendar year 2023 was deposited into the 9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Trust Fund account and applied to offset a portion of the cost of programs within the Departments of Law and Public Safety, Military and Veterans’ Affairs, and Treasury.<sup>140</sup> New Jersey reports that from this total, it appropriated \$13,822,000 for the Statewide 9-1-1 Emergency Telecommunication System and \$920,000 for the Office of Emergency Telecommunication Services.<sup>141</sup> As in prior years, we find these expenditures to be 911 related.<sup>142</sup> In addition, this year New Jersey reports that it spent \$10,000,000 on PSAP Upgrades and Consolidation,<sup>143</sup> which we also find to be a 911-related expenditure. New Jersey reports that the remaining balance of \$106,445,673.63 was allocated to programs such as the Division of State Police, National Guard Support Services, Urban Search and Rescue, and Rural Section Policing.<sup>144</sup> As in previous years, the state has not supplied documentation that would support a conclusion that these latter programs are 911 related. Therefore, consistent with previous reports, the Bureau concludes that New Jersey diverted the \$106,445,673.63 spent on these programs.<sup>145</sup>

37. New Jersey asserts that its “9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Fee” is a multi-purpose fee that falls within the FCC’s voluntary safe harbor provisions.<sup>146</sup> We do not agree with this assertion. This is the same fee that New Jersey has collected for a number of years, and New Jersey acknowledges that there was no change to the relevant state law in calendar year 2023.<sup>147</sup> Moreover, the

---

<sup>137</sup> See FCC, Sixth Annual Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges at 12-13, paras. 15, 18 (2014), [https://transition.fcc.gov/pshs/911/Net%20911/NET911\\_Act\\_6thReport\\_to\\_Congress\\_123014.pdf](https://transition.fcc.gov/pshs/911/Net%20911/NET911_Act_6thReport_to_Congress_123014.pdf).

<sup>138</sup> New Jersey Response at 12.

<sup>139</sup> New Jersey Response at 7.

<sup>140</sup> New Jersey Response at 7-8, 10.

<sup>141</sup> New Jersey Response at 7-8.

<sup>142</sup> See, e.g., Fifteenth Report at 66, para. 36; Fourteenth Report at 63, para. 35; Thirteenth Report at 50-51, para. 37; Twelfth Report at 50, para. 28.

<sup>143</sup> New Jersey Response at 8.

<sup>144</sup> New Jersey Response at 7.

<sup>145</sup> In this year’s response, New Jersey has again reported a combination of fiscal year and calendar year data. See, e.g., New Jersey Response at 7-8, 10 (E1 and F2). The Bureau has calculated New Jersey’s diversion amount based on the information New Jersey has made available.

<sup>146</sup> New Jersey Response at 14-15 (Section G3). See also 911 Fee Diversion Report and Order, 36 FCC Rcd at 10813, para. 20 (explaining the Commission has found that multi-purpose fees that support 911/E911 and other purposes fall within the Commission’s authority under section 6(f)(1) of the NET 911 Act).

<sup>147</sup> New Jersey Response at 5.



New Jersey fee does not meet two of the three requirements for the FCC’s voluntary safe harbor for multi-purpose fees.<sup>148</sup> First, although New Jersey asserts that the 911 portion of its 9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Fee is segregated and not commingled with other funds,<sup>149</sup> New Jersey’s response to another section of the questionnaire indicates that all fee revenue is deposited in a single account.<sup>150</sup> Second, New Jersey has not demonstrated that a fixed dollar amount or percentage of the fee is dedicated to 911 services.<sup>151</sup> Under the relevant New Jersey statute, funds credited to the 9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Trust Fund Account are annually appropriated for a number of listed purposes, both 911 and non-911 related, but the statute does not specify a fixed amount or percentage to be used for 911 purposes.<sup>152</sup> We therefore find that New Jersey has not demonstrated that the 9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Fee is a permissible multi-purpose fee under the FCC’s rules.<sup>153</sup>

38. *New York.* The Bureau’s reports have identified New York’s statutory framework as resulting in diversion of 911 fees since the first fee report to Congress in 2009.<sup>154</sup> Under section 186-f of the New York State Consolidated Tax Law, 41.7% of the fees collected by the Public Safety Communications Surcharge is allocated to the state’s General Fund and, after deducting this amount and a small administrative fee for each wireless communications service supplier and prepaid wireless communications seller, the remaining balance is then deposited into the Statewide Public Safety Communications Account.<sup>155</sup> New York also reports collecting two other kinds of fees that contribute to 911 support, an “Enhanced Emergency Telephone System Surcharge” and a “Wireless Communications Surcharge.”<sup>156</sup>

---

<sup>148</sup> The three requirements to qualify for the FCC’s voluntary safe harbor for multi-purpose fees are set forth at 47 CFR § 9.23(d).

<sup>149</sup> New Jersey Response at 15 (G3b); *see also* 47 CFR § 9.23(d)(2).

<sup>150</sup> New Jersey Response at 7. *See also* N.J. Stat. Ann. § 52:17C-18(c)(1) (West, Westlaw through 2024) (establishing the fee and directing that “the State Treasurer shall credit the fee revenue to the ‘9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Trust Fund Account’”); N.J. Stat. Ann. § 52:17C-19 (West, Westlaw through 2024) (listing the 911 related and non-911 related purposes for which the funds in the 9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Trust Fund Account can be spent).

<sup>151</sup> *See* 47 CFR § 9.23(d)(1).

<sup>152</sup> N.J. Stat. Ann. § 52:17C-19(b) (West, Westlaw through 2024).

<sup>153</sup> The FCC’s multi-purpose fee safe harbor provision is “a voluntary provision that provides a set of criteria for states and taxing jurisdictions with multi-purpose fees to demonstrate that they are not diverting 911 fees or charges.” *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*, 36 FCC Rcd at 10830, para. 57. This elective safe harbor provision with its particular set of criteria is not the only means by which a state may demonstrate that its use of a portion of a multi-purpose fee for non-911 related purposes does not constitute fee diversion. However, New Jersey also has not otherwise demonstrated that its use of the 9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Fee does not constitute diversion.

<sup>154</sup> *See, e.g.*, Fifteenth Report at 67-69, paras. 38-41; FCC, Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges at 11-12, para. 16, Table 4 (2009), <https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/DOC-292216A2.pdf>.

<sup>155</sup> N.Y. Tax Law § 186-f 5(a)-(b) (McKinney). Section 186-f of the New York State Consolidated Tax Law requires the collection of a Public Safety Communications Surcharge. *Id.* at § 186-f 2. The remaining portion of the surcharge, slightly less than 58.3%, is deposited to the Statewide Public Safety Communications Account. *Id.* at § 186-f 5(b).

<sup>156</sup> New York Response at 4-7.

39. New York continued to operate under this state law framework in calendar year 2023.<sup>157</sup> Consistent with prior reports, we conclude that the 41.7% of the surcharge that is allocated to the state's General Fund constitutes a diversion of 911 fees.<sup>158</sup> In the absence of any showing by New York as to how the funds allocated to the General Fund were spent, we identify the full 41.7%, or \$109,244,801.05, as diverted.<sup>159</sup> In addition, as in past years, New York has not provided sufficient information relating to expenditure of the remaining 58.3% of funds allocated to the Statewide Public Safety Communications Account, and thus has not established that these expenditures in calendar year 2023 were 911 related. The statute identifies a variety of public safety related programs that may receive state grants or allocations funded by this account,<sup>160</sup> only one of which is clearly 911 related.<sup>161</sup> Because we lack information regarding the specific expenditures of public safety grant funds from this account, we do not reach the issue of whether these funds were diverted and do not include them in our calculation of the amount diverted by New York.

40. This year, New York again asserts that its Public Safety Communications Surcharge is a multi-purpose fee that falls within the FCC's voluntary safe harbor provisions, and thus that New York's expenditure of a portion of the fee revenues on non-911 related items does not constitute diversion.<sup>162</sup> We do not agree with this assertion. New York has collected this same surcharge for years and has diverted a significant portion of the revenues to the state General Fund, which we have consistently found to constitute fee diversion. There has been no change to the relevant state law or the nature of New York's fee expenditures to warrant a different conclusion this year with respect to such expenditures.

41. In addition, even the portion of the New York surcharge that is allocated to the Statewide Public Safety Communications Account fails to meet two of the three requirements for the FCC's safe harbor for multi-purpose fees.<sup>163</sup> First, although New York asserts that a portion of the surcharge dedicated to PSAP-related grants is segregated and not commingled with other funds,<sup>164</sup> the relevant state

---

<sup>157</sup> See, e.g., New York Response at 5 (reporting no change in the funding mechanism during calendar year 2023).

<sup>158</sup> See, e.g., Fifteenth Report at 67-68, para. 39; Fourteenth Report at 65-66, para. 39; Thirteenth Report at 52-53, para. 40; Twelfth Report at 52, para. 32.

<sup>159</sup> In this year's questionnaire, New York reports data for the total dollar amount of fees collected, but does not break out the dollar amount specifically from the Public Safety Communications Surcharge under § 186-f, as opposed to other fees. New York Response at 9-11. Because New York has not supplied any information on the amount it collected in 2023 through the Public Safety Communications Surcharge, the Bureau has used publicly available fiscal year data for this surcharge in its calculations. State tax records indicate that New York collected \$261,977,940.16 through its Public Safety Communications Surcharge in fiscal year 2023. See New York State, Department of Taxation and Finance, Table 6: Article 9 – Corporation and Utilities Tax Collections by Fiscal Year, State Fiscal Years 2019-2023, [https://www.tax.ny.gov/research/stats/statistics/sales\\_tax/reports/annual-statistical-reports/2022-2023/table-6.xlsx](https://www.tax.ny.gov/research/stats/statistics/sales_tax/reports/annual-statistical-reports/2022-2023/table-6.xlsx). The New York fiscal year runs from April 1 to March 31. See [https://www.tax.ny.gov/research/stats/statistics/stat\\_fy\\_collections.htm](https://www.tax.ny.gov/research/stats/statistics/stat_fy_collections.htm).

<sup>160</sup> For example, the statute allocates \$25.5 million from these surcharge funds to the New York State Police and sets aside additional funds for grants to counties in support of interoperable communications for first responders. N.Y. Tax Law §§ 186-f 6(a), 6(c) (McKinney).

<sup>161</sup> The statute allocates \$10 million for grants to counties for costs related to PSAP operations. *Id.* at § 186-f 6(g). See also New York Response at 6-7, 9, 16, 18, 22-23 (discussing the \$10 million from § 186-f revenue that is allocated to PSAP grants).

<sup>162</sup> New York Response at 15-16 (Section G3).

<sup>163</sup> The three requirements to qualify for the FCC's voluntary safe harbor for multi-purpose fees are set forth at 47 CFR § 9.23(d).

<sup>164</sup> New York Response at 16 (Section G3); see also 47 CFR § 9.23(d)(2).

statute states that these funds are deposited into the Statewide Public Safety Communications Account along with other funds that are then paid out for both 911 related and non-911 related purposes listed in the statute.<sup>165</sup> Second, New York has not established that the fee structure includes a fixed amount or percentage of expenditures that is dedicated to 911 services.<sup>166</sup> New York asserts that \$10 million in revenues from the fee is dedicated to PSAP-related grants under the state statute,<sup>167</sup> but the statute also allows up to \$75 million to be used for “public safety communications systems or networks designed to support statewide interoperable communications for first responders.”<sup>168</sup> This does not provide the level of transparency or certainty regarding multi-purpose expenditures that the safe harbor requires.<sup>169</sup> We therefore find that New York has not demonstrated that its Public Safety Communications Surcharge meets the safe harbor requirements.

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

---

<sup>165</sup> N.Y. Tax Law §§ 186-f 5, 6 (McKinney). In its questionnaire responses, New York states that the PSAP grant funds are “segregated in each year’s budget appropriation into a single-purpose budgetary program code 30331,” and says that “[f]unding and expenditures from this budget line are not commingled with funding or expenditures for other purposes.” New York Response at 16. However, New York makes no contentions that the \$10 million is actually placed into a separate account or similarly actually segregated and not commingled with other funds. *Id.*

<sup>166</sup> New York Response at 15-16 (Section G3); *see also* 47 CFR § 9.23(d)(1).

<sup>167</sup> New York Response at 6, 15-16 (C3, G3); *see also* N.Y. Tax Law §§ 186-f 6(g) (McKinney) (allocating \$10 million annually “for the provision of grants to counties for costs related to the operations of public safety dispatch centers”). As noted above, publicly available state tax records indicate that New York collected \$261,977,940.16 through its Public Safety Communications Surcharge in fiscal year 2023.

<sup>168</sup> N.Y. Tax Law § 186-f 6(c) (McKinney).

<sup>169</sup> *See, e.g., 911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*, 36 FCC Rcd at 10830, paras. 58, 60.

**Table 18 – States/Jurisdictions Identified as Diverting 911/E911 Funds (2009 – 2024)**

| Report Year   | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |    |
|---------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|----|
| Report        | 1st  | 2nd  | 3rd  | 4th  | 5th  | 6th  | 7th  | 8th  | 9th  | 10th | 11th | 12th | 13th | 14th | 15th | 16th |    |
| Calendar Year | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 |    |
| States        |      | AZ   | AZ   | AZ   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |    |
|               |      |      |      |      |      | CA   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |    |
|               |      | DE   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |    |
|               |      | GA   | GA   | GA   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |    |
|               |      | HI   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |    |
|               |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | IA   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |    |
|               |      | IL   | IL   | IL   | IL   | IL   | IL   | IL   | IL   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |    |
|               |      |      |      |      |      | KS   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |    |
|               |      | ME   |      | ME   | ME   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |    |
|               |      |      | NE   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |    |
|               |      | MT   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | MT   |      |      |      |      |      |    |
|               |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | NH   | NH   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |    |
|               |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | NJ   | NJ   | NJ   | NJ   | NJ   | NJ   | NJ   | NJ   | NJ   | NJ |
|               |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | NM   |      |      |      | NM   |      |      |    |
|               |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | NV   | NV   | NV   | NV   | NV   | NV   | NV |
|               |      | NY   | NY   | NY   | NY   | NY   | NY   | NY   | NY   | NY   | NY   | NY   | NY   | NY   | NY   | NY   | NY |
|               |      | OR   | OR   | OR   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |    |
|               |      | RI   | RI   | RI   | RI   | RI   | RI   | RI   | RI   | RI   | RI   | RI   | RI   |      |      |      |    |
|               |      | TN   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |    |
|               |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | WA   |      | WA   |      |      |      |      |      |      |    |
|               | WI   | WI   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |    |
|               |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | WV   | WV   | WV   | WV   | WV   | WV   |      |      |      |    |

| Report Year  | 2009     | 2010      | 2011     | 2012     | 2013     | 2014     | 2015     | 2016      | 2017     | 2018     | 2019     | 2020     | 2021     | 2022     | 2023     | 2024     |     |
|--|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----|
| Report   | 1st      | 2nd       | 3rd      | 4th      | 5th      | 6th      | 7th      | 8th       | 9th      | 10th     | 11th     | 12th     | 13th     | 14th     | 15th     | 16th     |     |
| Calendar Year  | 2008     | 2009      | 2010     | 2011     | 2012     | 2013     | 2014     | 2015      | 2016     | 2017     | 2018     | 2019     | 2020     | 2021     | 2022     | 2023     |     |
| Other Jurisdictions  |          |           |          |          |          | Guam     | Guam     | Guam      | Guam     | Guam     |          |          |          |          |          |          |     |
|  |          |           |          |          |          | PR       |          | PR        |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |     |
|  |          |           |          |          |          |          |          |           |          | USVI     |          |          |          |          |          |          |     |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>8</b> | <b>10</b> | <b>7</b> | <b>6</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>8</b> | <b>7</b> | <b>10</b> | <b>6</b> | <b>8</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>3</b> |     |
| <b>States and Other Jurisdictions That Did Not File a Fee Report</b> |          |           |          |          |          |          |          |           |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |     |
| States Not Filing a Report   |          |           |          |          | AR       |          |          |           |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |     |
|  |          |           |          |          |          |          |          |           |          |          |          |          |          |          | ID       |          |     |
|  |          |           | KS       |          |          |          |          |           |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |     |
|  |          |           |          | LA       |          | LA       | LA       |           |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |     |
|  |          |           |          |          |          |          | MO       | MO        | MO       |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |     |
|  |          |           |          |          |          |          |          |           | MT       |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |     |
|  |          |           |          | NH       |          |          |          |           |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |     |
|  |          |           | NJ       |          |          |          |          |           |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |     |
|  |          |           |          |          |          |          |          |           |          | NY       |          |          |          |          |          |          |     |
|  |          |           | OK       |          |          |          |          |           |          | OK       |          |          |          |          |          |          |     |
| Other Jurisdictions Not Filing a Report                              |          |           |          |          | RI       |          |          |           |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |     |
|  |          |           |          |          | AS       | AS       |          |           |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | AS       |     |
|  |          |           |          | DC       |          |          |          |           |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |     |
|  |          | Guam      | Guam     |          | Guam     | Guam     | Guam     | Guam      | Guam     |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |     |
|  |          | NMI       | NMI      | NMI      | NMI      | NMI      | NMI      | NMI       | NMI      | NMI      |          |          | NMI      | NMI      | NMI      | NMI      | NMI |
|  |          |           |          |          |          |          |          |           |          | PR       |          |          |          |          |          |          |     |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>2</b> | <b>2</b>  | <b>5</b> | <b>6</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>3</b>  | <b>7</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>2</b> |     |

## 2. Public Safety Radio Expenditures

43. Since the Fourteenth Report, the FCC Questionnaire has included Section G2 to gather data on public safety radio and related spending. The revised questionnaire asked states and jurisdictions to report on whether funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes were obligated or expended for the purchase, maintenance, replacement, or upgrade of public safety radios, networks, equipment, or related infrastructure.<sup>170</sup> Thirty-two states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported obligating or expending collected 911 funds on public safety radios and related items in 2023.<sup>171</sup> Question G2b of the questionnaire asked for amounts and descriptions of such obligations or expenditures. Table 19 below shows that, in total, states and jurisdictions reported public safety radio expenditures of \$252,034,778.99, or approximately 6.26% of all 911/E911 fees collected by all states and jurisdictions in 2023. However, not all respondents who reported public safety radio spending actually listed amounts, so the reported dollar total may underestimate the actual total.

44. States and jurisdictions reported spending on a variety of public safety radio uses. For example, Arkansas spent collected 911/E911 funds on upgrades and maintenance for its statewide public safety radio network.<sup>172</sup> California spent funds to upgrade its state microwave radio network to deliver 911 calls to PSAPs that do not have adequate commercial IP connectivity.<sup>173</sup> Guam, which designates the Guam Fire Department as its lead agency to operate the 911 system, reports it spent funds for a radio maintenance contract for all fire stations and emergency response base stations, mobile radios, and portable radios that are tied to the 911 system.<sup>174</sup> Kentucky spent funds for radio consoles for several county E911 entities.<sup>175</sup> North Carolina's expenditures included radio dispatch console equipment and software located within the PSAP.<sup>176</sup> Oregon reports expenditures on CPE and geographic information systems (GIS) equipment and on networks and infrastructure.<sup>177</sup> Pennsylvania spent funds on core radio system components from dispatch positions to a tower, including hardware, software, licenses, maintenance, and repairs.<sup>178</sup>

45. We do not make any finding of fee diversion based on these reported public safety radio expenditures. The Commission's rules provide that expenditure of 911 fees for equipment or infrastructure that does not "directly support providing 911 services" would not be an acceptable use of such fees.<sup>179</sup> In the *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*, the Commission declined to define a bright line test for applying this rule to public safety radio expenditures and referred the issue to the 911 Strike Force

---

<sup>170</sup> See FCC Questionnaire (Section G2).

<sup>171</sup> Most of the 36 states and jurisdictions that reported such spending at G2 (except Delaware, Minnesota, Missouri, and New Hampshire) also responded Yes to follow-up Question G2a: "If YES to G2, are all of the public safety radios, networks, equipment, or related infrastructure on which [911/E911] funds were obligated or expended used to deliver 911-originated information to emergency responders?" Delaware, Minnesota, Missouri, and New Hampshire responded No at G2a, explaining their responses at G2a(i).

<sup>172</sup> Arkansas Response at 14-15.

<sup>173</sup> California Response at 13-14.

<sup>174</sup> Guam Response at 7, 13.

<sup>175</sup> Kentucky Response at 13-14.

<sup>176</sup> North Carolina Response at 14.

<sup>177</sup> Oregon Response at 13.

<sup>178</sup> Pennsylvania Response at 13-14.

<sup>179</sup> 47 CFR § 9.23(c)(3).

for further consideration.<sup>180</sup> In its report, the 911 Strike Force recommended that expenditures be allowed for public safety radio systems that “directly provide[] the ability to deliver 911 voice and data information between the ‘entry point’ to the 911 system and the first responder.”<sup>181</sup> This issue remains under consideration following the issuance of the 911 Strike Force report. Therefore, we believe it would be premature to make any findings in this report that would prejudge the issue.

---

<sup>180</sup> *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*, 36 FCC Rcd at 10828-29, paras. 54-55.

<sup>181</sup> *911 Strike Force Report and Recommendations* at 10 (citation omitted).

**Table 19 – Public Safety Radio Expenditures<sup>182</sup>**

| State | Were Collected 911 Funds Obligated / Expended for Public Safety Radios, etc.? | If Yes, Are All the Radios, etc., Used to Deliver 911- Originated Information to Emergency Responders? | Descriptions of Obligations / Expenditures for Public Safety Radios, Networks, Equipment, or Related Infrastructure   | Total Amount of Public Safety Radio, etc., Expenditures of Collected 911 Funds |
|-------|---|--|---|--|
| AK    | No  | [No Response]  | [No Response]   | [NA]   |
| AL    | Yes   | Yes  | [No Response]   | [No Response]  |
| AR    | Yes   | Yes  | Annually goes towards upgrades and maintenance for the statewide public safety radio network, Arkansas Wireless Information Network (AWIN)  | \$8,000,000.00   |
| AZ    | No  | [No Response]  | [No Response]   | [NA]   |
| CA    | Yes   | Yes  | Upgrade State Microwave network to MPLS so that it can be used to deliver 9-1-1 calls to PSAPs that do not have adequate, redundant, commercial IP connectivity.  | \$18,552,000.00  |
| CO    | Yes   | Yes  | [No Response]   | [No Response]  |
| CT    | No  | [No Response]  | [No Response]   | [NA]   |
| DE    | Yes   | No <sup>[183]</sup>  | [No Response]   | [No Response]  |
| FL    | No  | [No Response]  | [No Response]   | [NA]   |
| GA    | [No Response]   | [No Response]  | [No Response]   | [No Response]  |
| HI    | Yes   | Yes  | Training[;] Maintenance[;] Administration[;] Telecommunications[;] Non-Recurring <sup>[184]</sup>   | \$8,189,416.00   |
| IA    | Yes   | Yes  | Includes Radio and Radio Components (including but not limited to: radio base station, mobile, portable, repeaters, towers, and maintenance) solely [sic] for public safety and public safety answering points the purposes of the disposition of 911 calls. Any radio expenditures were exclusively purchased by local jurisdictions without State involvement | \$10,565,332.73  |
| ID    | Yes   | Yes  | [No Response]   | [No Response]  |
| IL    | No  | [No Response]  | [No Response]   | [NA]   |
| IN    | Yes   | Yes  | [No Response]   | [No Response]  |

<sup>182</sup> Alabama, Colorado, the District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, Nevada, New York, North Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, and Wyoming provided substantive entries in Addendum Section G2 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/sixteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>. Some states indicate they have no information on whether local jurisdictions obligated or expended funds on public safety radio items, or on how much may have been obligated or expended. *See, e.g.*, Georgia Response at 17; Missouri Response at 13; Nevada Response at 13.

<sup>183</sup> At Question G2a(i), Delaware states, “Delaware Code Title 16 Chapter 101 Subsection 10104. Disbursements from the Fund- (d) Disbursements may not be made for: (4) Two-way radios.” Delaware Response at 13.

<sup>184</sup> At Addendum Section G2, Hawaii provides additional information: “CAD, Imagerry [sic], Text2911, MSAG, GIS.” Hawaii Response at 13-14.



| State | Were Collected 911 Funds Obligated / Expended for Public Safety Radios, etc.? | If Yes, Are All the Radios, etc., Used to Deliver 911- Originated Information to Emergency Responders? | Descriptions of Obligations / Expenditures for Public Safety Radios, Networks, Equipment, or Related Infrastructure  | Total Amount of Public Safety Radio, etc., Expenditures of Collected 911 Funds |
|-------|---|--|--|--|
| KS    | Yes   | Yes  | [No Response] <sup>[185]</sup>   | [No Response]  |
| KY    | Yes   | Yes  | Cumberland County E-911 Radio Console[;] Elliott County Fiscal Court Radio Console[;] Livingston County Fiscal Court Radio Console[;] Perry County E911 Radio Console[;] RPSCC/Boyd County 911 Radio Console | \$552,012.56   |
| LA    | [No Response]   | [No Response]  | [No Response]  | [No Response]  |
| MA    | Yes   | Yes  | CoMIRS interoperable radio network [;] Grant funding for radio equipment, infrastructure, installation & maintenance   | \$26,516,265.00  |
| MD    | No  | [No Response]  | [No Response]  | [NA]   |
| ME    | No  | [No Response]  | [No Response]  | [NA]   |
| MI    | Yes   | Yes  | Purchase (Public Safety Radios)[;] Purchase (Radio Network)[;] Purchase (Infrastructure)[;] Maintenance (Public Safety Radios)[;] Maintenance (Radio Networks)   | \$32,018,055.31  |
| MN    | Yes   | No <sup>[186]</sup>  | Maintenance and support of the statewide land mobile radio system  | \$10,029,500.00  |
| MO    | Yes   | No <sup>[187]</sup>  | [No Response]  | [No Response]  |
| MS    | Yes   | Yes <sup>[188]</sup>   | Phase 1 Carrier Cost Recurring[;] Phase 2 Carrier Cost Recurring[;] Phase 1 Carrier Cost Non-Recurring   | \$4,674,744.71   |
| MT    | Yes   | Yes  | Public Safety Radio Expenditures Conducted at Local Level  | U/A  |
| NC    | Yes   | Yes  | Radio dispatch console equipment and software located within the PSAP per N.C.G.S. § 143B-1406(d)(1)d[;] Public safety radios, networks, equipment, or related infrastructure funded through the             | \$5,937,118.00   |

<sup>185</sup> At Addendum Section G2, Kansas states, “By statute, only PSAP control station radios and radio infrastructure used for radio dispatch of 911 calls are allowable expenditures of 911 funds. Subscriber radios (mobile and portable radios) are not allowed. The Council’s Expenditure Review Committee reviews all expenditures of 911 funds each year and demands confirmation from any PSAP expending money for the purchase or maintenance of radio equipment that the expenditure does not include subscriber radios. The dollar amounts of expenditures for PSAP radios and infrastructure are not readily available.” Kansas Response at 14.

<sup>186</sup> At Question G2a(i), which asks for an explanation for a No response to Question G2a, Minnesota states, “While a majority of the users on the land mobile radio system are public safety users who communicate with a PSAP, there are also non-public safety entities such as public works vehicles and school busses and metro transit systems who are users. The State of Minnesota is conducting a comprehensive system wide inventory to determine the exact percentage of public safety v. non public safety users.” Minnesota Response at 14.

<sup>187</sup> At Question G2a(i), which asks for an explanation for a No response to Question G2a, Missouri states, “It is unknown if local fees were used for purposes other than to deliver 911 originated information.” Missouri Response at 13.

<sup>188</sup> Despite checking Yes on Question G2a (which only requests an explanation at G2a(i) if the respondent checked No on Question G2a), Mississippi states at Question G2a(i), “County specific due to these items being budgetary county expenditures.” Mississippi Response at 15.

| State | Were Collected 911 Funds Obligated / Expended for Public Safety Radios, etc.? | If Yes, Are All the Radios, etc., Used to Deliver 911- Originated Information to Emergency Responders? | Descriptions of Obligations / Expenditures for Public Safety Radios, Networks, Equipment, or Related Infrastructure  | Total Amount of Public Safety Radio, etc., Expenditures of Collected 911 Funds |
|-------|---|--|--|--|
|       |   |  | NC 911 Board grant program per N.C.G.S. § 143B-1407(b)   |  |
| ND    | Yes   | Yes  | [No Response]  | [No Response]  |
| NE    | Yes   | Yes  | In the Next Generation 911 funding model that became effective in 2022, the use of 911 surcharge funds for the purchase and maintenance of radio consoles inside the PSAP became an allowable expense. All other expenses for radio equipment and radio network costs are not allowable. The expenditure of 911 funds for radio consoles inside a PSAP is a local decision using funds available to the PSAP. The amount expended cannot be identified [sic] until the audits for 2023 are complete. | Unknown  |
| NH    | Yes   | No <sup>189</sup>  | INdigital - which provides our telephony delivery services as well as our text-to-911. [;] AK Associates - which provides Call Processing Equipment [;] Motorola - which supports the state police radio network [sic] and the E911 backup microwave system[;] OnSolve - which provides the CodeRED, the Emergency Notification System.  | \$1,298,714.16   |
| NJ    | No  | [No Response]  | [No Response]  | [NA]   |
| NM    | [No Response]   | [No Response]  | [No Response]  | [No Response]  |
| NV    | Yes   | Yes  | Fire Station Alerting Systems for the Cities of Reno, Sparks, and Truckee Meadows Fire and Rescue[;] Body Cameras/Vehicle Cameras and associated infrastructure[;] Radio Site Infrastructure [sic] equipment replacement & Back up radios[;] New Cad System & Cad Maintenance, GIS Database[;] Communications Security <sup>190</sup>  | \$3,893,236.50   |
| NY    | Yes   | Yes  | See Addendum G2  | Unk  |
| OH    | No  | [No Response]  | [No Response]  | [NA]   |
| OK    | No  | [No Response]  | [No Response]  | [NA]   |
| OR    | Yes   | Yes  | CPE Equipment[;] GIS Equipment[;] Networks/Infrastructure  | \$17,290,472.19  |

<sup>189</sup> At Question G2a(i), which asks for an explanation for a No response to Question G2a, New Hampshire states, “Portions of the State Police public safety radio network system support the 911 system by using the Microwave to route E911 network connectivity as a backup to our PSAPs if the primary fiber lines go down. Some of the funds are used to provide a redundant 911 system and network for the State of New Hampshire’s two PSAPs. This is a crucial redundancy to maintain continuity of the 911 system. The remainder of funds for the radio network and equipment went to maintaining the state police radio network.” New Hampshire Response at 13.

<sup>190</sup> At Addendum Section G2, Nevada states, “Not all Nevada PSAPs collecting 911 fees provided the necessary information[.]” Nevada Response at 13.

| State                      | Were Collected 911 Funds Obligated / Expended for Public Safety Radios, etc.? | If Yes, Are All the Radios, etc., Used to Deliver 911- Originated Information to Emergency Responders? | Descriptions of Obligations / Expenditures for Public Safety Radios, Networks, Equipment, or Related Infrastructure  | Total Amount of Public Safety Radio, etc., Expenditures of Collected 911 Funds |
|----------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| PA                         | Yes   | Yes <sup>[191]</sup>   | Hardware/Software - Core radio system components [sic] from the dispatch positions to the tower[;] Maintenance - Core radio system components [sic] from the dispatch positions to the tower[;] Tower Maintenance - FCC license & fees, maintenance, and emergency repairs   | \$56,878,473.59  |
| RI                         | Yes   | Yes  | Next Gen (NG) 911 System Upgrade[;] Next Gen (NG) 911 System Maintenance   | \$569,167.10   |
| SC                         | No  | [No Response]  | [No Response]  | [NA]   |
| SD                         | Yes   | Yes  | Radio Equipment[;] Radio repair and maintenance[;] Radio circuits[;] Total amount of above   | \$390,275.03   |
| TN                         | Yes   | Yes  | Expenditures for radio equipment and networks are made at the local level by ECDs and data is not collected or tracked by TECB in reviewing change in net position   | Unknown  |
| TX                         | Yes   | Yes  | Radio over IP backup radio at Quarry Run; [;] Maintenance of radio capability in our multijurisdictional 9-1-1 backup center to permit any agency in the district to evacuate their primary ECC and operate from the 9-1-1 backup center; [;] UPS, routers, firewall, umbrella network monitoring system; [;] Motorola SUA One year [;] Astro Connectivity | \$2,157,089.86   |
| UT                         | Yes   | Yes  | These funds were expended to the UCA Radio Network Division to support the purchasing of radio network components for public safety communications and radio consoles for public safety answering points.[;] These funds were expended for the UCA P25 project.  | \$25,198,466.17  |
| VA                         | No  | [No Response]  | [No Response]  | [NA]   |
| VT                         | No  | [No Response]  | [No Response]  | [NA]   |
| WA                         | No  | [No Response]  | [No Response]  | [NA]   |
| WI                         | No  | [No Response]  | [No Response]  | [NA]   |
| WV                         | Yes   | Yes  | [No Response]  | [No Response]  |
| WY                         | Yes   | Yes  | [No Response]  | [No Response]  |
| <b>Other Jurisdictions</b> |   |  |  |  |
| AS                         | [DNF]   | [DNF]  | [DNF]  | [DNF]  |

<sup>191</sup> Despite checking Yes on Question G2a (which only requests an explanation at G2a(i) if the respondent checked No on Question G2a), Pennsylvania states at Question G2a(i), “For clarification, only core radio system components at the PSAP are eligible costs for 911 fees in Pennsylvania. For example, handheld radios for emergency responders are not eligible costs for 911 fees in Pennsylvania.” Pennsylvania Response at 13.

| State        | Were Collected 911 Funds Obligated / Expended for Public Safety Radios, etc.? | If Yes, Are All the Radios, etc., Used to Deliver 911-Originated Information to Emergency Responders? | Descriptions of Obligations / Expenditures for Public Safety Radios, Networks, Equipment, or Related Infrastructure   | Total Amount of Public Safety Radio, etc., Expenditures of Collected 911 Funds |
|--------------|---|---|---|--|
| DC           | Yes   | Yes   | Public Safety Radio Equipment[;] Public Safety Radio Infrastructure[;] Public Safety Radio Maintenance[;] Public Safety Radio Network   | \$18,323,148.08 <sup>[192]</sup>   |
| Guam         | Yes   | Yes   | Contract for Radio Maintenance at all Guam Fire Department [sic] Fire Stations, Emergency Response Units to include base stations, mobile radios and portable radios that are tied in the the [sic] 911 System. Funds were not expended for other radio communications equipment for other Government [sic] of Guam Agencies. | \$27,377.00  |
| NMI          | [DNF]   | [DNF]   | [DNF]   | [DNF]  |
| PR           | Yes   | Yes   | Equipment (Hardware, Software Purchases or Upgrades[;] Network Management Contract[;] Data, Voice Services and Network  | \$677,442.00   |
| USVI         | Yes   | Yes   | Maintenance[;] Network and Software Support[;] Equipment  | \$296,473.00   |
| <b>Total</b> |   |   |   | <b>\$252,034,778.99</b>  |

### 3. Multi-Purpose Fees

46. Section 9.23(d) of the Commission’s rules provides an elective safe harbor for states and taxing jurisdictions that collect multi-purpose fees or charges designated for “public safety,” “emergency services,” or other similar purposes where a portion of those fees or charges supports 911 services.<sup>193</sup> 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.<sup>194</sup>

47. Accordingly, since the Fourteenth Report, the FCC Questionnaire has included Section G3, which seeks information on multi-purpose fees. Specifically, the Bureau requested that states and jurisdictions report whether they collect fees or charges designated for “public safety,” “emergency services,” or other similar purposes where a portion of those fees or charges supports 911 services. In addition, Section G3 asked whether states that collect such multi-purpose fees meet each of the three requirements of the FCC’s voluntary safe harbor provision set forth at 47 CFR 9.23(d).<sup>195</sup>

<sup>192</sup> At Addendum Section G2, the District of Columbia provides additional information: “An additional \$14,272,949.89 in capital funding was spent on public safety radio equipment and radio infrastructure modifications[.]” District of Columbia Response at 13-14. We have included this figure in the calculation of the District of Columbia’s total reported amount of public safety radio-related expenditures of collected 911 funds.

<sup>193</sup> 47 CFR § 9.23(d).

<sup>194</sup> *Id.*

<sup>195</sup> As noted, the FCC’s voluntary multi-purpose fee safe harbor provides a set of criteria for states with multi-purpose fees to demonstrate that they are not diverting 911 fees. *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*, 36 FCC Rcd at 10830, para. 57. This elective safe harbor provision with its particular set of criteria is not the only means by

(continued....)

48. Ten states and the U.S. Virgin Islands report that they collected such multi-purpose fees in 2023. Table 20 below shows responses to questions on multi-purpose fees, including amounts or percentages of such fees that are dedicated to 911 services.

**Table 20 – Multi-purpose Fees<sup>196</sup>**

| State | Does State / Jurisdiction Collect Multi-Purpose Fees Where a Portion Supports 911 Services? | If Yes, Does State / Jurisdiction Specify Amount or Percentage Dedicated to 911 Services? | Amount or Percentage of Fee Dedicated to 911 Services | Does State / Jurisdiction Ensure that 911 Portion of Fee Is Segregated and Not Commingled With Other Funds? | Is the 911 Portion of Such Fees or Charges Used Only for Acceptable Purposes Per 47 CFR § 9.23? |
|-------|---|---|---|---|---|
| AK    | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| AL    | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| AR    | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| AZ    | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| CA    | No  | [No Response]   | N/A   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| CO    | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| CT    | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| DE    | Yes   | Yes   | 100%  | Yes   | Yes   |
| FL    | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| GA    | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| HI    | No  | No  | 0%  | Yes   | Yes   |
| IA    | Yes   | No  | 100%  | Yes   | Yes   |
| ID    | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| IL    | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| IN    | No  | Yes   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| KS    | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| KY    | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| LA    | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| MA    | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| MD    | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| ME    | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| MI    | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| MN    | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| MO    | No  | No  | [No Response]   | No  | Yes   |
| MS    | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |

(Continued from previous page) \_\_\_\_\_  
 which a state may demonstrate that its use of a portion of a multi-purpose fee for non-911 related purposes does not constitute fee diversion.

<sup>196</sup> Nevada, North Carolina, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin provided substantive entries in Addendum Section G3 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. In addition, several states and jurisdictions that reported they did not collect multi-purpose fees nevertheless answered some of the additional Section G3 questions about the required elements for the multi-purpose fee elective safe harbor. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/sixteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

| State                      | Does State / Jurisdiction Collect Multi-Purpose Fees Where a Portion Supports 911 Services? | If Yes, Does State / Jurisdiction Specify Amount or Percentage Dedicated to 911 Services? | Amount or Percentage of Fee Dedicated to 911 Services | Does State / Jurisdiction Ensure that 911 Portion of Fee Is Segregated and Not Commingled With Other Funds? | Is the 911 Portion of Such Fees or Charges Used Only for Acceptable Purposes Per 47 CFR § 9.23? |
|----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| MT                         | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| NC                         | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| ND                         | Yes   | Yes   | \$1.50 (max)  | Yes   | Yes   |
| NE                         | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| NH                         | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| NJ <sup>197</sup>          | Yes   | Yes   | \$24,742,000  | Yes   | Yes   |
| NM                         | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| NV                         | Yes   | Yes   | 100%  | Yes   | Yes   |
| NY <sup>198</sup>          | Yes   | Yes   | \$10,000,000  | Yes   | Yes   |
| OH                         | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| OK                         | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| OR                         | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| PA                         | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| RI                         | Yes   | Yes   | \$0.50  | Yes   | Yes   |
| SC                         | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | Yes   | Yes   |
| SD                         | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| TN                         | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| TX                         | Yes   | Yes   | 40%   | No  | Yes   |
| UT                         | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| VA                         | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| VT                         | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| WA                         | Yes   | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| WI                         | Yes   | Yes   | \$18,994,800 <sup>199</sup>                           | Yes   | Yes   |
| WV                         | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| WY                         | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| <b>Other Jurisdictions</b> |   |   |   |   |   |
| AS                         | [DNF]   | [DNF]   | [DNF]   | [DNF]   | [DNF]   |
| DC                         | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| Guam                       | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |

<sup>197</sup> As discussed above, we find that New Jersey has not demonstrated that its 9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Fee meets the FCC’s safe harbor requirements for multi-purpose fees. 47 CFR § 9.23(d).

<sup>198</sup> As discussed above, we find that New York has not demonstrated that its Public Safety Communications Surcharge meets the FCC’s safe harbor requirements for multi-purpose fees. 47 CFR § 9.23(d).

<sup>199</sup> At Addendum Section G3, Wisconsin states, “The amounts reported in G3a(ii) were calculated for calendar year 2023 based on the amounts in the segregated appropriation for the second half of State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2023 and the first half of SFY 2024.” Wisconsin Response at 16.

| State | Does State / Jurisdiction Collect Multi-Purpose Fees Where a Portion Supports 911 Services? | If Yes, Does State / Jurisdiction Specify Amount or Percentage Dedicated to 911 Services? | Amount or Percentage of Fee Dedicated to 911 Services | Does State / Jurisdiction Ensure that 911 Portion of Fee Is Segregated and Not Commingled With Other Funds? | Is the 911 Portion of Such Fees or Charges Used Only for Acceptable Purposes Per 47 CFR § 9.23? |
|-------|---|---|---|---|---|
| NMI   | [DNF]   | [DNF]   | [DNF]   | [DNF]   | [DNF]   |
| PR    | No  | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| USVI  | Yes   | Yes   | \$0.80  | Yes   | Yes   |

#### H. Oversight and Auditing of 911/E911 Fees

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

50. The Bureau also asked whether each state or other jurisdiction has the authority to audit service providers to ensure that the amount of 911/E911 fees collected from subscribers matches the service provider’s number of subscribers. Forty-two states, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that they have authority to conduct audits of service providers. Eight states, the District of Columbia, and Guam reported that they do not. Of the 44 states and jurisdictions indicating they have authority to audit service providers, 13 states and Puerto Rico indicated they had “conduct[ed] an audit of service providers in connection with such auditing authority” in 2023; 24 states and the U.S. Virgin Islands indicated no such audits were conducted in 2023; and five states responded “N/A” or did not respond.

**Table 21 – Description of Oversight and Auditing of Collection and Use of 911/E911 Fees<sup>200</sup>**

| State | Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures? | If YES, provide a description of: (i) the mechanisms or procedures and (ii) any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2023.  | Does your state have the authority to audit service providers? | Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2023 |
|-------|--|---|--|--|
| AK    | No   | [No Response]   | No   | N/A  |
| AL    | Yes  | Under § 11-98-6 (e), Code of Alabama 1975, ‘beginning with fiscal year 2013, the Department of Examiners of Public Accounts shall audit each district on a biennial basis to ensure compliance with the requirements of this chapter regarding both revenues and expenditures.’ | Yes  | Yes  |

<sup>200</sup> Maine provided a substantive entry in Addendum Section H1 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. Connecticut, Florida, and Iowa provided substantive entries in Addendum Section H2 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/sixteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

| State | Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures? | If YES, provide a description of: (i) the mechanisms or procedures and (ii) any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2023.  | Does your state have the authority to audit service providers? | Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2023 |
|-------|--|---|--|--|
| AR    | Yes  | None  | Yes  | No   |
| AZ    | Yes  | Internal auditing policies and procedures as well as Department of Revenue policies on auditing funds.  | Yes  | No   |
| CA    | Yes  | California Revenue and Taxation Code Section 41130. Provides, 'Upon proper notification to the service supplier, the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration or its authorized representative shall have the right to inspect and audit all records and returns of the service supplier at all reasonable times.'   | Yes  | No   |
| CO    | No   | [No Response]   | Yes  | Yes <sup>201</sup>                           |
| CT    | Yes  | The Division of Statewide Emergency Telecommunications authorizes use of the 911 Funds and requires quarterly and annual audits for recipients of the E911 subsidy including funded municipalities, regional emergency communications centers and multi-town PSAPs. Failure to utilize funds for emergency telecommunications or failure to submit expenditure reports can result in the withholding of funds. No corrective actions were necessary for period ending December 2023.<br>General Statutes of Connecticut Sec. 28-30a. Enhanced Telecommunications Fund | Yes  | No   |
| DE    | Yes  | The Delaware Enhanced 911 Emergency Reporting System Service Board employs a full time administrator to oversee day to day operations. The governing statute requires the board to perform an audit of the funds. Audit is underway   | Yes  | Yes  |
| FL    | Yes  | The Board provides an annual report to the Governor and Legislature on the amount of collected fee that were expended, the purpose for which the expenditures were made, and the status of 911 services throughout the state. The Auditor General's Office audits the Fund to ensure that moneys are being managed in accordance with Florida Statutes. The Florida Auditor General's Office provides a report of   | Yes  | No   |

<sup>201</sup> At Question H2b, asking for a description of auditing or enforcement or corrective actions, Colorado states, "The Colorado Public Utilities Commission ('Commission') audited Verizon Wireless, Inc.'s ('Company') 2022 telecommunications surcharge remittances which the Company and its affiliates and subsidiaries (together 'the Companies') were required to provide as registered originating service providers in the State of Colorado. The Companies included in this surcharge remittance audit were: Cellco Partnership, MCI Communications Services, San Isabel Cellular of CO LP, Commnet Cellular and XO Communications Services. The Commission reviewed each company's books and records concerning the collection and remittance of the State 9-1-1 Surcharge ('9-1-1') and Emergency Telephone Charge ('ETC'), 9-8-8 Surcharge ('9-8-8'), and Telecommunications Relay Service ('TRS') Surcharge in this audit. The scope of this audit was limited to the collection and remittance of the stated surcharges. The Company was not in compliance with 723-2-2150(d)(III), due to not listing the State 911 surcharge separately while listing fees separately on its billing to customers for two of the Companies. The Companies must correctly list fees separately on all future remittances. Commission staff was concerned about the implications the factoring methodology that the Companies use which results in locations with one or more phone numbers paying zero surcharges may have on local services. Staff referred this matter to the Commission for a rulemaking. Otherwise it was concluded that the methods and procedures designed and implemented by the Companies are in compliance with Colorado Public Utilities Commission telecom surcharge remittance statute and rules." Colorado Response at 17.



| State | Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures? | If YES, provide a description of: (i) the mechanisms or procedures and (ii) any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2023.  | Does your state have the authority to audit service providers? | Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2023 |
|-------|--|---|--|--|
|       |  | the audit to the Board and the Department of Management Services. Counties are required to establish a 911 account fund to be used exclusively for the receipt and expenditure of 911 fee revenues. In each county's 911 fund, the moneys collected and the interest earned are appropriated by the county commissioners for statutorily-defined 911 purposes and are incorporated into the annual county budget. A financial audit of county 911 funds is included within the county audit report, as required by section 218.39, Florida Statutes. County 911 funds have been periodically audited by the Florida Auditor General and the Department of Management Services' Office of Inspector General. In addition, the Florida Single Audit Act establishes state audit and accountability requirements for state financial assistance to counties. The Florida Single Audit Act is codified in section 215.97, Florida Statutes.   |  |  |
| GA    | Yes  | O.C.G.A. 46-5-134(m)<br>(1) Any local government collecting or expending any 9-1-1 charges or wireless enhanced 9-1-1 charges in any fiscal year beginning on or after July 1, 2005, shall document the amount of funds collected and expended from such charges. Any local government collecting or expending 9-1-1 funds shall certify in its audit, as required under Code Section 36-81-7, that 9-1-1 funds were expended in compliance with the expenditure requirements of this Code section.<br>Any local government which makes expenditures not in compliance with this Code section may be held liable for pro rata reimbursement to telephone and wireless telecommunications subscribers of amounts improperly expended. Such liability may be established in judicial proceedings by any aggrieved party. The noncompliant local government shall be solely financially responsible for the reimbursement and for any costs associated with the reimbursement. Such reimbursement shall be accomplished by the service suppliers abating the imposition of the 9-1-1 charges and wireless enhanced 9-1-1 charges until such abatement equals the total amount of the rebate. | Yes  | No   |
| HI    | Yes  | The State of Hawaii Enhanced 911 Board authorizes an annual audit of the E911 Fund by an independent [sic] CPA Firm.  | No   | No   |
| IA    | Yes  | 911 Funds are audited by the Iowa State Auditor's Office in three distinct ways for this reporting period.<br>The Iowa Department of Homeland Security and Emergency Management is subject to an annual audit. As such, because the 911 program falls under HSEMD, 911 funds are audited along with other Department financial programs: No findings<br>The 911 Program is subject to an annual standalone audit by the State Auditor's Office: No findings.<br>PSAPs are required to submit all expenses to the 911 Program Manager. These expense reports are audited biennially by the auditor   | Yes and No <sup>[202]</sup>                                    | N/A  |

<sup>202</sup> Iowa reports both Yes and No on Question H2 on whether the State has authority to audit service providers. For calculation purposes, we have treated Iowa's response as a Yes.

| State | Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures? | If YES, provide a description of: (i) the mechanisms or procedures and (ii) any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2023.  | Does your state have the authority to audit service providers? | Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2023 |
|-------|--|---|--|--|
|       |  | of the state. No significant findings or issues of misspending during the audit.<br>Local 911 service boards are also subject to audits from the Auditor of the State   |  |  |
| ID    | Yes  | Under ID Code 31-48 an independent auditor can be used. Beyond auditing prepaid telcos for non-payment, no agencies have been audited.  | No   | [No Response]                                |
| IL    | Yes  | Beginning in October of 2014 and every year thereafter, 9-1-1 authorities are legislatively required to file an Annual Financial Report (AFR) to provide revenue and expenditure information for the prior calendar year by January 31st. Additionally, the State's Auditor General has specific requirements for auditing the State's collection and distribution of 9-1-1 funds.  | Yes  | No   |
| IN    | Yes  | In IC 36-8-16.7 states (d) Beginning in 2013 the state board of accounts annually shall audit each PSAP that receives distributions under this chapter. In conducting an audit under this subsection, the state board of accounts shall determine, in conjunction [sic] with the board, whether the expenditures made by each PSAP are in compliance with subsections (s) and (b). The board shall review and further audit any ineligible expenditure identified by the state board of accounts under [sic] this subsection or through any other report. If the board verifies that the expenditure did not comply with this section, the board shall ensure the the [sic] fund is reimbursed in the dollar amount of the noncomplying expenditure from any source of funding, other than [sic] a fund described in subsection (f), that is available to the PSAP or to a unit in which the PSAP is located.   | Yes  | No   |
| KS    | Yes  | PSAPs are required to submit annual expenditure reports of 911 fee funds. The Council's Expenditure Review Committee reviews these reports and requests additional information or documentation for any questioned expenditures. If questioned expenditures are deemed to be unallowable under the statute, the PSAP is required to reimburse their 911 fund for these expenditures and provide documentation of the transfer of funds to the Council. Each PSAP is required to submit invoices supporting five randomly selected expenditures reported. If a PSAP reports less than five expenditures for the year, then all reported expenditures require submission of the invoice. Additionally, the statute requires a legislative post audit be conducted every five years to determine (1) Whether the moneys received by PSAPs pursuant to this act are being used appropriately; (2) whether the amount of moneys collected pursuant to this act is adequate; and (3) the status of 911 service implementation. The LCPA is required to be audited annually by the statute | Yes  | No   |
| KY    | Yes  | KRS 65.7629(13) directs the Kentucky 911 Services Board to retain an independent certified public accountant to audit the books of the Board, CMRS providers and PSAPs to verify the accuracy of collection and disbursement of the CMRS service charge, on a biennial basis.   | Yes  | Yes  |
| LA    | Yes  | Louisiana Revised Statutes 33:9101 and other Louisiana state laws and acts regulate approved expenditures. Each district is subject to  | Yes  | No   |

| State | Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures? | If YES, provide a description of: (i) the mechanisms or procedures and (ii) any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2023.   | Does your state have the authority to audit service providers? | Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2023 |
|-------|--|--|--|--|
|       |  | periodic audits overseen by the Legislative Auditor of the State of Louisiana  |  |  |
| MA    | Yes  | M.G.L. Chapter 6A, Section 18B(f) explicitly authorizes the State 911 Department to disburse funds from the Enhanced 911 Fund for specific E911 purposes (described above). M.G.L. Chapter 6A, Section 18B(b) reserves specific approval authority of grant distribution formulas and major contracts for the State 911 Commission which is made up of eight (8) state public safety and disability agency heads and eleven (11) members appointed by the Governor representing various 911 related constituencies. M.G.L. Chapter 6A, Section 18B(b) states as follows: ‘The [State 911] commission shall review and approve by a majority vote of those members present all formulas, percentages, guidelines or other mechanisms used to distribute the grants described in section 18B, and all major contracts that the [State 911] department proposes to enter into for enhanced 911 services.’ Additionally, M.G.L. Chapter 6A, Section 18B grants the Department of Telecommunications and Cable certain approval authority over expenditures of 911 related funds by the State 911 Department. The State 911 Department files an annual petition with the Department of Telecommunications and Cable for its review and approval. This petition includes the State 911 Department’s prior year expenditures and budget projections for a five year period. In addition, the State 911 Department is subject to audit by the Office of the State Auditor. | No   | N/A  |
| MD    | Yes  | Awards for enhancements to county 9-1-1 systems are described by the county PSAP director in their application for funding. The County PSAP director makes their presentation to the Board and the Board votes to approve the project provided it meets the statutorily defined eligible expenses and is a good use of public funds. The Board then pays vendors directly or reimburses the county once the county pays the vendor. In either case, the county must provide documentation demonstrating the funds were used for the intended purpose.<br>County 9-1-1 fees are subject to annual audits provided for by the Maryland Public Safety Article § 1-312(d)(1).  | Yes  | Yes  |
| ME    | Yes  | [No Response]  | Yes  | No   |
| MI    | Yes  | State 911 Fund: In accordance with MCL 484.1407(5), the State Office of the Auditor General performs a biennial audit of the State 911 Fund. The October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2023 audit is currently in progress with the kickoff meeting held April 22, 2024. Local 911 Fund: Independent local audit and annual reporting process to the SNC as set out in MCL 484.1406(2)-(4).<br>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  | Yes  | Yes  |

| State | Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures? | If YES, provide a description of: (i) the mechanisms or procedures and (ii) any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2023.  | Does your state have the authority to audit service providers? | Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2023 |
|-------|--|---|--|--|
|       |  | <p>procedures, and facility security/readiness.</p> <p>The following is a list of compliance reviews which were completed in 2023: Baraga, Clare, Gogebic, Houghton, Kalkaska, Keweenaw, Lake, Manistee, Ontonagon, Saginaw, and Schoolcraft.</p> <p>The following is a list of compliance reviews which were in progress at the end of 2023: Alpena, Clinton, Dickinson, Marquette, and Wayne.</p>   |  |  |
| MN    | Yes  | <p>Most funds are remitted directly to our office. If it is found that a carrier is not or has not been remitting the correct fee amount, ECN contacts the carrier and/or preparer contact person(s) listed on the carrier's Minnesota Telephone Fees Remittance Form to determine if corrective action is needed and, if so, how to administer a correction. For prepaid wireless, 911 fees are collected at retail point of sale and remitted to the Minnesota Department of Revenue, less 3% which is retained by the retailer for collection administration. MnDOR then transmits prepaid wireless revenue to ECN on a monthly basis, less 2% retained by MnDOR for collection and distribution administration. Currently, ECN has little to no visibility into the prepaid wireless fee collection and remittance process between MnDOR and Minnesota retailers. There have been multiple discussion over the years concerning information released by MnDOR to the Department of Public Safety, tax payer data privacy, and the limitations of the current statute language. Most recently MnDOR legal has floated the idea of a potential statute update to expand the information that could be provided.</p> | Yes  | Yes  |
| MO    | No   | [No Response]   | No   | N/A  |
| MS    | Yes  | <p>No known actions were taken. But the Mississippi State Auditor's office. MISS. CODE ANN. § 7-7-211 (e) (1972) states that one of the powers and duties of the department of audit is: ...to postaudit [sic] and, when deemed necessary, preaudit and investigate separately the financial affairs of (i) the offices, boards and [sic] commissions of county government...</p>   | Yes  | N/A  |
| MT    | Yes  | <p>The State monitors the expenditures of local and tribal government PSAP operational expenditures and State programs are audited [sic] by the State Legislative Auditor</p>   | Yes  | N/A  |
| NC    | Yes  | <p>N.C.G.S. § 143B-1402(a)(5) - The NC 911 Board staff conducts an annual 'Revenue/Expenditure Review' of each PSAP receiving 911 funds. For any expenditures identified as not an eligible 911 expense, the PSAP is required to reimburse the 911 Fund the amount determined ineligible.</p> <p>N.C.G.S. § 143B-1410 - The State Auditor may perform audits of the 911 Board pursuant to Part 5A of Chapter 147 of the General Statutes to ensure that funds in the 911 Fund are being managed in accordance with the provisions of the Board's governing statutes. The State Auditor must perform an audit of the 911 Board at least every two years. The 911 Board must reimburse the State Auditor for the cost of an audit of the 911 Board.</p>   | No   | N/A  |
| ND    | Yes  | <p>Each jurisdiction is mandated by 57-40.6-12 to submit a report to the statutory body (ESC3) on the revenues and expenditures related to</p>  | Yes  | N/A  |

| State | Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures? | If YES, provide a description of: (i) the mechanisms or procedures and (ii) any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2023.  | Does your state have the authority to audit service providers? | Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2023 |
|-------|--|---|--|--|
|       |  | the 911 fee, and the Committee then reviews the reports against the guidelines and compiles the information for presentation to the Legislature.<br>None, no actions taken.   |  |  |
| NE    | Yes  | With respect to landline and VoIP surcharge funds, local governing bodies are subject to audit by the Nebraska State Auditor to ensure that public funds are being spent appropriately. So far as the Public Service Commission is aware, no corrective actions relating to the use of 911 surcharge funds were taken as a result of any such audit during the reporting period.<br>With respect to wireless surcharge funds, the Public Service Commission requires each PSAP to annually complete an audit form, which must be returned with documentation supporting each expenditure of funding. Each audit form is reviewed and double checked by Public Service Commission staff. Any discrepancy identified is required to be explained and remedied. If needed, corrective actions may include replacing monies incorrectly used, paying money back to the 911 Service System Fund, or a reduction in future funding. | Yes  | Yes  |
| NH    | Yes  | Currently, the New Hampshire Department of Revenue Administration audits for our Division when they are out auditing for other tax purposes. Additionally, the Division has one permanent full-time auditor position providing auditing and enforcement services specific to the E911 prepaid surcharge.  | Yes  | Yes  |
| NJ    | No   | [No Response]   | No   | N/A  |
| NM    | Yes  | Local public bodies are required to have their annual financial statements audited in compliance with the New Mexico Audit Act (Section 12-6-1 et. seq. NMSA 1978).<br>The Department of Finance and Administration (DFA) conducts an annual Agency financial audit. All obligations and payments from the E-911 fund are approved by the E-911 Bureau Chief. Program expenditures are also reported to State Board of Finance during budget review.  | Yes  | No   |
| NV    | Yes  | Carson City, Elko, and Washoe counties utilize an outside auditor annually pursuant to NRS 244a.7641 through NRS 244a. 7647   | Yes  | No   |
| NY    | Yes  | To the extent state statutes comport with the Commission's rules, the New York State Office of State Comptroller is authorized to audit counties' and cities' expenditures of local 911 surcharge monies to ensure compliance with the enabling statute.  | Yes  | No   |
| OH    | Yes  | Annually, all counties are required to submit documentation identifying all expenditures and funding sources for the previous year and identifying any balance to be carried over to the next year as per Ohio Revised Code 128.06(E).  | Yes  | No   |
| OK    | Yes  | The State 9-1-1 Management Authority mandates a report from local agencies on all revenue and expenditures related to the operations of the Emergency 9-1-1 center. The Authority has the authority to audit any agency that does not comply with required reports and escrow wireless funding until the agency falls into compliance.  | Yes  | No   |

| State | Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures? | If YES, provide a description of: (i) the mechanisms or procedures and (ii) any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2023.   | Does your state have the authority to audit service providers? | Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2023 |
|-------|--|--|--|--|
| OR    | Yes  | The Department of Revenue (DOR) has the authority to adjust returns for misreporting or non-reporting of 9-1-1 tax collected. DOR monitors businesses that should have filed and remitted 9-1-1 tax, sets up estimated returns, and bills based on these estimations if the remitted amount is incorrect   | Yes  | No   |
| PA    | Yes  | Every PSAP must report to PEMA how 911 funds were spent annually. Every expenditure line item is reviewed by PEMA staff to determine if the expense was eligible and reported in accordance with PEMA's 911 Program guidelines. In addition, PEMA requires a biennial performance audit of each PSAP's use of the disbursements it has received from the fund, including amounts placed in capital or operating reserve consistent with published guidelines established by PEMA. 35 Pa.C.S. § 5306.1 (i) (2). PEMA has contracted with an independent CPA firm to conduct these audits.   | Yes  | No   |
| RI    | Yes  | All collected funds are subject to allocation under the annual Appropriation Act, which provides the legislative authority for state spending. The State's Bureau of Audits and the General Assembly's Auditor General would be the authorized Auditors of this program.   | Yes  | No   |
| SC    | Yes  | South Carolina Code of Laws Section 23-47-50(E) reads:<br>(E)(1) In order to ensure compliance with the provisions of this chapter and with generally accepted accounting standards, the 'emergency telephone system' fund must be included in the annual audit of the local government. The audit must include a review of the accounting controls over the collection, reporting, and disbursement of 911 funds and a supplementary schedule detailing revenue and expenses by category as authorized in this chapter. If the annual audit contains a finding of any inappropriate use of 911 funds, the local government must restore these funds within ninety days of the completion of the audit.<br>(2) The local government must provide the Revenue and Fiscal Affairs Office a copy of the audit report regarding this compliance within sixty days of the completion of the audit. The Revenue and Fiscal Affairs Office shall review these audits on a regular basis and report to the board any findings or concerns. In conducting this review, the Revenue and Fiscal Affairs Office may request additional information from the local government. If a local government fails to provide a copy of the audit or any requested additional information, or correct any findings identified in the audit, the board may withhold funding pursuant to subsection (G) | Yes  | No   |
| SD    | Yes  | <a href="https://sdlegislature.gov/Statutes/Codified_Laws/2057866">https://sdlegislature.gov/Statutes/Codified_Laws/2057866</a><br>SDCL 34-45-20 The 911 Coordination board has the authority to collect annual financial data from any entity receiving 911 surcharge funds. The board requires each PSAP and county receiving surcharge funds submit a financial report of their local 911 fund for review by the State 911 Coordinator. The board will develop criteria for implementing performance audits which will be conducted by the Department of Legislative Audit.<br><a href="https://sdlegislature.gov/Statutes/Codified_Laws/2057863">https://sdlegislature.gov/Statutes/Codified_Laws/2057863</a> .<br>The Department of Revenue Board has the authority to promulgate   | Yes  | Yes  |

| State | Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures? | If YES, provide a description of: (i) the mechanisms or procedures and (ii) any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2023.  | Does your state have the authority to audit service providers? | Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2023 |
|-------|--|---|--|--|
|       |  | rules regarding returns, records and audits. However, at this time there is nothing in Statute that gives the board the authority to enforce compliance with the Administrative Rules.  |  |  |
| TN    | Yes  | <p>Tenn. Code Ann. § 7-86-102(d) requires that each ECD use funds received from all sources ‘exclusively’ in the operation of the emergency communications district.’ Consistent with that mandate, the TECB has 911 Revenue Standards established pursuant to Tenn. Code Ann. § 7-86-306(a)(11), which provide guidance to the ECDs on the Required, Permissible and Prohibited Uses of 911 revenue. In accordance with the 911 Revenue Standards, the purchase of radios for use in the exclusive operation of a local 911 district is permissible.</p> <p>ECDs are subject to annual audits to assure compliance with the Revenue Standards and generally accepted auditing standards. Audits are submitted to the Comptroller of the Treasury. ECDs are also prohibited from spending 911 revenue except as specifically set forth in their annual budgets.</p>   | Yes  | No   |
| TX    | Yes  | <p>The question specifically asks about state established oversight. Only CSEC and its 20 Regional Planning Commissions are subject to oversight/auditing by the Texas State Auditor (or CSEC internal auditor). The remaining 57 ECDs are subject to state single audit requirements only if they receive state funds. Accordingly, as answered, the question includes city/county oversight and auditing. And the answers are a mix of ‘yes’ and ‘no.’</p> <p>No Texas 9-1-1 Entity reported corrective actions for CY 2023.</p> <p>For the CSEC 9-1-1 Program, 9-1-1 service is provided by 20 Regional Planning Commissions and overseen and administered by CSEC. Health and Safety Code Chapter 771 governs the CSEC 9-1-1 program and includes requirements for providing 9-1-1 service and prescribes limits regarding the use of 9-1-1 fees and the equalization surcharge. CSEC rules and policy statements are used to implement 9-1-1 service consistent with statutory requirements. Per these rules/policies, CSEC routinely monitors RPC expenditures of appropriated and allocated 9-1-1 service fees and equalization surcharge for uses consistency with statute. CSEC, in turn, is subject to audit by the Texas State Auditor, Texas Comptroller (e.g., post payment audits), as well as by its internal auditor.</p> <p>The 772 ECDs are statutorily charged to provide 9-1-1 service in their participating jurisdictions’ areas. In addition, the 772 ECDs are required to submit a draft annual budget to their participating jurisdictions for 9-1-1 service and adopt the final annual budget at an open public meeting. As soon as practicable after the end of each ECD fiscal year, the director of the ECD will prepare and present to the board and to all participating public agencies a sworn statement of all money received by the ECD and how the money was disbursed or otherwise disposed of during the preceding fiscal year. The report must show in detail the operations of the ECD for the period covered by the report. The board of managers of the ECD is required to perform an annual independent financial audit.</p> | Yes  | Yes  |

| State | Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures? | If YES, provide a description of: (i) the mechanisms or procedures and (ii) any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2023.  | Does your state have the authority to audit service providers? | Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2023 |
|-------|--|---|--|--|
|       |  | <p>As noted earlier, Municipal ECDs and the one county ECD are required by state law to set annual budgets at public open meetings and perform audits. (As also noted, however, 9-1-1 fees represent a fraction of the overall budgeting and auditing responsibilities of these governing bodies.) Additionally, and by way of example including from past responses:</p> <p>The Municipal ECDs have and continue to report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dallas identifies eligible expenses by categories and periodically audits expense reports from the financial system. Budget requests go through an approval process for new/one-time expenses.</li> <li>• Highland Park has an internal policy established by the Police Chief to ensure 9-1-1 funds are expended only for purposes designated by the funding mechanism.</li> <li>• Portland conducts an annual audit on all city funds to ensure all monies are spent prudently and according to guidelines established by the City Council, general accounting procedures, and GASB standards.</li> <li>• Cities of Cedar Hill, DeSoto, Duncanville (which combined to establish and operate a single PSAP/ECC) conducts 9-1-1 auditing through the Finance Department of DeSoto.</li> </ul> <p>Longview reported that all collected 911 fees are maintained in a budget separate from the City’s general fund. All purchases must be approved by the Communications Manager. There is no expenditure of these funds for purposes other than [sic] E911 support, training, and administration. No enforcement/corrective actions were required.</p> <p>Richardson: The City’s financial statements and underlying accounting records are subject to audit by a third-party, independent audit firm. The 911 fees and their use fall within the scope of the audit. Also, Budget and Accounting staff review the use of 911 fees as part of the budget preparation process each year. No corrective actions have been required as a result of this oversight.</p> <p>Plano: Municipal budgets and audits thereof, are subject to applicable municipal ordinance(s) and/or Texas Local Government Code Chapters 102 (budgets) and 103 (audit of finances). Municipal oversight procedures reflect the normal operations. Our budget is approved by the City Council and oversight is provided by city officials practicing and adhering to state purchasing/procurement procedures, and general accepted accounting principles.</p> <p>University Park reported that the City is subject to annual yearly external audits. No corrective actions were noted for the period in question.</p> |  |  |
| UT    | Yes  | <p>In Utah Statute: Effective 7/1/2017 69-2-301. Public safety answering point -- 911 emergency service account -- Permitted uses of funds.</p> <p>(1) A public safety answering point shall maintain in a separate emergency telecommunications service fund any funds dispersed to the public safety answering point from the commission under Section 69-2-302, from proceeds of the 911 emergency services charge levied under Section 69-2-402.</p>  | Yes  | Yes  |



| State | Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures? | If YES, provide a description of: (i) the mechanisms or procedures and (ii) any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2023.  | Does your state have the authority to audit service providers? | Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2023 |
|-------|--|---|--|--|
|       |  | <p>(2) A public safety answering point may expend the money in the emergency telecommunications service fund described in Subsection (1) to pay the costs of:</p> <p>(a) establishing, installing, maintaining, and operating a 911 emergency service system;</p> <p>(b) receiving and processing emergency communications from the 911 system or other communications or requests for emergency services;</p> <p>(c) integrating a 911 emergency service system into an established public safety answering point, including contracting with an access line provider or a vendor of appropriate terminal equipment as necessary to implement the 911 emergency services; or</p> <p>(d) indirect costs associated with the maintaining and operating of a 911 emergency services system.</p> <p>(3) A public safety answering point may expend revenue derived from the emergency telecommunications service fund described in Subsection (1) for personnel costs associated with receiving and processing communications and deploying emergency response resources.</p> <p>(4) Any unexpended funds at the end of a fiscal year in a public safety answering point's emergency telecommunications service fund described in Subsection (1) do not lapse.</p> |  |  |
| VA    | Yes  | During this period, 60% of the Wireless E-911 fund, approximately \$37 million, was distributed by the Virginia Department of Taxation directly to PSAPs. The distribution to each PSAP is based on pre-determined percentages calculated using population and call load data.  | Yes  | [No Response]                                |
| VT    | Yes  | Audit and oversight mechanisms are defined by the State of Vermont in Title 30, Chapter 88 § 7503 (d): The fiscalagent [sic] shall be audited annually by a certified public accountant in a manner determined by and under the directionof [sic] the Public Service Board.   | Yes  | No   |
| WA    | Yes  | The State 911 Coordination Office, through its County Grant programs, regularly reviews the use of County and State 911 excise tax funds, as they are the basis for the award amounts of the grants. Additionally, the Office of the Washington State Auditor conducts routine audits of all state, county, and local entities, and these audits include the proper use of 911-dedicated funds.   | Yes  | Yes  |
| WI    | Yes  | <p>(i) The Wisconsin 911 statute requires that participating local exchange carriers submit a new 911 contract, or an amendment to an existing 911 contract to the Public Service Commission for review. See Wis. Stat. 256.35(3)(i). The PSC may disapprove a contract or contract amendment if it finds the contract is not compensatory, is excessive, or is not in the public interest.</p> <p>(ii) None</p>  | No   | N/A  |
| WV    | Yes  | [No Response]   | Yes  | No   |
| WY    | Yes  | State Statutes are very specific to how jurisdictions may use the funds. The state does not have an audit report from the local government on how funds were spent.   | Yes  | No   |

| State                      | Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures? | If YES, provide a description of: (i) the mechanisms or procedures and (ii) any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2023.  | Does your state have the authority to audit service providers? | Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2023 |
|----------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Other Jurisdictions</b> |  |   |  |  |
| AS                         | [DNF]  | [DNF]   | [DNF]  | [DNF]  |
| DC                         | Yes  | N / A   | No   | N/A  |
| Guam                       | Yes  | NONE  | No   | N/A  |
| NMI                        | [DNF]  | [DNF]   | [DNF]  | [DNF]  |
| PR                         | Yes  | There are two offices that conduct audits of all public funds managed by Puerto Rico Executive Branch agencies and instrumentalities:<br>- The Comptroller of Puerto Rico which is a constitutionally created office charged with carrying out post-audits of the use of public funds in Puerto Rico; and<br>- Office of the Inspector General of the Government of Puerto Rico<br>We do not recognize any ongoing diversion-related investigations during 2023 | Yes  | Yes <sup>203</sup>                           |
| USVI                       | No   | [No Response]   | Yes  | No   |
| <b>Yes Totals</b>          | <b>49</b>  |   | <b>44</b>  | <b>14</b>                                    |
| <b>No Totals</b>           | <b>5</b>   |   | <b>10</b>  | <b>26</b>                                    |

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

51. The Bureau requested that states and other jurisdictions specify whether they classify NG911 expenditures as within the scope of acceptable purposes and functions for the obligation or expenditure of 911 fees, and whether they expended funds on NG911 in calendar year 2023. With respect to classifying NG911 as within the scope of acceptable expenditures, 47 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, and Puerto Rico indicated that their 911 funding mechanism allows for distribution of 911 funds for the implementation of NG911. Three states and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that their funding mechanism does not allow for the use of 911 funds for NG911 implementation. Forty states, the District of Columbia, Guam, and Puerto Rico reported expenditures on NG911 programs in 2023.<sup>204</sup> Table 22

<sup>203</sup> At Question H2b, asking for a description of auditing or enforcement or corrective actions, Puerto Rico states, “During calendar year 2023, the Bureau’s 911 service charge Investigators Office completed preliminary exams of Companies that are providing voice service but are non compliant with the 9-1-1 service charge. This was achieved through the Collaboration Agreement with the Telecommunications Bureau of PR. During this process, the Bureau has identified several VoIP companies that are non-compliant, we have started communications to validate the 911 charge applies and how many lines were active during the period in order to start actions directed to collect the 911 service charge. As of December 2023, we received the final resolution for partial declaratory judgment from Puerto Rico Supreme Court (Case Gobierno de Puerto Rico v. Tracfone, BY2020CV03539). Once the Discovery of evidence is finished, the Bureau is expected to collect the 911 service funds in the claim.” Puerto Rico Response at 17-18.

<sup>204</sup> This count includes some states and jurisdictions that do not classify NG911 as within the scope of acceptable 911 fee expenditures, but nevertheless report expenditures to implement and support NG911 in 2023. See, e.g., Hawaii Response at 17, 19.

shows the general categories of NG911 expenditures, although some respondents did not specify NG911 expenditures by category.

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

| Area of Expenditure                               | States/Other Jurisdictions   | Total |
|---|--|-------|
| <b>General Project or Not Specified</b>           | Alabama, Arizona, California, Guam, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming  | 29    |
| <b>Planning or Consulting Services</b>            | Arizona, California, Connecticut, Florida, Guam, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin   | 32    |
| <b>ESInet Construction</b>                        | Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin   | 26    |
| <b>NG911 Core Services</b>                        | Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Guam, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin                                       | 36    |
| <b>Hardware or Software Purchases or Upgrades</b> | Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, U.S. Virgin Islands, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin         | 38    |
| <b>GIS</b>  | Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Guam, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming | 40    |
| <b>NG911 Security Planning</b>                    | Alabama, Arizona, California, Guam, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia   | 25    |

| Area of Expenditure | States/Other Jurisdictions  | Total |
|---------------------|---|-------|
| Training            | Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Guam, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin | 34    |

52. The Bureau requested that states and jurisdictions report the amount expended on NG911 programs in the annual period ending December 31, 2023. As noted, forty states, the District of Columbia, Guam, and Puerto Rico reported or indicated expenditures on NG911 programs in 2023.<sup>205</sup> Collectively, these jurisdictions reported spending \$532,531,107.81 on NG911 programs in 2023. Nine states<sup>206</sup> and the U.S. Virgin Islands checked No for whether they had spent funds on NG911-related programs in 2023.<sup>207</sup> Table 23 shows all the reported NG911-related expenditures and projects.

**Table 23 – Funds Spent on Next Generation 911 Programs<sup>208</sup>**

| State | Amount Spent    | Description of Projects   |
|-------|-----------------|---|
| AK    | [NA]            | [No Response]   |
| AL    | \$14,907,772.80 | The state of Alabama began geo-spatially routing wireless calls via the NG911 core services, as opposed to utilizing legacy tabular data in September 2023. This was made possible by the work of Alabama 911 Board’s GIS department creating a seamless PSAP boundary layer as part of the overall NG911 GIS Project. Further efforts to remediate GIS data to meet the NG911 data standard continue |

<sup>205</sup> Thirty-nine states checked Yes at Question I2 for whether they had spent funds on NG911-related programs. Washington did not respond to Question I2 on whether it had spent funds on NG911, but at Question I2a did provide the amount spent, indicating it did spend funds on NG911 in 2023. Therefore, we have counted Washington as one of the forty states reporting or indicating NG911 expenditures. We also note that in response to Question I2, five states (Delaware, Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland, and West Virginia) checked Yes to report that they spent funds on NG911 in 2023, but they did not provide amounts in response to Question I2a. Louisiana explained at Question I2a that it “does not track the funds expended on NG-911 projects as a separate amount.” Louisiana Response at 18. See Table 23.

<sup>206</sup> The nine states checking No to Question I2 were Alaska, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Mississippi, Montana, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Wyoming. Two states (Colorado and Washington) did not respond to Question I2. However, as noted, Washington provided an amount in response to Question I2a, which we include in the grand total. Colorado Response at 18; Washington Response at 18.

<sup>207</sup> Eight of these nine states (Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho, Mississippi, Montana, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Wyoming) and the U.S. Virgin Islands checked No for whether they had spent funds on NG911 programs in 2023, but nevertheless provided a description of NG911-related programs in response to Question I4 or checked one or more categories of NG911 expenditures in Question I4a, indicating such programs were either in progress in 2023 or in the planning stages. For example, Hawaii reported that it was “[c]urrently in the process of upgrading call-taking equipment.” Hawaii Response at 19. Meanwhile, Mississippi explained that plans for NG911 were in progress, but funding was not yet available. Mississippi Response at 21.

<sup>208</sup> Colorado, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin completed Addendum Section I2 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/sixteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

| State | Amount Spent   | Description of Projects   |
|-------|--|---|
|       |  | with either local district personnel or by Board GIS staff conducting that work. Multiple ESInet circuits to PSAPs that had provided consistently [sic] unreliable service were replaced by the system service provider (SSP) to strengthen network resilience. There has been continued work on wireline and VoIP carrier conversion [sic] but the completion of this portion of the NG911 project is still hampered because of the requirement to work with the few carriers left individually. A project to supply PSAPs with access to a third party additional data repository application began. This application allows PSAPs to gain supplemental device-based location data and other emergency alert information to bolster voice calls received over the NG911 network. In addition to the text-for-911 application utilized to provide statewide 911 texting coverage, and optional application is now being offered that will allow PSAPs to receive photos, video, and other MMS content from those accessing the 911 system. |
| AR    | \$2,787,084.49   | In July, 2021, the Arkansas 911 Board contracted with AT&T to implement a statewide ESInet & NGCS. At the end of 2023, 76 Primary PSAPs were connected to ESInet. The 911 Board maintains an interlocal agreement with the Arkansas GIS Office for NG911 data layer maintenance as well as a contract with 1Spatial, Inc. for GIS data validation.  |
| AZ    | \$20,446,256.49  | NGCS buildout with statewide interconnectivity [sic] to all PSAPs statewide via 2 ESInets. Upgraded CHE in 67 PSAPs   |
| CA    | \$94,751,000.00  | The Prime Network Service Provider and the four (4) Region Network Service Providers have continued PSAP remediation, equipment install, and network build-out to all of the PSAPs. NG 9-1-1 transition has commenced and i3 traffic is live at 18 PSAPs statewide as of April 2024.  |
| CO    | [No Response]  | None  |
| CT    | \$12,307,940.00  | ESInet conversion, enhanced software and upgrades for NG 911 call reports.  |
| DE    | n/a  | The state of Delaware is currently has the PSAP's administrative lines to a cloud based solution. This will allow any of the PSAPS to receive their own administrative calls in a different location in the event their center is inoperable. Text to 911 translation services and video to 911 services are under investigation for implementation.  |
| FL    | \$20,912,797.00  | In 2023, Florida counties have contracted and implemented NG911 services with multiple vendors, started regional GIS data repositories and upgraded their Call Handling Systems (CHS) to allow the implementation of next generation services. These are ongoing projects, continuing in 2024.  |
| GA    | [NA]   | [No Response]   |
| HI    | \$0.00   | Currently in the process of upgrading call-taking equipment.  |
| ID    | [NA]   | GIS Services  |
| IA    | ...<br>approximately<br>\$12,717,626.09<br>was spent on<br>Next<br>Generation<br>programs.<br>... <sup>[209]</sup> | During this reporting period PSAPs continued to upgrade to the NENA i3 standard Next Gen. PSAPs upgraded their CPE's and Recorders to SIP capable/enabled.<br>During this reporting period, PSAPs worked with GeoComm to continue the maintenance phase for GIS data that is being used for 911 call delivery and routing. HSEMD offered GIS grants to local jurisdictions to help facilitate this effort. Iowa transitioned to and ECRF during the reporting year.<br>During this time period, we continued implementation of the providing shared services for CPE, CAD, mapping, EMD, and recorder to the benefit of the PSAPs. Additional redundancy to the core of this system is derived from FirstNet.<br>During this time period we continued the effort to merge the legacy landline network onto the existing ESInet. The remaining work is focused on landline providers with direct trunks to PSAPs and getting those routed to POIs for the State network.   |
| IL    | \$439,061.00   | The State of Illinois has been implementing the AT&T ESInet throughout 2023. Implementation will  |

<sup>209</sup> Iowa's full response to Question I2a is, "We do not track amounts by 'NG programs.' At the state level, a reasonable estimate is that approximately \$12,717,626.09 was spent on Next Generation programs. At this time, it is difficult to determine how much was spent on next-generation programs by local jurisdictions." Iowa Response at 19.

| State    | Amount Spent  | Description of Projects   |   |         |        |   |       |                                    |           |  |            |  |           |      |            |  |           |  |         |  |       |   |           |   |          |   |         |  |
|----------|---|---|---|---------|--------|---|-------|------------------------------------|-----------|--|------------|--|-----------|------|------------|--|-----------|--|---------|--|-------|---|-----------|---|----------|---|---------|--|
|          |   | continue in 2024 with 65 PSAPs to be cutover.   |   |         |        |   |       |                                    |           |  |            |  |           |      |            |  |           |  |         |  |       |   |           |   |          |   |         |  |
| IN       | [No Response]   | As of August 4, 2021 AT&T migrated their buildout of the second ESInet for Indiana. Indigital completed their buildout in 2015 and upgraded in 2019. The Board continues to work towards moving from the RFAI to the i3 standards.  |   |         |        |   |       |                                    |           |  |            |  |           |      |            |  |           |  |         |  |       |   |           |   |          |   |         |  |
| KS       | \$16,125,142.00   | Statewide NG911 system implementation completed in 2023, with a total of 110 PSAPs on the system by year's end. This encompasses [sic] all PSAPs in the state outside of the Mid-America Regional Council service area. All statewide system PSAPs are connected via IP to the AT&T Nationwide ESInet in an i3 routing configuration. Migration of the statewide system PSAPs to geospatial call routing was completed by August of 2020. All PSAPs on the system are currently text enabled. The MARC system has completed replacement of legacy selective routers with IP Selective routers and a planned migration to NGCS and i3 routing is underway. A part of that migration plan includes interconnection with the statewide ESInet.   |   |         |        |   |       |                                    |           |  |            |  |           |      |            |  |           |  |         |  |       |   |           |   |          |   |         |  |
| KY       | \$973,224.14  | With assistance from the 2019 federal NG911 grant, Kentucky completed a new state NG911 Road Map and Readiness Assessment; launched a statewide NG911 GIS integration and aggregation project; and constructed a statewide supplemental data portal to push validated and aggregated GIS data along with supplemental mapping and data layers to all certified Kentucky PSAPs. Funding has been received from the general fund and an RFP is currently being drafted for an ESInet implementation beginning in 2025.  |   |         |        |   |       |                                    |           |  |            |  |           |      |            |  |           |  |         |  |       |   |           |   |          |   |         |  |
| LA       | Louisiana does not track the funds expended on NG-911 projects as a separate amount   | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Louisiana Parish</th> <th>Project</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Acadia</td> <td>Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium ESInet Project. Plan to work with Tax Assessor's Office for development better parish map with multi-layer users.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Allen</td> <td>911 Consortium Planning for ESINET</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ascension</td> <td>All existing equipment is capable. We are in the process of refreshing hardware/equipment prior to moving to SIP. We are working with the Directors Consortium on an ESInet project. We are working on vetting vendor solutions.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Assumption</td> <td>Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium ESInet Project</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Avoyelles</td> <td>None</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Beauregard</td> <td>Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium ESInet Project</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bienville</td> <td>All equipment refreshed in Oct. 2023, Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium ESInet Project</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bossier</td> <td>Actively working with 9-1-1 directors across the state to develop an RFP to move towards NG911. This includes research and possible procurement of an ESI Net service in preparation of NG911 systems.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Caddo</td> <td>Continuing final phases of installation contract with Motorola for Vesta NG911 Call Handling System. Equipment has been delivered and we are prepared for installation. The District had to pause the project due to AT&amp;T failing to deliver required circuits on time. We have signed a multi-parish agreement to begin the process of converting to an ESI Net. The next phase is to establish standards for a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to find a consulting firm to help the Consortium author a Request for Proposal (RFP).</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Calcasieu</td> <td>Working with multiple parish to generate a joint RFP for ESI net and Core Services through the Louisiana 911 Director's Consortium.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Caldwell</td> <td>Caldwell has entered into a Cooperative Endeavor Agreement with multiple parishes to secure professional services for the development and purchase of ESInet.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cameron</td> <td>Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium ESInet Project</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Louisiana Parish  | Project | Acadia | Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium ESInet Project. Plan to work with Tax Assessor's Office for development better parish map with multi-layer users. | Allen | 911 Consortium Planning for ESINET | Ascension | All existing equipment is capable. We are in the process of refreshing hardware/equipment prior to moving to SIP. We are working with the Directors Consortium on an ESInet project. We are working on vetting vendor solutions. | Assumption | Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium ESInet Project | Avoyelles | None | Beauregard | Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium ESInet Project | Bienville | All equipment refreshed in Oct. 2023, Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium ESInet Project | Bossier | Actively working with 9-1-1 directors across the state to develop an RFP to move towards NG911. This includes research and possible procurement of an ESI Net service in preparation of NG911 systems. | Caddo | Continuing final phases of installation contract with Motorola for Vesta NG911 Call Handling System. Equipment has been delivered and we are prepared for installation. The District had to pause the project due to AT&T failing to deliver required circuits on time. We have signed a multi-parish agreement to begin the process of converting to an ESI Net. The next phase is to establish standards for a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to find a consulting firm to help the Consortium author a Request for Proposal (RFP). | Calcasieu | Working with multiple parish to generate a joint RFP for ESI net and Core Services through the Louisiana 911 Director's Consortium. | Caldwell | Caldwell has entered into a Cooperative Endeavor Agreement with multiple parishes to secure professional services for the development and purchase of ESInet. | Cameron | Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium ESInet Project |
|          |   | Louisiana Parish  | Project   |         |        |   |       |                                    |           |  |            |  |           |      |            |  |           |  |         |  |       |   |           |   |          |   |         |  |
|          |   | Acadia  | Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium ESInet Project. Plan to work with Tax Assessor's Office for development better parish map with multi-layer users.   |         |        |   |       |                                    |           |  |            |  |           |      |            |  |           |  |         |  |       |   |           |   |          |   |         |  |
|          |   | Allen   | 911 Consortium Planning for ESINET  |         |        |   |       |                                    |           |  |            |  |           |      |            |  |           |  |         |  |       |   |           |   |          |   |         |  |
|          |   | Ascension   | All existing equipment is capable. We are in the process of refreshing hardware/equipment prior to moving to SIP. We are working with the Directors Consortium on an ESInet project. We are working on vetting vendor solutions.  |         |        |   |       |                                    |           |  |            |  |           |      |            |  |           |  |         |  |       |   |           |   |          |   |         |  |
|          |   | Assumption  | Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium ESInet Project  |         |        |   |       |                                    |           |  |            |  |           |      |            |  |           |  |         |  |       |   |           |   |          |   |         |  |
|          |   | Avoyelles   | None  |         |        |   |       |                                    |           |  |            |  |           |      |            |  |           |  |         |  |       |   |           |   |          |   |         |  |
|          |   | Beauregard  | Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium ESInet Project  |         |        |   |       |                                    |           |  |            |  |           |      |            |  |           |  |         |  |       |   |           |   |          |   |         |  |
|          |   | Bienville   | All equipment refreshed in Oct. 2023, Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium ESInet Project  |         |        |   |       |                                    |           |  |            |  |           |      |            |  |           |  |         |  |       |   |           |   |          |   |         |  |
|          |   | Bossier   | Actively working with 9-1-1 directors across the state to develop an RFP to move towards NG911. This includes research and possible procurement of an ESI Net service in preparation of NG911 systems.  |         |        |   |       |                                    |           |  |            |  |           |      |            |  |           |  |         |  |       |   |           |   |          |   |         |  |
|          |   | Caddo   | Continuing final phases of installation contract with Motorola for Vesta NG911 Call Handling System. Equipment has been delivered and we are prepared for installation. The District had to pause the project due to AT&T failing to deliver required circuits on time. We have signed a multi-parish agreement to begin the process of converting to an ESI Net. The next phase is to establish standards for a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to find a consulting firm to help the Consortium author a Request for Proposal (RFP). |         |        |   |       |                                    |           |  |            |  |           |      |            |  |           |  |         |  |       |   |           |   |          |   |         |  |
|          |   | Calcasieu   | Working with multiple parish to generate a joint RFP for ESI net and Core Services through the Louisiana 911 Director's Consortium.   |         |        |   |       |                                    |           |  |            |  |           |      |            |  |           |  |         |  |       |   |           |   |          |   |         |  |
| Caldwell | Caldwell has entered into a Cooperative Endeavor Agreement with multiple parishes to secure professional services for the development and purchase of ESInet. |   |   |         |        |   |       |                                    |           |  |            |  |           |      |            |  |           |  |         |  |       |   |           |   |          |   |         |  |
| Cameron  | Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium ESInet Project  |   |   |         |        |   |       |                                    |           |  |            |  |           |      |            |  |           |  |         |  |       |   |           |   |          |   |         |  |

| State | Amount Spent | Description of Projects  |
|-------|--------------|--|
|       |              | Catahoula<br>working toward the purchase of ESINET. Just finished new fly over mapping system with Tax Assessor and Sheriff's office.  |
|       |              | Claiborne<br>not at this time  |
|       |              | Concordia<br>Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium ESInet Project  |
|       |              | De Soto<br>Currently working with the 911 Director's Consortium and NG911 Committee with plans for Next Generation 911   |
|       |              | East Baton Rouge<br>Current ongoing project, 911 call-taking system being upgraded to ESInet and NG-911. An RFP was awarded to NGA911 and the contract was signed in December 2021. The installation has begun and go-live completion is projected for 2024. |
|       |              | East Carroll<br>Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium ESInet Project   |
|       |              | East Feliciana<br>Working with Director's Consortium on Statewide ESInet Project.  |
|       |              | Evangeline<br>Currently getting pricing and working with other parishes to get a cost effective ESINET Plan. Training that is specific to NG911 for dispatchers.   |
|       |              | Franklin<br>Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium ESInet Project   |
|       |              | Grant<br>0   |
|       |              | Iberia<br>Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium ESInet Project   |
|       |              | Iberville<br>None  |
|       |              | Jackson<br>None  |
|       |              | Jefferson<br>State ESInet discussions, CAD to CAD and Upgrading CAD and Phone systems  |
|       |              | Jefferson Davis<br>None  |
|       |              | La Salle<br>Actively working with 9-1-1 directors across the state to develop a plan/RFP moving forward to NG911. This includes research of funding for acquisition of ESInet service in preparation of NG911 systems.                                       |
|       |              | Lafayette<br>Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium ESInet Project  |
|       |              | Lafourche<br>None  |
|       |              | Lincoln<br>Currently working with the Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium and NG911 Committee with plans for Next Generation 911   |
|       |              | Livingston<br>Livingston, East Baton Rouge and Terrebonne Parishes have begun migrating to Next Gen 911 using NGA as our provider. We did this as a joint procurement.   |
|       |              | Madison<br>new mapping system  |
|       |              | Morehouse<br>None  |
|       |              | Natchitoches<br>Actively working with 9-1-1 directors across the state to develop a plan/RFP moving forward to NG911. This includes research of funding for acquisition of ESInet service in preparation of NG911 systems.                                   |
|       |              | Orleans<br>Completed transition to ESInet in 2022.   |
|       |              | Ouachita<br>YES; We continue to work closely with APCO/NENA and other Districts on a State-Wide ESInet project.  |
|       |              | Plaquemines<br>None  |
|       |              | Pointe Coupee<br>Pending DOJ/COPS Grand Award for CAD upgrade  |
|       |              | Rapides<br>(State of La- Cooperative Endeavor Agreement)   |
|       |              | Red River<br>Working with State Director's Consortium on Statewide ESInet Project  |
|       |              | Richland<br>Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium ESInet Project   |

| State          | Amount Spent    | Description of Projects  |  |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--|
|                |                 | Sabine   | Sheriff Dept working on getting CAD  |
|                |                 | St. Bernard  | Yes  |
|                |                 | St. Charles  | None   |
|                |                 | St. Helena   | None   |
|                |                 | St. James  | None   |
|                |                 | St. John The Baptist   | None   |
|                |                 | St. Landry   | St. Landry Parish 911 is currently using a SolaCom ANI/ALI system that is NG-911 Ready however, we are actively researching ANI/ALI and CAD systems in preparation for future upgrades that will better position the Parish 911 agency for an appropriate NG-911 solution. At the end of 2019, the 911 District installed a new voice recorder that is capable of recording voice and data received through the recently installed SolaCom system. In 2020 the installation of two new 700MHz LWIN radio network Consoles began in the 911 Communications Center and was completed in 2021. This has provided more efficient radio communications between the 911 center and Public Safety response agencies in the parish and region, in addition to enhancing interoperable communications between area response agencies. Regarding mapping, currently a GIS map of the parish is still being updated and addressing data is being prepared for the Parish's transition to Next Gen 911. Finally, St. Landry Parish 911 is actively participating with the Louisiana 911 Directors in researching and evaluating current options for establishment of or buy into an ESI net. |
|                |                 | St. Martin   | Currently working with the 911 Directors Consortium & NG Committee with planning.  |
|                |                 | St. Mary   | New CAD system purchased   |
|                |                 | St. Tammany  | Continuing to monitor the State's Director's Consortium's process on securing an NG911 system through bid process.   |
|                |                 | Tangipahoa   | Yes-future plans to better equip our parish - on hold waiting for the new director   |
|                |                 | Tensas   | Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium ESInet Project   |
|                |                 | Terrebonne   | during FY2023 over \$100K expended to NGA911 for NG-911 ESInet/CHS milestones. Additional moneys spent for redundant Fiber connections with REV and Altaworx (ATT).  |
|                |                 | Union  | None   |
|                |                 | Vermilion  | Equipment upgrade to newer version of West Viper NG-911 call system-done in 2021. Upgrade to Kologik Cad system - done in 2021.  |
|                |                 | Vernon   | Continued meetings with other re-911 agencies to develop NG911 Plans   |
|                |                 | Washington   | NG 911 CPE Installed; Louisiana 911 Directors' Consortium ESInet Project   |
|                |                 | Webster  | upgraded to web-based CAD/Mapping system, upgraded call handling solution to easily convert to NG911 when possible in our area   |
|                |                 | West Baton Rouge   | None at this time  |
| West Carroll   | None            |  |  |
| West Feliciana | In Progress     |  |  |
| Winn           | None            |  |  |
| MA             | \$49,102,581.00 | The State 911 Department is working with its Next Generation 911 service provider to explore interstate connectivity with a bordering state. |  |



| State | Amount Spent    | Description of Projects   |
|-------|-----------------|---|
| MD    | [No Response]   | Twenty-one Maryland counties were live with Next Generation 9-1-1 services in 2023. All remaining counties were approved and awarded funds in 2022 for migration, with all counties anticipated going live in 2024.   |
| ME    | \$5,209,128     | System planning and a new expanded training space to allow for expanded 911 training opportunities.   |
| MI    | \$23,380,407.25 | In 2023, there was one service district (3 PSAPs) that started the conversion to an IP-based 911 service provider.  |
| MN    | \$43,318,551.38 | Ongoing work on statewide GIS dataset creation, completion and review of cybersecurity assessments, ongoing individual PSAP deployments of text to 9-1-1 (regional answering point relinquishes to local answering point), OSP migration to NG911 POIs.   |
| MO    | \$247,937.65    | The Board's ARPA funded NG911 and GIS projects were initiated in 2023, these project include establishing local and regional partnerships, as well as funding for ESInets, equipment upgrades and GIS data remediation.   |
| MS    | [NA]            | Plans for NG911 were in progress in 2023, but funding was not yet available for additional expansion and buildout. Mississippi Emergency Management Agency (MEMA) will move forward with the implementation of Phase 2 of the strategic plan for development of the Next Generation (NG) 911 project. Emergency Services Ip Network (ESiNet) core network configurations and resource acquisition for deployment of the State ESiNet will be part of Phase 2 as funding is available [sic]. Deployment of resources to selected PSAPs in the ESiNet buildout, will strengthen the backbone gateways for adding redundancy with Mississippi Wireless Information Network (MSWIN) and carrier class solutions.  |
| MT    | [NA]            | In 2023 the Montana Legislature passed HB 597 granting authority for the Department of Justice to expend 911 funds on a statewide NG911 System. As of December 31, 2023, DOJ had retained a consultant to assist in developing an RFP for the NG911 System.   |
| NC    | \$34,038,794.00 | ESiNet and Hosted Call Handling Statewide PSAP migration: The NC 911 Board approved the award of the State ESiNet contract to AT&T in June 2017 with the actual contract award in August 2017. The contract provides for a Statewide ESiNet provided as a managed service. In addition, the contract provides hosted call handling services that are also provisioned as a managed service. In 2023, the project awaited the final migration of the remaining one PSAP to the NG911 service platform, which will lead to 100% of the State being connected to the ESiNet. At the end of 2023, 111 of the 125 PSAPs migrations utilized a hosted call handling design, 13 PSAPs utilized an on-premise call handling solution connected to the State ESiNet, and one PSAP was not on the ESiNet. As of February 28, 2024, the current status of the ESiNet migration was finalized with 125 or 100% of PSAPs on the Statewide ESiNet and can be viewed here: <a href="https://nconemap.maps.arcgis.com/apps/dashboards/ca70ca087c084a35ab644ea0b693ffc">https://nconemap.maps.arcgis.com/apps/dashboards/ca70ca087c084a35ab644ea0b693ffc</a><br>GIS project for the development of i3 Statewide data set: This project was launched in March of 2019 and runs concurrently with the NG911 ESiNet/Hosted call Handling project. The goal of this project is to migrate all PSAPs coming onto the ESiNet to utilize the NENA i3 standard for geospatial call routing as the SOP for North Carolina. The project is managed under the auspices of a contract awarded to GeoComm Inc in March of 2019. The project also includes in its scope the retrofit of RFAI PSAPs migrated to the ESiNet in 2018-2019 to the i3 standard. This is a Statewide effort that also involves the participation of the NC Center for Geographic Information Analysis (CGIA) as a critical project coordination partner. At the end of 2023, all jurisdictions responsible for serving as the GIS authority were and remain i3 ready in EGDMS. The status of the project can be viewed here: <a href="https://nconemap.maps.arcgis.com/apps/dashboards/bf74d87b26654801ab3d69c686bacf3e">https://nconemap.maps.arcgis.com/apps/dashboards/bf74d87b26654801ab3d69c686bacf3e</a> |
| ND    | \$2,296,810.68  | A major push to migrate national, regional, and local OSPs to SIP-based origination began in 2023. By the end of 2023 a quarter of the state's OSPs had migrated to pure IP/SIP connection without the use of gateway equipment. Continued GIS efforts to prepare for the replacement of MSAG/ALI with LVF/LIS.   |
| NE    | \$4,705,027.00  | Nebraska established the 911 Service System Advisory Committee, which is an advisory committee composed of state and local public safety officials as well as representatives of the telecommunications industry. The committee has been active in establishing working groups to make recommendations in the following areas: Technicial, [sic] GIS, Training, Funding, and Operations.  |

| State | Amount Spent   | Description of Projects  |
|-------|--|--|
|       |  | <p>The Technical Working Group established criteria to be used in the development of a Request For Proposal (RFP) for a vendor hosted statewide Emergency Services Internet Protocol Network and NG 911 Core Services. That RFP resulted in a contract in January 2021 with Lumen/Intrado to provide the services necessary for the Nebraska 911 Service System. After establishing Points of Interconnect for Originating Service Providers, and building circuits to the PSAP's, PSAPs began migrating to the statewide ESInet and became Next Generation 911 PSAPs. At the end of 2023, there were 55 of 68 PSAPs connected to the Statewide ESInet.</p> <p>The Funding Working Group collaborated on the development of a new funding mechanism for NG 911 which was adopted by the Public Service Commission and became effective January 1, 2022. The Training Working Group developed minimum statewide training standards that were adopted and became effective January 1, 2022. The Operations Working Group continues to work on developing model operational policies that PSAPs can adopt.</p> <p>Additionally, the Public Service Commission contracted with Mission Critical Partners to provide implementation consulting services and Intrado to provide Geographic Information Systems (GIS) TDMS (Transitional Database Management Services) to create GeoMSAGs (Master Street Address Guides).</p> |
| NH    | \$1,076,794.63   | The State property that our 911 facility in Laconia is located on is in the process of being sold. Due to the sale of the property, the Division of Emergency Services and Communications, has begun the process of planning for the design and construction for the new PSAP. The Division has been working with New Hampshire's Department of Administration, Division of Public Works and in 2022 a feasibility study was completed on the desired property to ensure the land could occupy the needs of a robust state of the art 911 facility. As of the end of 2023, The DESC and DAS are now working with an architect to design a state of the art PSAP.   |
| NJ    | \$10,250,000.00  | A contract for the Statewide NG9-1-1 network, based on the NENA i3 Standards, was awarded in March of 2022. The vendor has completed the planning and design of the network and has placed the CORE Network Orders. In addition, they have designed the support and maintenance program and coordinated the Verizon database load solution. The vendor is still working on the Verizon Transitional Connectivity Planning, surveying PSAPs and providing electrical remediation. The vendor has started installing the equipment racks and fiber circuits in the PSAPs. Deployment of the first county is now expected to occur in the summer of 2024.   |
| NM    | \$3,726,940.00   | RFP issued 1/2/2023 for NM911 Implementation and Transition to Next Generation 911 (NG911). Contract awarded 7/11/2023 - 7/10/2027. Project is at approximately 32% complete. Completed PSAP and ESZ boundaries. Continued to deploy NG911-ready Call Handling Equipment, now at 100% of PSAPs with NG911 capable systems. Software upgrades scheduled in 2024 to meet ESInet and NGCS requirements.   |
| NV    | \$220,908.00   | 0 <sup>[210]</sup>   |
| NY    | \$12,759.86  | NYC NG 911   |
| OH    | State of Ohio expended: \$377,146.59, Local/Counties expended \$4,036,521.00 | The State of Ohio is currently building our statewide ESInet and Next Generation 9-1-1 Core Services, and the statewide call handling equipment. This began in July 2023 and should be completed around the end of 2024.   |
| OK    | [NA]   | [No Response]  |
| OR    | [NA]   | Statewide NG9-1-1 strategic plan in development. Statewide GIS assessment for NG9-1-1 readiness complete.  |
| PA    | \$19,674,396.28  | In accordance with the Statewide 911 Plan, PEMA continues to work with Comtech   |

<sup>210</sup> At Addendum Section I2, Nevada states, "Rave Mobility Smart 911, Carbyne, NGA911, Prepared 911, RapidSOS." Nevada Response at 17.

| State | Amount Spent    | Description of Projects   |
|-------|-----------------|---|
|       |                 | Telecommunications Corp and the PSAPs to implement and operate Pennsylvania’s NG911 System. A phased implementation of NG911 across Pennsylvania is underway. As of June 2024, 49 PSAPs have migrated to NG911 service. All of Pennsylvania’s [sic] PSAPs will be migrated to NG911 by December 2024.   |
| RI    | \$581,551.60    | INDigital Core Services, VOIP Responder Phones  |
| SC    | \$7,620,516.00  | South Carolina is in year 4 of a multi-year staged approach to transition all the PSAPs onto the statewide ESInet.. 43 PSAPs were migrated by the annual period ending December 31, 2023. Approximatley [sic] 17 PSAPs are scheduled to migrate in 2024.  |
| SD    | \$4,371,540.00  | i3 geospatial call routing was implemented for all state hosted PSAPs for wireless and VoIP calls; still working on remaining migrations to full geospatial call routing when all PSAPs/counties reach 98% data accuracy. GIS incentive grant was initiated in 2023 and we now have 9 counties who are i3 and geo spatial call routing. GIS cleanup work has been completed for 29 counties. All PSAPs were upgraded to new call handling software. These software upgrades will help lay the foundation for future NG911 enhancements and interoperability.  |
| TN    | \$14,496,988.00 | Under the TECB’s contract with AT&T for NG9-1-1 services, each 9-1-1 call center will benefit from two redundant physical connections to the NG9-1-1 network, alongside a wireless backup connection through AT&T’s FirstNet wireless network.<br>The TECB’s expenditures for NG9-1-1 encompassed several key initiatives:<br>1. Migrating PSAPs to AT&T ESInet<br>2. Financing the start-up costs associated with the statewide hosted controller, also known as the Call Handling as a Service program.<br>3. Maintenance of a twenty-four-hour network operations center dedicated to assisting PSAPs with technical issues.<br>4. Procurement of Esri GIS software licenses, essential for the functionality of the NG9-1-1 project.  |
| TX    | \$66,842,012.00 | CSEC state 9-1-1 Program: No fully i3 NG911 compliant networks were turned up and operational during CY 2023. All 20 RPCs have deployed ESINets with NGCS (4 with Motorola, 16 with ATT). During CY 2023, RPCs were primarily in the process of their NG9-1-1 providers doing OSP migrations. The 16 on ATT are in the process of beginning OSP traffic migration to the ATT NG Core. As a sub-project, CSEC began the procurement process for a statewide cybersecurity assessment for all 20 RPCs for all 237 PSAPs and awarded a contract in July 2023 -- subsequently that contract was terminated due to underlying issues with the contractor.<br>Municipal ECDs: Plano completed its procurement, special construction completed, and planning for implementation in 2023. Rowlett installed NG9-1-1 compliant Call Handling Equipment (CHE). Sherman transitioned to ATT ESInet as part of a hosted solution with Texoma Council of Governments. Richardson and Longview conducted internal discussions regarding possibly contracting for NGCS from a vendor or possibly becoming a satellite agency from its local Council of Governments’ existing network. Dallas, Garland, and Highland Park executed NG9-1-1 agreements with AT&T. A majority of Municipal ECDs neither have ESInets nor have expended funds for NG9-1-1 projects. The Texas Legislature appropriated to CSEC \$150 million in federal American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 to CSEC to award to Texas 9-1-1 Entities to implement NG9-1-1. For a majority of Municipal ECDs, the federal funds are the first occasion the entity will begin the process of transitioning to NG9-1-1 service.<br>772 statutory ECDs: Several 772 ECDs reported ongoing NG9-1-1 projects during CY 2023. Bexar Metro 9-1-1 completed 8 out of 9 milestones including transition of PSAPs to SIP MSRP protocols and transition of 6 OSPs to NGCS. Brazos County ECD completed 2 subprojects including network improvement and installation of NG9-1-1 compliant CHE. Calhoun County completed installation of NG9-1-1 compliant Call Handling Equipment and improved GIS systems for the ECD. Cameron County ECD completed ORT for 11 PSAPs, installed NG9-1-1 compliant CHE at multiple PSAPs, and installed new improved GIS software. Capital Area ECD is in the process of transitioning CHE to NG9-1-1 compliant systems and completed OSP migration of AT&T and T-Mobile. Lubbock County ECD installed new networking equipment. Medina County 9-1-1 obtained routers and NG9-1-1 compliant CHE for PSAPs. North Central Texas 9-1-1 completed installation of capital network gear and NG9-1-1 compliant CHE. Wichita-Wilbarger 9-1-1 completed a GIS data cleanup project. |

| State | Amount Spent  | Description of Projects   |
|-------|---|---|
|       |   | General reporting on NG9-1-1 Projects (without attribution) includes:<br>OSP Transitions to NGCS Ongoing; Implented [sic] NGCS with Motorola for all 5 PSAPs in Brazos County; Core Services- Esinet complete; Transition from RFAI to i3; NG core services/ESINet service provider migratrion [sic]; Current project is transition to NGCS; CHE ready for cutover in February 2024 underway ECRF, LVF, SI, EIDO, FG, LSRG; Anticipate first round of cutovers September-October time-frame; NGCS implementation is in progress; Planned migration to the AT&T ESINet; NGCS, ESINet upgrade, secondary network; Next Gen Core Routing Service and GIS Map Accuracy; We have replaced the 9-1-1 System and are transitioning to NG911 now; Transition to Next Generation Core Services and ESINet; 'Next Generation Core Services Transition Microwave Fresh and Update Capital Network Gear;' NGCS completed 2/1/24; 1- 9-1-1 Call Routing & Location Monthly Recurring Costs; 2- High Resolution GIS Imagery for PSAP Mapping; 3-(NGCS) Core Services and VESTA Call Handling Upgrade; GIS Cleanup-completed; NGCS-in process.   |
| UT    | \$8,198,956.40  | [No Response]   |
| VA    | \$10,294,849.37   | Virgina's NG9-1-1 deployment dashbord [sic] can be found here :<br><a href="https://vgin.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=d8426fe09efc4ad1b4fd756e1fb4d47b">https://vgin.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=d8426fe09efc4ad1b4fd756e1fb4d47b</a>  |
| VT    | \$4,755,333.00  | In October 2020, the Board and our new contracted system provider, INdigital, deployed a new statewide NG911 system which continues to operate.   |
| WA    | ~\$12M  | King County, the 14th largest county in the US and home to the City of Seattle, has entered into a contract with Intrado to provide a cloud-hosted remote call handling system to 11 PSAPs. The cloud-hosted system will function similar to an ESINet, but remains essentially a private cloud call handling system. Key functional elements, such as ECRF, ESRP, LVF remain functions of the statewide ESINet and Core Services.<br>Other counties have entered into consortiums to implement Host/Remote call handling systems in order to leverage the improved networking connectivity provided by the statewide MPLS ESINet.  |
| WI    | \$596,804.49  | Wisconsin signed a statewide ESINet and NextGen Cores Services contract with AT&T in 2021. The third year of the intial [sic] five year contract began in 2023. 93 PSAPs had signed an agreement to join the statewide ESINet and 6 PSAPs had implemented the ESINet by the end of 2023. Entities that were awarded the first round of state grant funding under the two annual NG911 grant programs (Chapter DMA 2 PSAP and NG911 GIS grant programs) started their grant performance period at the end of 2022 or early 2023. 63 grant projects totaling \$6,797,298.72 in state grant funding continued throughout 2023. Two grantees completed their projects, totaling \$125,585 in grant reimbursement. The remaining open grant projects from the first round of awards will complete in 2023. The second application period for both programs opened in mid-2023. 19 grant awards were issued under the PSAP grant program and 28 grant awards were issued under the GIS grant program totaling \$7,070,074.31 in additional state grant funding awarded as of December 2023. Wisconsin awarded a contract to GeoComm for a NG911 GIS managed service to aggregate statewide GIS data for NG911 call routing in December 2023. The project will begin in 2024 and the initial contract term will end in 2028. |
| WV    | [No Response]   | [No Response]   |
| WY    | Local jurisdictions have spent money on systems and equipment in preparation for being NG911 ESI-Net ready. There is not an audit amount reported to the state. The | The State of Wyoming has adopted GIS data requirements and is working to secure funding for an ESI-Net.   |

| State                      | Amount Spent  | Description of Projects  |
|----------------------------|---|--|
|                            | State of Wyoming has not spend funds directly on any NG911 program. |  |
| <b>Other Jurisdictions</b> |   |  |
| AS                         | [DNF]   | [DNF]  |
| DC                         | \$2,992,012.73  | N/A  |
| Guam                       | \$1,191,098.52  | Build up which consisted of Planning of buildup, major renovation of proposed NG911 center, Design of workstations layout, electrical requirements completed, workstations and monitors installed, furnitures [sic] procured and installed has all been completed. |
| NMI                        | [DNF]   | [DNF]  |
| PR                         | \$546,838.37  | New 9-1-1 CAD Implementation   |
| USVI                       | [NA]  | Testing and and [sic] preparation for implementation of Text to 911 service across the USVI.   |
| <b>Total</b>               | <b>\$532,531,107.81</b>   |  |

53. **ESInet Deployments.** The Bureau requested that states and other responding jurisdictions provide information on whether they had any Emergency Services IP Networks (ESInets) operating during calendar year 2023.<sup>211</sup> The Bureau further requested descriptions of the type and number of ESInets operating within each state or jurisdiction, and the number of PSAPs linked to each ESInet. As detailed in Table 24 below, 24 states and the District of Columbia reported having deployed statewide ESInets; 13 states reported having regional ESInets; and 11 states reported local-level ESInets.<sup>212</sup>

---

<sup>211</sup> ESInet deployment is an indicator that the state or jurisdiction is transitioning to IP-based routing of 911 calls, but ESInet deployment, by itself, does not mean the state has completed its transition to NG911 service. The deployment of ESInets, while a significant step in the transition to NG911, does not in and of itself constitute full implementation of NG911 functionality. In addition, while the data reported here indicate that significant ESInet deployment has occurred, the data also indicate that the majority of PSAPs nationwide continue to operate on legacy networks.

<sup>212</sup> Eleven states reported having more than one type of ESInet operating in 2023. For example, the following states indicated that they have both regional and local ESInets operating within the state: Michigan, Missouri, South Carolina, and Wisconsin.

**Table 24 – States and Jurisdictions Deploying ESInets and Total PSAPs Operating on ESInets<sup>213</sup>**

| Type of ESInet                               | Number of States/Jurisdictions Indicating PSAPs Connected to ESInets |    | States/Jurisdictions Responding YES  | Total PSAPs Operating on ESInets |
|--|--|----|--|----------------------------------|
|  | Yes  | No |  |                                  |
| <b>Single Statewide ESInet<sup>214</sup></b> | 25   | 27 | Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin | 1,906                            |
| <b>Regional ESInet</b>                       | 13   | 34 | Arkansas, California, Illinois, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin   | 1,328                            |
| <b>Local ESInet</b>                          | 11   | 37 | Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, Nevada, South Carolina, West Virginia, Wisconsin  | 267                              |

54. **Text-to-911 Service.** The Bureau requested that respondents specify the number of PSAPs within each state and jurisdiction that had implemented text-to-911 as of the end of calendar year 2023. The Bureau also requested that respondents estimate the number of PSAPs that they anticipated would become text capable by the end of calendar year 2024. As shown in Table 25 below, 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico collectively reported 3,633 PSAPs as being text capable as of the end of 2023. These respondents plus Guam and the U.S. Virgin Islands further reported that they

<sup>213</sup> Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Virginia, Washington, and Wyoming provided substantive entries in Addendum Section I3 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/sixteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>. Michigan states, “The ESInets started as a regional ESInet in the Upper Peninsula. Over time, there have been several different regions that have joined together to get on the same network, helping to share equipment. At the end of 2023, there were 131 PSAPs on a regional ESInet; 38 PSAPs have their own individual ESInet. All PSAPs and regional ESInets are able to connect to each other and share information.” Michigan Response at 21. Indiana did not check any ESInet boxes at I3, but it states at Addendum Section I3, “Indiana operates a dual ESInet. This is run by Indigital and AT&T.” Indiana Response at 25.

<sup>214</sup> At Question I3a, Utah checked Yes to Single Statewide ESInet, but it did not provide a number of PSAPs operating on the ESInet. Utah Response at 27. Virginia states, “70 PSAPs were on the AT&T ESInet at the end of 2023.” At Addendum Section I3, Virginia states, “In previous years we have listed other regional ESInets on the annual FCC report. As of the end of 2023, there is only a single ESInet provider in Virginia.” However, Virginia is not listed in this table because it left all ESInet Yes boxes, including the single statewide ESInet Yes box, unchecked. Virginia Response at 19-20.

anticipated a total of 3,868 PSAPs would be text capable by the end of 2024, representing an estimated increase of 235 PSAPs or approximately 6.5%. For purposes of comparison, Table 25 also includes data from the FCC’s Text-to-911 Registry as of the November 26, 2024 edition, which shows a total of 3,301 text-capable PSAPs registered with the FCC.<sup>215</sup>

**Table 25 – Text-to-911 Deployments<sup>216</sup>**

| State | Text-Capable PSAPs as of Year End 2023 | Estimated Total Text-Capable PSAPs as of Year End 2024 | Total Text-Capable PSAPs Listed in FCC Text-to-911 Registry as of November 26, 2024 |
|-------|--|--|---|
| AK    | 4                                      | 4  | 9   |
| AL    | 94                                     | 96   | 4   |
| AR    | 17                                     | 17   | 23  |
| AZ    | 80                                     | 80   | 79  |
| CA    | 440                                    | 440  | 389   |
| CO    | 77                                     | 77   | 73  |
| CT    | 106                                    | 106  | 107   |
| DE    | 8                                      | 8  | 9   |
| FL    | 185                                    | 197  | 140   |
| GA    | 64                                     | Unknown  | 34  |
| HI    | 8                                      | 8  | 9   |
| IA    | 111                                    | 111  | 106   |
| ID    | 51                                     | 52   | 39  |
| IL    | 116                                    | 150  | 88  |
| IN    | 117                                    | 117  | 90  |
| KS    | 123                                    | 123  | 119   |
| KY    | 38                                     | Unknown  | 19  |
| LA    | 25                                     | 45   | 17  |
| MA    | 210                                    | 210  | 242   |

<sup>215</sup> The FCC’s PSAP Text-to-911 Readiness and Certification Registry is available at <https://www.fcc.gov/general/psap-text-911-readiness-and-certification-form>. FCC rules do not require PSAPs to register with the FCC when they become text capable; they may notify service providers directly that they are text capable and certified to accept texts. The FCC has encouraged all text-capable PSAPs to register with the FCC. Bureau staff counted registered PSAPs by unique PSAP ID numbers. Duplicate PSAP IDs were ignored. However, staff counted entries with blank PSAP IDs as well as other PSAP ID entries such as “NA” and “All PSAPs.”

<sup>216</sup> Alabama, Alaska, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey, North Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin provided substantive entries in Addendum Section I5 of the Questionnaire; and Alabama, Hawaii, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin provided substantive entries in Addendum Section I6 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. Ten states report that all of their PSAPs are accepting texts to 911 at Addendum Sections I5 and/or I6. Delaware Response at 20; Hawaii Response at 20; Kansas Response at 21; Maine Response at 20; Maryland Response at 20; Massachusetts Response at 22; New Hampshire Response at 20; North Carolina Response at 21-22; South Dakota Response at 21; Texas Response at 33. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/sixteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

| State             | Text-Capable PSAPs as of Year End 2023 | Estimated Total Text-Capable PSAPs as of Year End 2024 | Total Text-Capable PSAPs Listed in FCC Text-to-911 Registry as of November 26, 2024 |
|-------------------|--|--|---|
| MD                | 24                                     | N/A  | 20  |
| ME                | 25                                     | 25   | 27 <sup>[217]</sup>   |
| MI                | 133                                    | 134  | 121   |
| MN                | 97                                     | 99   | 86  |
| MO                | 57                                     | 80   | 65  |
| MS                | 38                                     | 38   | 22  |
| MT                | U/A                                    | U/A  | 47  |
| NC <sup>218</sup> | 125                                    | 124  | 104   |
| ND                | 22                                     | 22   | 20  |
| NE                | 57                                     | 67   | 30  |
| NH                | 2                                      | 2  | 1 <sup>[219]</sup>  |
| NJ <sup>220</sup> | 17                                     | 35   | 19  |
| NM                | 0                                      | 0  | 0   |
| NV <sup>221</sup> | 8                                      | 9  | 9   |
| NY                | 48                                     | Unk[nown]  | 47  |
| OH                | 56                                     | 97   | 58  |
| OK                | 27                                     | 35   | 23  |
| OR                | 34                                     | 37   | 26  |
| PA                | 60                                     | 61   | 45  |
| RI                | 2                                      | 2  | 0   |
| SC                | 30                                     | 44   | 29  |
| SD                | 32                                     | 32   | 33  |
| TN                | 84                                     | 115  | 126   |
| TX                | 516                                    | [No Response]  | 507   |
| UT                | 27                                     | 27   | 32  |

<sup>217</sup> In the Text-to-911 Registry, Maine has an entry for “All PSAPs” in addition to entries for individual PSAPs.

<sup>218</sup> North Carolina reports that 125 PSAPs had implemented text-to-911 as of December 31, 2023, and that it anticipates 124 PSAPs will have implemented text-to-911 as of December 31, 2024. North Carolina explains that all its PSAPs have implemented text-to-911, but two primary PSAPs consolidated in 2024, so that there will only be 124 Board-funded PSAPs in North Carolina by the end of 2024. “All Board-funded PSAPs will continue to accept text-to-911.” North Carolina Response at 21-22.

<sup>219</sup> In the Text-to-911 Registry, New Hampshire has just one entry for “All PSAPs.”

<sup>220</sup> At Addendum Section I5, New Jersey states, “Text to 9-1-1 capability became available statewide in July 2016 through 17 regional PSAPs equipped with the necessary equipment.” At Addendum Section I6, New Jersey states, “Text to 9-1-1 is available statewide through 17 regional PSAPs now. As the NG9-1-1 Network is built it is anticipated that the number of PSAPs with Text to 9-1-1 capability will increase to approximately 35.” New Jersey Response at 20.

<sup>221</sup> At Addendum Section I5, Nevada states, “5 PSAPs collecting 911 fees have the capability to accept texts.” At Addendum Section I6, Nevada states, “Eureka County has the capability to accept texts as of 5/2024.” Nevada Response at 19-20.



| State                       | Text-Capable PSAPs as of Year End 2023 | Estimated Total Text-Capable PSAPs as of Year End 2024 | Total Text-Capable PSAPs Listed in FCC Text-to-911 Registry as of November 26, 2024 |
|-----------------------------|--|--|---|
| VA                          | 119                                    | 119  | 99  |
| VT                          | 6                                      | 6  | 6   |
| WA                          | 48                                     | 49   | 49  |
| WI                          | 18                                     | Unknown  | 28  |
| WV                          | 35                                     | 38   | 11  |
| WY                          | 9                                      | 15   | 9   |
| <b>Other Jurisdictions</b>  |  |  |   |
| AS                          | [DNF]                                  | [DNF]  | 0   |
| DC                          | 1                                      | 1  | 1   |
| Guam                        | NONE                                   | 2  | 0   |
| NMI                         | [DNF]                                  | [DNF]  | 0   |
| PR                          | 2                                      | 2  | 1   |
| USVI                        | 0 <sup>[222]</sup>                     | 2  | 2   |
| <b>Totals<sup>223</sup></b> | <b>3,633</b>                           | <b>3,868</b>   | <b>3,301</b>  |

## J. Cybersecurity Expenditures

55. The Bureau requested that states and jurisdictions provide information on whether they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs in 2023 and, if so, the amounts of those expenditures. As represented in Table 26 below, 24 states and the District of Columbia reported that they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs in 2023, with a combined total reported expenditure of \$11,526,087.56. Twenty-five states,<sup>224</sup> Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands responded that they did not expend funds on PSAP-related cybersecurity programs. The Bureau additionally requested information on the number of PSAPs in each state or jurisdiction that had or participated in a cybersecurity program in 2023. Collectively, respondents reported that 1,461 PSAPs had or participated in a cybersecurity program in calendar year 2023. Twenty states, the District of Columbia, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that one or more of their PSAPs either had a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program in 2023. Nine states and Puerto

<sup>222</sup> The U.S. Virgin Islands reports that it is testing text-to-911. U.S. Virgin Islands Response at 4, 19.

<sup>223</sup> Several states entered “Unknown,” “N/A,” or similar to Question I6, but reported information in Question I5 that allowed an estimate to be ascertained. In such cases, for I6 calculation purposes, the Bureau assumed that at least the same number of PSAPs in those states that accepted texts as of year-end 2023 would also accept texts as of year-end 2024. (Because most of these states reported “Unknown,” their actual numbers could also be higher by the end of 2024.) Based on Question I5 responses, for Question I6, we assume in our calculations 64 PSAPs for Georgia, 38 PSAPs for Kentucky, 24 PSAPs for Maryland, 48 PSAPs for New York, 516 PSAPs for Texas, and 18 PSAPs for Wisconsin, for a subtotal of 708 PSAPs that we are including in the grand total of estimated text-capable PSAPs as of the end of 2024.

<sup>224</sup> We note that this count includes some states that reported “No” at J1 for whether the state had expended funds on cybersecurity programs, but that then gave indications elsewhere that some PSAP cybersecurity activities or spending was taking place. For example, Colorado reported “No” at J1 for whether the state had expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs in 2023, but then explained at Addendum Section J1 that its local 911 governing bodies reported spending on PSAP cybersecurity. Colorado Response at 21-22; *see also*, e.g., Wyoming Response at 20 (“The state did work with CISA to provide educational opportunities and planning for cyber events.”).

Rico reported that their PSAPs did not have or participate in cybersecurity programs.<sup>225</sup> Twenty states reported or indicated that they lacked data or otherwise did not know whether their PSAPs had or participated in cybersecurity programs.<sup>226</sup>

**Table 26 – Annual Cybersecurity Expenditures<sup>227</sup>**

| State             | Jurisdictions reporting that they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs during the annual period ending December 31, 2023 |    |             | Amount  | Number of PSAPs that either implemented a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program |
|-------------------|--|----|-------------|---|--|
|                   | Yes  | No | No Response |   |  |
| AK                |  | X  |             | [NA]  | 0  |
| AL                | X  |    |             | These expenses are part of the NG911 system service provider’s scope, but are not completely itemized in their invoicing. | Unknown  |
| AR                |  | X  |             | [NA]  | N/A  |
| AZ                |  | X  |             | [NA]  | 0  |
| CA                |  | X  |             | [NA]  | 440  |
| CO <sup>228</sup> |  | X  |             | [NA]  | [No Response]  |
| CT                |  | X  |             | [NA]  | UNK[NOWN]  |
| DE                | X  |    |             | [No Response]   | 8  |
| FL                | X  |    |             | \$2,995,711.00  | 106  |
| GA                |  | X  |             | [NA]  | Unknown  |
| HI                |  | X  |             | [NA]  | 4  |

<sup>225</sup> Although these ten jurisdictions specifically reported at Question J2 that their PSAPs did not have or participate in a cybersecurity program, several of them then indicated elsewhere in their questionnaires that they had worked on or were planning such cybersecurity programs. *See, e.g.*, Oklahoma Response at 21 (reporting “No” at Question J2 and then reporting at Addendum Section J2, “But we will!”); New Mexico Response at 21 (Addendum Section J2); Nebraska Response at 22 (Addendum Section J2).

<sup>226</sup> These 20 states all entered “Unknown” or similar at Question J2, specifically indicating that they did not know, or left Question J2 blank but indicated at Addendum Section J2 that they did not know. *See* Wyoming Response at 20 (leaving Question J2 blank but saying at Addendum Section J2 that “[t]his information [sic] is not known to the state”); Colorado Response at 22 (leaving Question J2 blank but saying at Addendum Section J2 that Colorado had “no regional or state-run cybersecurity program for PSAPs,” but had no information “regarding how many PSAPs may have implemented their own programs beginning in 2022”).

<sup>227</sup> California, Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Texas, Wisconsin, and Wyoming provided substantive entries in Addendum Section J1, associated with responses in this table. California, Colorado, Hawaii, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming provided substantive entries in Addendum Section J2 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/sixteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>.

<sup>228</sup> At Addendum Section J1, Colorado states, “While the state spent no funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs, the local 9-1-1 governing bodies reported that they expended \$ on cybersecurity-related expenses. Not all governing bodies responded to our data collection effort, so the actual figure may be higher. Several governing bodies also reported that their cybersecurity expenses are included in the budgets of the county or city that operates their PSAP(s), so they were unable to provide a figure.” Colorado Response at 22.

| State             | Jurisdictions reporting that they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs during the annual period ending December 31, 2023 |    |             |  | Number of PSAPs that either implemented a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program |
|-------------------|--|----|-------------|--|--|
|                   | Yes  | No | No Response | Amount   |  |
| IA                | X  |    |             | Unknown  | 111  |
| ID                |  | X  |             | [NA]   | [No Response]  |
| IL                |  | X  |             | [NA]   | unknown  |
| IN                | X  |    |             | [No Response]  | unknown  |
| KS <sup>229</sup> | X  |    |             | \$1,088,965.00   | 26   |
| KY                |  | X  |             | [NA]   | 64   |
| LA                | X  |    |             | not tracked  | Unk[nown]  |
| MA                | X  |    |             | Although not broken out as a separate line item, monitoring, alerting, and prevention of external attacks is undertaken under the Next Generation 911 service provider contract.<br>... <sup>[230]</sup> | Unknown  |
| MD                | X  |    |             | \$2,969,492.03   | 24   |
| ME                | X  |    |             | The exact amount expended is unknown as it is part of the NG911 Services Contract.   | 25   |
| MI                | X  |    |             | [No Response]  | Unknown  |
| MN                | X  |    |             | \$68,090.00  | unknown  |
| MO                | X  |    |             | [No Response]  | 33   |
| MS                |  | X  |             | [NA]   | N/A  |
| MT                |  |    | X           | U/A  | U/A  |
| NC                | X  |    |             | \$2,444.00   | 48   |
| ND                | X  |    |             | Unknown  | Unknown  |
| NE                |  | X  |             | [NA]   | 0  |
| NH                | X  |    |             | [No Response]  | 2  |
| NJ                |  | X  |             | [NA]   | Unknown  |
| NM                |  | X  |             | [NA]   | 0  |
| NV                |  | X  |             | [NA]   | 0  |
| NY                | X  |    |             | [No Response]  | 36   |

<sup>229</sup> At Addendum Section J2, Kansas states, “The 110 PSAPs that participate in the statewide call handling system benefit from the Council’s efforts to ensure cyber security is maintained on the system. The costs of this cyber effort is rolled up in the overall system costs. In 2023 the Council implemented a cybersecurity monitoring platform to ensure that cyber efforts made by the system vendor are validated.” Kansas Response at 22.

<sup>230</sup> At Question J1 on the amount expended, Massachusetts’ full response is: “Although not broken out as a separate line item, monitoring, alerting, and prevention of external attacks is undertaken under the Next Generation 911 service provider contract. The boundary of the network is protected with Anti-Malware, Anti-Virus, Firewall, and Network Intrusion Protection capabilities, monitored 24x7x365 by a Security Operations Center. A second layer of Firewalls protect the data centers (the brains of the systems) from the Internet DMZ and ESInet/PSAPs. This provides blocks to prevent both malware and internal user threats from accessing key systems. Finally, the PSAP system is isolated on the Massachusetts Next Generation 911 networks, they do not share any connections or networks with the police stations or fire stations in which they are installed, and all VPN applications have a cyber-security brief.”

| State                      | Jurisdictions reporting that they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs during the annual period ending December 31, 2023 |           |             |   | Number of PSAPs that either implemented a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program |
|----------------------------|--|-----------|-------------|---|--|
|                            | Yes  | No        | No Response | Amount  |  |
| OH                         |  | X         |             | [NA]  | 64   |
| OK                         |  | X         |             | [NA]  | No   |
| OR                         |  | X         |             | [NA]  | Unknown  |
| PA                         | X  |           |             | [No Response]   | 61   |
| RI                         | X  |           |             | \$28,605.21   | 2  |
| SC                         |  | X         |             | [NA]  | unknown  |
| SD                         |  | X         |             | [NA]  | 0  |
| TN                         |  | X         |             | [NA]  | Unknown  |
| TX                         | X  |           |             | \$3,391,325.00  | 287  |
| UT                         | X  |           |             | The statewide NG911 end to end solution includes strict cybersecurity protocols that UCA pays for in the monthly reoccurring [sic] costs on behalf of the Utah PSAPs. | 27   |
| VA                         |  | X         |             | [NA]  | Unknown.   |
| VT                         | X  |           |             | [No Response]   | Unknown  |
| WA                         | X  |           |             | Amount is included in an overall contract for NG911 ESInet/Core Services and not itemized.  | 66   |
| WI                         |  | X         |             | [NA]  | Unknown  |
| WV                         | X  |           |             | \$969,755.32  | 23   |
| WY                         |  | X         |             | [NA]  | [No Response]  |
| <b>Other Jurisdictions</b> |  |           |             |   |  |
| AS                         | [DNF]  | [DNF]     | [DNF]       | [DNF]   | [DNF]  |
| DC                         | X  |           |             | \$11,700.00   | 1  |
| Guam                       |  | X         |             | [NA]  | 1  |
| NMI                        | [DNF]  | [DNF]     | [DNF]       | [DNF]   | [DNF]  |
| PR                         |  | X         |             | [NA]  | 0  |
| USVI                       |  | X         |             | [NA]  | 2  |
| <b>Total</b>               | <b>25</b>  | <b>28</b> | <b>1</b>    | <b>\$11,526,087.56<sup>[231]</sup></b>  | <b>1,461</b>   |

56. The Bureau asked states and jurisdictions to report whether they adhere to the National Institute of Standards and Technology *Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity* (NIST Framework)<sup>232</sup> for networks that support one or more PSAPs. As detailed in Table 27 below, 27 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam reported that they adhere to the NIST Framework; four states

<sup>231</sup> This Total amount does not include any amounts spent by 16 states that checked Yes indicating that they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs, but that did not provide amounts in Question J1's "If Yes, Amount Expended (\$)" box. The sixteen states are Alabama, Delaware, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Utah, Vermont, and Washington.

<sup>232</sup> See National Institute of Standards and Technology, *Cybersecurity Framework*, <https://www.nist.gov/cyberframework> (last visited Dec. 19, 2024).

reported that they do not; 18 states, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands indicated that they did not know; and one state provided no response.<sup>233</sup>

**Table 27 – Adherence to the NIST Cybersecurity Framework<sup>234</sup>**

| State | State or jurisdiction adheres to the National Institute of Standards and Technology <i>Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity</i> (April 2018) for networks supporting one or more PSAPs in the state or jurisdiction |    |                    |             |
|-------|--|----|--------------------|-------------|
|       | Yes  | No | Reported “Unknown” | No Response |
| AK    |  |    | X                  |             |
| AL    | X  |    |                    |             |
| AR    |  |    | X                  |             |
| AZ    | X  |    |                    |             |
| CA    | X  |    |                    |             |
| CO    |  | X  |                    |             |
| CT    |  | X  |                    |             |
| DE    | X  |    |                    |             |
| FL    |  |    | X                  |             |
| GA    |  |    | X                  |             |
| HI    | X  |    |                    |             |
| IA    | X  |    |                    |             |
| ID    |  |    |                    | X           |
| IL    |  |    | X                  |             |
| IN    | X  |    |                    |             |
| KS    | X  |    |                    |             |
| KY    | X  |    |                    |             |
| LA    |  |    | X                  |             |
| MA    | X  |    |                    |             |
| MD    | X  |    |                    |             |
| ME    |  |    | X                  |             |
| MI    | X  |    |                    |             |
| MN    |  |    | X                  |             |
| MO    |  |    | X                  |             |

<sup>233</sup> In its response to Question J3 on whether Texas adheres to the NIST Framework, Texas checks all three boxes for Yes, No, and Unknown. Texas explains at Addendum Section J3: “Yes, unknown, or N/A were the prevalent answers -- with a majority of the reporting Texas 9-1-1 Entities reporting yes. The CSEC state 9-1-1 Program anticipates implementing NIST cybersecurity framework by the end of CY 2024.” Texas Response at 34. We have counted Texas’ Question J3 response as a Yes for purposes of this NIST Framework calculation.

<sup>234</sup> Delaware, Georgia, Illinois, Kansas, Minnesota, Mississippi, Pennsylvania, and Texas provided substantive entries in Addendum Section J3 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/sixteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>. Kansas states at Addendum Section J3, “66 PSAPs reported that their local jurisdictions are NIST compliant.” Kansas Response at 23. Minnesota, which checks the Unknown box at J3, states at Addendum Section J3, “It is Minnesota’s intent to adhere to the NIST framework.” Minnesota Response at 23.

| State                      | State or jurisdiction adheres to the National Institute of Standards and Technology <i>Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity</i> (April 2018) for networks supporting one or more PSAPs in the state or jurisdiction |          |                    |             |
|----------------------------|--|----------|--------------------|-------------|
|                            | Yes  | No       | Reported “Unknown” | No Response |
| MS                         | X  |          |                    |             |
| MT                         |  |          | X                  |             |
| NC                         | X  |          |                    |             |
| ND                         | X  |          |                    |             |
| NE                         | X  |          |                    |             |
| NH                         | X  |          |                    |             |
| NJ                         |  |          | X                  |             |
| NM                         | X  |          |                    |             |
| NV                         | X  |          |                    |             |
| NY                         |  |          | X                  |             |
| OH                         |  | X        |                    |             |
| OK                         |  | X        |                    |             |
| OR                         | X  |          |                    |             |
| PA                         | X  |          |                    |             |
| RI                         | X  |          |                    |             |
| SC                         | X  |          |                    |             |
| SD                         | X  |          |                    |             |
| TN                         |  |          | X                  |             |
| TX <sup>235</sup>          | X  |          |                    |             |
| UT                         |  |          | X                  |             |
| VA                         |  |          | X                  |             |
| VT                         | X  |          |                    |             |
| WA                         | X  |          |                    |             |
| WI                         |  |          | X                  |             |
| WV                         |  |          | X                  |             |
| WY                         |  |          | X                  |             |
| <b>Other Jurisdictions</b> |  |          |                    |             |
| AS                         | [DNF]  | [DNF]    | [DNF]              | [DNF]       |
| DC                         | X  |          |                    |             |
| Guam                       | X  |          |                    |             |
| NMI                        | [DNF]  | [DNF]    | [DNF]              | [DNF]       |
| PR                         |  |          | X                  |             |
| USVI                       |  |          | X                  |             |
| <b>Totals</b>              | <b>29</b>  | <b>4</b> | <b>20</b>          | <b>1</b>    |

<sup>235</sup> As noted above, Texas checked all three boxes at Question J3 (Yes, No, and Unknown) and has been counted as a Yes.

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

57. The Bureau asked respondents to provide “an assessment of the effects achieved from the expenditure of state 911/E911 or NG911 funds, including any criteria [the] state or jurisdiction uses to measure the effectiveness of the use of 911/E911 fees and charges.”<sup>236</sup> Of the jurisdictions that responded, many described some effort to measure the effectiveness of 911/E911 fund expenditures, as detailed below in Table 28. Responses varied from descriptions of how funds had been spent on NG911 to state plans with metrics describing improvements to the 911 system.

58. In December 2016, the Task Force on Optimal Public Safety Answering Point Architecture (Task Force), an expert advisory committee the Commission formed in 2014, completed its work on a comprehensive set of recommendations on actions that state, local, and Tribal 911 authorities can take to optimize PSAP cybersecurity, network architecture, and funding.<sup>237</sup> Included in the Task Force’s report are detailed recommendations for state and local NG911 planning and budgeting and a common NG911 “scorecard” to enable jurisdictions to assess the progress and maturity of their NG911 implementations. States and other jurisdictions may incorporate these guidelines into their planning and use them to assess whether utilization of 911/E911 fees has been effective.

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

| State | Assessment of Effects Achieved from the Expenditure of State 911/E911 or NG911 Funds, Including Any Criteria Used to Measure the Effectiveness of the Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges  |
|-------|---|
| AK    | The collection and expenditure of 911 fees allows the Boroughs and Municipalities maintain and support 911 emergency calling.   |
| AL    | <p>Data collection and legal compliance examination at the local district level began in late 2013 on a biennial basis by a third-party state agency. All districts have now completed five rounds of these examinations. The legal compliance examinations are designed to ensure that 911 funds are being utilized properly, as directed by statute, but do not deliver a comprehensive or consistent [sic] assessment of effective use of funds from a quality of service perspective. The various audit reports for each Emergency Communication District can be searched on the Alabama Department of Examiners of Public Accounts website, (<a href="https://examiners.alabama.gov/audit_reports.aspx">https://examiners.alabama.gov/audit_reports.aspx</a>).</p> <p>The Alabama 9-1-1 Board supplements this data by utilizing an extensive annual district certification form. Most of this data collection consists of operational systems in the various PSAPs, staffing numbers, and what training programs were in place per district and are required. The filing of this annual certification is mandatory from emergency communication districts.</p> <p>The NG911 reporting suite provided by our system service provider is being continually improved upon and provides certain quality of service indicators such as call total by defined time period, ring time, talk time, and inter-network transfers that has improved visibility into local operational efficiency. With all PSAPs being migrated onto the Alabama Next Generation Emergency Network (ANGEN), we continue to improve our visibility into the points of data mentioned above, at a network level, and use that data in conjunction with the other reports to improve the measure of effective utilization of 911 funding in Alabama. Additionally, we have begun a project to install and implement a separate analytics system that will measure data from edge points of the system (at the call handling systems in each PSAP) that will provide our office with more granular data than the network analytics system can deliver.</p> |
| AR    | The increase in 911 fees collected due to Act 660, the Public Safety Act of 2019, has reduced the amount of funds that localities are supplementing from general funds to operate a PSAP by approximately 50%. The Arkansas 911 Board is in the process of implementing a Statewide ESInet and NGCS through the collection of fees and improving GIS data statewide.  |

<sup>236</sup> FCC Questionnaire at 20 (K1).

<sup>237</sup> See FCC, *Task Force on Optimal Public Safety Answering Point Architecture (TFOPA)* (Dec. 7, 2016), <https://www.fcc.gov/about-fcc/advisory-committees/general/task-force-optimal-public-safety-answering-point>.

| State | Assessment of Effects Achieved from the Expenditure of State 911/E911 or NG911 Funds, Including Any Criteria Used to Measure the Effectiveness of the Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges  |
|-------|---|
| AZ    | All PSAPs have access to the State NGCS and are receiving [sic] geospatially routed calls via 2 ESInets. 67 of the 81 PSAPs are operating on NG911 i3 compliant CHE. All OPS's have connected to our NGCS POI's.  |
| CA    | Cal OES, California 9-1-1 Branch conducts a Fiscal and Operational Review (F.O.R.) of all PSAPs in the state. These reviews take place, on average, every five years in each PSAP and provide the information needed to ensure that PSAPs are in compliance with statutory requirements. Cal OES also uses the F.O.R. process to provide the PSAPs with the information and guidance the PSAPs need to run efficiently and effectively. The State made a staffing prediction tool available to all PSAPs to assist PSAPs with staffing levels that support P.01 level of service and call answer times established by the state. Cal OES also completes an annual review of wireless call routing for all cellular sectors in the state and tracks all outages in the state. The results of these assessments, reviews, and data-gathering are presented to the 9-1-1 Advisory Board and Long Range Planning Committee who provide guidance and input to the effectiveness of 9-1-1 in California.  |
| CO    | A copy of the 2022-2023 State of 9-1-1 Report will be provided. This is a comprehensive report from the Colorado Public Utilities Commission to the Colorado General Assembly on the state of 9-1-1 services in Colorado.   |
| CT    | The Division of Statewide Emergency Telecommunications submits its annual budget request to the Public Utility Regulatory Authority (PURA) for approval and the setting of the 9-1-1 surcharge rate. 9-1-1 funds provide funding for a number of programs and services. All purchasing and expenditures are authorized and tracked by the Division of Statewide Emergency Telecommunications and meet state guidelines for purchasing. Requests and approvals for Transition Grants measure success of consolidation efforts, requests and reimbursements for capital expenditures measure activity and upgrades to funded municipalities and regional communications centers. Recipients of subsidies and grants must provide fiscal reports detailing the expenditure of funds. Annual reports are submitted to the Connecticut General Assembly, detailing all Division activities and projects.   |
| DE    | The State of Delaware has established a public education campaign to promote NG911 and 911/E911 functions to the citizens we serve. We have seen sizeable increases in the Smart911 registrations due to the public education campaigns. We are capturing new Smart 911 accounts each month. The total # of smart 911 profiles in the State is 93681 at this time.  |
| FL    | <a href="https://dms-media.ccplatform.net/content/download/163584/file/ECB%202023_AnnualReport_2-28-2024-final%20version.pdf">https://dms-media.ccplatform.net/content/download/163584/file/ECB%202023_AnnualReport_2-28-2024-final%20version.pdf</a>   |
| GA    | The State of Georgia currently does not have a means of assessing the effects achieved from the expenditure of state 911/E911 or NG911 funds.   |
| HI    | Neither the State or Counties have formalized assessments of the effectiveness [sic] of the use of 911/E911 fees and charges. However, the State of Hawaii Enhanced 911 Board evaluates the effects achieved [sic] from the expenditures of E911 funds in terms of efficiency [sic] through our reimbursement request system that ensures all PSAPs receive funding in a timely manner. These actions ensure the continued efficiency [sic] of their systems replacing legacy equipment, maintenance of existing equipment, and training of personnel in new and emerging technology. Furthermore, the State of Hawaii Enhanced 911 Board monitors the number and efficiency [sic] of call processing of the PSAPs on a monthly basis.<br>The PSAPs in the State of Hawaii have benefitted tremendously by the leadership of the Enhanced 911 Board and successful [sic] funding. Furthermore, all PSAPs have benefitted by continuing to update the 9-1-1 Database and GIS to ensure timely and successful [sic] location of 9-1-1 Callers.  |
| IA    | Iowa's 911 program entered a period of more steady state operations during this year. Our two large projects continued, along with continual efforts to transition to NG911.<br>Our two large projects consist of migrating the legacy landline 911 network onto the existing ESInet, as well as leveraging shared call handling equipment, allowing the PSAPs to share technology.<br>Since 2019, the State worked with PSAPs to continue implementing a state-hosted shared services technology environment, allowing the PSAPs to achieve cost savings while leveraging technology made possible by next-generation 911. No longer will each PSAP need to have its own call processing equipment within the walls of its PSAP. As part of this virtual consolidation plan, PSAPs can share call handling equipment throughout the state. This project now includes additional ESInet redundancy leveraging FirstNet broadband. This project will be ongoing for the foreseeable future. There are currently 77 PSAPs utilizing this program, with an additional 1 signed up for activation in the near future.<br>Also since 2019, HSEMD has been undertaking an effort with public and private partners to merge the legacy |



| State | Assessment of Effects Achieved from the Expenditure of State 911/E911 or NG911 Funds, Including Any Criteria Used to Measure the Effectiveness of the Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges   |
|-------|--|
|       | <p>wireline 911 network onto the existing wireless ESInet. This project is now 100% complete. Future efforts will look towards establishing new SIP POI's and decommissioning the legacy selective routers.</p> <p>Iowa processed 6,726 text to 911 in the 12-month period. Text to 911 is available in 99 out of Iowa's 99 Counties. We also are now able to transfer text to 911 messages from one PSAP to another to include neighboring States.</p> <p>Additionally, great strides were made in the state's NG911 GIS program, achieving over 98% match rates, and 98% ALI match rates and zero critical errors through the use of GIS grants to local jurisdictions. We implemented an ECRF during the reporting year.</p> <p>Approximately 99% of PSAPs in Iowa are receiving SIP calls and are therefore truly receive end to end IP based wireless calls.</p> <p>Our Strategic Plan is available at: <a href="https://homelandsecurity.iowa.gov/media/205/download?inline=">https://homelandsecurity.iowa.gov/media/205/download?inline=</a></p> <p>Our legislative report is available at: <a href="https://homelandsecurity.iowa.gov/media/207/download?inline">https://homelandsecurity.iowa.gov/media/207/download?inline</a></p>  |
| ID    | [No Response]  |
| IL    | <p>The State of Illinois requires that every 9-1-1 Authority complete an Annual Financial Report (AFR) each year by the end of January. This provides a complete assessment of annual expenditures and revenues for each 9-1-1 system in the State. This assists the State in determining the financial condition of each 9-1-1 system and whether there is appropriate funding available and whether inappropriate spending exists.</p>   |
| IN    | attach reports (PSAP financials)   |
| KS    | <p>Expenditure of 911 funds allows PSAPs to maintain their legacy 911 systems or NG911 systems and accompanying support systems (radio, recorders, CAD, etc.). The structure of the statute allows these funds to be carried forward from year to year, unlike general funds, allowing PSAPs to accrue the funds for major purchases. Through the use of 911 funds and general fund supplements, the entire State of Kansas is served by an ESInet. The Council is utilizing prepaid wireless fees to provide great benefit to all PSAPs participating in the statewide system. Kansas is a leader in the nation in the migration to ESInet with geospatial routing and i3 services. This has been accomplished with funds generated by the state 911 fee.</p> <p>Some examples of statements from the PSAPs in regard to this question:</p> <p>Continued technological and high-quality service. However, with increased contractual fees to maintain PSAP, the fees received from 911 are inadequate to maintain the technology at the level necessary.</p> <p>Without having these funds, we would not be able to continue to keep our computer system, workstations and equipment up to date.</p> <p>Provision of mission critical dispatch equipment, CAD Infrastructure, 911 Infrastructure</p> <p>Allows us to be able to provide critical assistance to our citizens in times of need.</p> <p>The fund helps us to maintain and upgrade our equipment so that we can provide efficient emergency response to the community as well as being able to purchase technologies available to aid our first responders.</p> |
| KY    | <p>In accordance with 202 KAR 6:100, Board-certified PSAPs (those PSAP receiving wireless funds from the 911 Services Board because they have proven that they are capable of properly handling wireless E911 calls) receive a geospatial audit that measures the accuracy of their ability to receive a plot wireless 911 calls on the PSAP map. Board-certified PSAPs are also subject to a financial review, each PSAP being audited at least once every two years.</p> <p>Board-certified PSAPs are also required to complete a comprehensive 'PSAP Survey' annually in order to maintain certification. The 911 Services Board has attempted to modify this survey each year in accordance with the type of information required to provide to the federal government. PSAPs are also required to submit GIS data sets necessary for NG911 (PSAP boundary, ESBs, RCLs, SSAPs) on at least a quarterly basis.</p> <p>The 911 Services Board competitive grant program administered by the Board adheres to guidelines that align with the state plan. During the review process, projects are evaluated based upon their adherence toward next generation frameworks.</p> <p>In conjunction with the Kentucky Office of Homeland Security (to which the 911 Services Board is administratively attached), the 911 Services Board produces an annual report that includes detailed reporting on the receipt and expenditure of wireless 911 fees collected and disbursed by the Board.</p>  |
| LA    | Unk[nown]  |
| MA    | <p>Pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 6A, Section 18B(j), 'the [State 911] department shall file a written annual report with the governor and shall file a copy thereof with the state secretary, the clerks of the house of representatives and</p>  |

| State | Assessment of Effects Achieved from the Expenditure of State 911/E911 or NG911 Funds, Including Any Criteria Used to Measure the Effectiveness of the Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges   |
|-------|--|
|       | <p>the senate who shall forward such report to the joint committee on public safety and homeland security and the house and senate ways and means committees. The [State 911] department shall review and monitor the expenditures incurred under the grant programs established in this section to ensure compliance with grant guidelines. The [State 911] department shall include a reporting of grant expenditures by municipality in the written annual report. Not later than June 30, every 3 years, the [State 911] department shall prepare a report documenting the expenditures of each recipient of funds from surcharge revenues to ensure compliance with applicable statutes and regulations. In addition, pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 6A, Section 18H(b), the State 911 Department is required to report annually to the department of telecommunications and cable on the financial condition of the Enhanced 911 Fund and on the department’s assessment of new developments affecting the enhanced 911 system.’ Additional information is available on the State 911 Department’s website at <a href="http://www.mass.gov/e911">www.mass.gov/e911</a>.</p>  |
| MD    | <p>Maryland’s 9-1-1 Trust Fund administered by the Maryland 9-1-1 Board is a national model. By collecting funds that any county may use for 9-1-1 enhancements, each county provides 9-1-1 service at a consistent level through the funding of telephone equipment, protocol systems and training, regardless of county population or county budget. The Board does more than a funding source, and serves a regulatory, oversight and leadership role for Maryland’s 9-1-1 community. The Board has convened monthly, and more frequently in sub-committees, to consider a variety of 9-1-1 related issues and projects.</p> <p>Maryland continues to benefit from an effective 9-1-1 system. Recent Board statewide efforts include working with Verizon and NG911 service providers, Maryland PSAP personnel, Maryland Department of Emergency Management, and the Maryland Public Service Commission to review the implementation of policies and standards adopted by the Federal Communications Commission and Board to minimize disruptions to 9-1-1 service caused by power outages and network failures. Ongoing Board activities include providing a vigorous 9-1-1 training program throughout the state, cybersecurity assessments and response planning, recruitment support, working with vendors to improve 9-1-1 service delivery, and continuing research, planning and implementation of ‘Next Generation’ technologies. The Board has also required demonstrations of interoperability with other systems before being approved to go-live with NG911 service. The Board remains focused on the enhancement of 9-1-1 and the critical role it plays in public safety.</p> |
| ME    | <p>Legislative annual report: The bureau shall include in the Public Utilities Commission’s annual report pursuant to Title 35-A, section 120, subsection 7 to the joint standing committee of the Legislature having jurisdiction over utilities and energy matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. The bureau’s planned expenditures for the year and use of funds for the previous year;</li> <li>B. The statewide E-9-1-1 surcharge collected under this section;</li> <li>C. The bureau’s recommended statewide E-9-1-1 surcharge for the coming year;</li> <li>D. The bureau’s recommendations for amending existing and enacting new law to improve the E-9-1-1 system; and</li> <li>E. The performance of each of the public safety answering points in the State during the previous calendar year, including the results of the bureau’s quality assurance program audits under section 2926, subsection 1-A and any recommendations of the bureau relating to the emergency dispatching standards, practices and procedures of public safety answering points.</li> </ul> <p><a href="https://www.maine.gov/mpuc/sites/maine.gov/mpuc/files/inline-files/2023%20Annual%20Report%20Final_0.pdf">https://www.maine.gov/mpuc/sites/maine.gov/mpuc/files/inline-files/2023%20Annual%20Report%20Final_0.pdf</a></p>   |
| MI    | <p>Each year the SNC collects data and submits a report to the Michigan Legislature which exceeds the statutorily required reporting of data to provide a comprehensive status report on Michigan’s 911 system. The 2023 Annual Report to the Michigan Legislature may be accessed at: <a href="https://www.michigan.gov/msp/-/media/Project/Websites/msp/911/About-SNC-Page/Annual-Reports/2023-Annual-Report.pdf?rev=a3f1c44f9aa8416b841fbee804c70cb1">https://www.michigan.gov/msp/-/media/Project/Websites/msp/911/About-SNC-Page/Annual-Reports/2023-Annual-Report.pdf?rev=a3f1c44f9aa8416b841fbee804c70cb1</a></p> <p>The 2024 Annual Report to the Michigan Legislature is due August 1, 2024, and will be posted on the SNC website once submitted.</p>  |
| MN    | <p>Electronic Excel Document included with submission (‘CY23 MN Compliance Report Summary 2024-07-11’) contains summary of expenditures made by PSAPs eligible to receive monthly 911 fee distribution from ECN. Expenses divided into 11 defined categories.</p>  |
| MO    | <p>There is no assessment.</p>   |
| MS    | <p>In 2023 the State of Mississippi did not have a committee, organization, or board that had full oversight or that</p>   |

| State | Assessment of Effects Achieved from the Expenditure of State 911/E911 or NG911 Funds, Including Any Criteria Used to Measure the Effectiveness of the Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges   |
|-------|--|
|       | implemented policies and procedures regarding 911/E911 fee usage. The responsibility lay solely with the local board of supervisors. Therefore, the supervisors measure the effective utilization of 911/E911 usage and whether those efforts are meeting the standards and needs of their citizens.   |
| MT    | U/A  |
| NC    | <p>The annual 911 service charge is distributed to primary PSAPs based on a 5-year rolling average; secondary PSAPs are funded based on a cost-per-call basis using the primary PSAP’s expenditures for the current year. N.C.G.S. § 143B-1402(a)(5) provides guidelines to ensure the funding is disbursed and expensed appropriately. The NC 911 Board staff conducts an annual ‘Revenue/Expenditure Review’ of each PSAP receiving 911 funds. For any expenditures identified as ineligible 911 expenses, the PSAP is required to reimburse the 911 Fund the amount determined ineligible.</p> <p>North Carolina Administrative Code. Board Rule 09 NCAC 06C .0209(a) requires ninety percent (90%) of 911 calls received on emergency lines to be answered within 10 seconds, and 95 percent (95%) of 911 calls received on emergency lines to be answered within 20 seconds. The Code further states that the PSAP and the Board shall evaluate call answering times monthly by using data from the previous month.</p> <p>Board Rule 09 NCAC 06C .0216(a), ‘Assessing PSAP Operations’ requires the Board to conduct annual reviews of PSAP operations to determine whether a PSAP meets the requirements in Section .0200 of the Board’s rules relating to PSAP operations. The attached report is current to the date of submission of this Fee Report.</p> <p>Next Generation 911 efforts are continuing, as 124 PSAPs migrated to the Statewide ESInet at the close of 2023. As of the date of this report, all 125 PSAPs have migrated to the ESInet and an estimated 90% of PSAPs are utilizing the hosted call handling solution offered by two platforms. The NG911 project has also resulted in all jurisdictions responsible for serving as the GIS authority remaining i3 ready in EGDMS. Additionally, all PSAPs were invited to participate in cybersecurity workshops as a follow-up to the cybersecurity assessments funded by the Board in 2020-2021. All of these cybersecurity measures were intended to assist PSAPs in identifying any areas of improvement for cyber hygiene.</p> |
| ND    | [No Response]  |
| NE    | <p>State wireless 911 funds continue to be used to support the 68 PSAPs providing 911 in Nebraska. Each PSAP receives an annual allocation of these funds to supplement their general fund and wireline dollars to provide 911 services. During 2023, 911 wireless funds have also been used to continue the statewide transition to Next Generation 911. This includes contracting with a vendor to provide a statewide ESInet and NG 911 Core Services, an NG 911 Implementation Consulting firm, contracting with a statewide MIS provider, and a vendor to assist with the development of a statewide [sic] GIS data, as well as, Transitional Database Management [sic] Services. The Commission is supported by the 911 Service System Advisory Committee which is comprised of state and local stakeholders of the 911 Service System. This committee is working on developing statewide technical and quality assurance standards. Minimum training standards were developed and became effective in 2022. Additionally, a new funding mechanism has been developed and was adopted by the Commission in 2021. The Public Service Commission submits a report annually to the Nebraska Legislature on telecommunications with a section on 911 included. That report can be found at: chrome-extension: <a href="https://psc.nebraska.gov/telecommunications/2023-annual-report-legislature">https://psc.nebraska.gov/telecommunications/2023-annual-report-legislature</a></p>  |
| NH    | <p>The State of New Hampshire has provided PSAP services to all E911 callers and first responders through two state-run PSAPs since July 1995. We believe that it has been an extremely cost-effective E911 system providing even the smallest jurisdictions with services they could not have afforded on their own. In addition to all call handling functions, the state provides mapping and addressing services to all jurisdictions, telephony database maintenance, interpreter services, emergency notification as well as Emergency Medical Dispatch for 100% of the state’s population. Currently, there is no annual assessment completed that measures the effectiveness of the use of E911 funds, however, the state has a seventeen-member Enhanced 911 Commission that meets quarterly to review expenditures and advise the Division on the proper use of funds.</p> <p><a href="https://www.dos.nh.gov/sites/g/files/ehbemt656/files/documents/2023-09/dos-biennial-report-fy2023-final.pdf">https://www.dos.nh.gov/sites/g/files/ehbemt656/files/documents/2023-09/dos-biennial-report-fy2023-final.pdf</a></p>  |
| NJ    | <p>No assessments or reports exist related to the effectiveness of the expenditures of the 9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Fee collected in New Jersey. The amount of funds collected annually is approximately \$130M are used to offset over \$355M in State expenditures for programs itemized in the enabling legislation N.J.S.A. 52:17C in support of emergency response.</p>  |
| NM    | N/A  |

| State | Assessment of Effects Achieved from the Expenditure of State 911/E911 or NG911 Funds, Including Any Criteria Used to Measure the Effectiveness of the Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges  |
|-------|---|
| NV    | 2024 is the first year Nevada has had a State 911 Coordinator. For next year's report an assessment will be submitted to all Nevada PSAPs to determine each agency's progress towards NG911. State 911 Coordinator will assist agencies that have not composed a 5-year plan and will attend 911 regional committee meetings for progress.  |
| NY    | Since it's [sic] inception, the PSAP Grant Program has provided over \$60 million to counties and NYC. These monies have resulted in the improvements needed to keep our PSAPs updated with emerging technologies in equipment. Also these funds have allowed for improvements in training and other programs which improved the delivery of 911 emergency dispatch services to all who live, work and visit New York   |
| OH    | <p>Annually, the 9-1-1 Program Office monitors 9-1-1 funds collected at the State level to ensure proper use for 9-1-1 purposes as outlined in ORC 128.57. Any locally collected funds are monitored at the local level to ensure the expenditures meet the requirements as defined in the local legislation. Under section 130.63 of House Bill 33 of the 135th General Assembly, the Auditor of State is reviewing 9-1-1 funding in Ohio. The Auditor's report will be provided to the Ohio Legislature in February 2025. The report will determine if our state 9-1-1 fee needs to be increased, remain the same, or be reduced.</p> <p>Annually, all 88 counties submit a fiscal form to the 9-1-1 Program Office reporting their expenditures towards 9-1-1 services. Effects achieved from 9-1-1 funding include upgrades to phone systems and equipment, training of personnel, and 9-1-1 infrastructure expenses such as software and hardware upgrades. It also contributes to personnel costs and helps counties remain in compliance with state and federal guidelines.</p>      |
| OK    | Do not currently have matrix in use to measure effectively [sic].   |
| OR    | An assessment of the effects achieved from the expenditure of state 911/E911 or NG911 funds was not assessed during this reporting period   |
| PA    | <p>911 fees in Pennsylvania have been critical to not only sustaining current 911 systems but also for facilitating our transition to NG911 service. Pennsylvania's 911 Fund and County General Funds continue to face significant financial pressure from increasing personnel, technology and connectivity/infrastructure costs associated with today's 911 service. In addition, Pennsylvania is incurring significant costs to implement a statewide ESInet and NG911 service. Funding constraints [sic] are impacting the ability of PSAPs to recruit/retain personnel, invest in 911 system improvements, and invest in future technologies.</p> <p>PEMA is required to provide the Pennsylvania General Assembly an Annual Report on 911 revenue and expenditures. Additionally, the Annual Report provides details on Pennsylvania's 911 systems priorities. The report can be access at the on the PEMA 911 webpage. <a href="https://www.pema.pa.gov/911-Program/Documents/Annual-Reports/2022.pdf">https://www.pema.pa.gov/911-Program/Documents/Annual-Reports/2022.pdf</a></p> |
| RI    | <p>Rhode Island E-911 monitors the number of incoming 911 calls daily, the number of calls that enter queue, the duration of the calls that enter queue, the maximum duration of the calls that enter queue, and the average duration of the calls that enter queue.</p> <p>RI E-911 also examines the duration of the call before transfer as well as the median and total duration of the length of the calls within each dispatch area including fire, police and medical responses.</p> <p>Additionally, RI E-911 monitors, on a weekly basis, our incoming call volume reports and staffing levels. These measures/metrics provide RI E-911 with an overview of our operational effectiveness.</p>   |
| SC    | [No Response]   |
| SD    | Compliance reviews are completed by the State 9-1-1 Coordinator for PSAPs receiving State 9-1-1 surcharge funds. Operational, training, and financial standards are reviewed, as are equipment and facilities to ensure proper procedures are in place for the effective operation of a PSAP. Local jurisdictions must also submit an annual report detailing their 911 fund expenditures which is reviewed by the State 9-1-1 Coordinator.   |
| TN    | <p>The TECB collects the 911 surcharge from service providers and uses those funds to fulfill the TECB's statutory mandates of establishing emergency communications for all citizens of the state and assisting the state's 100 ECDs in the areas of management, operations and accountability. A majority of 911 funds collected by the state are redistributed to the local ECDs to support local operations. The TECB works closely with the ECDs to ensure those funds are used to provide efficient and effective 911 service across the state.</p> <p>The 911 Emergency Communications Fund is a separate fund of deposits in the state treasury comprised of 911 surcharges collected by the TECB and interest accumulated on those deposits. The 911 surcharge is the TECB's sole recurring revenue source. It is levied on communications services that are capable of contacting a PSAP [sic] by entering or dialing the digits 911.</p>   |

| State | Assessment of Effects Achieved from the Expenditure of State 911/E911 or NG911 Funds, Including Any Criteria Used to Measure the Effectiveness of the Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges  |
|-------|---|
|       | <p>Disbursements from the fund are limited solely to the operational and administrative expenses of the TECB. Authorized operational and administrative expenditures include distributing a statutorily-determined amount of base funding to each ECD, implementing and maintaining an IP-based NG911 network, and funding the Tennessee Regulatory Authority for the Tennessee Relay Services/Telecommunications Devices Access Program, which provides assistance to those Tennesseans whose disabilities interfere with their use of communications services and technologies.</p> <p>In addition to providing Tennessee’s NG911 network, text-to-911 platform, the TECB provides an on-line training service at no cost to Tennessee’s 911 telecommunicators. This training initiative averaged more than thirteen hundred (1300) hours of training each month in FY2023. The platform provides a direct benefit to the frontline operations of 911 in Tennessee, saving local jurisdictions significant time and money. It allows local 911 personnel to meet Tennessee’s training requirements while reducing travel, staffing, and tuition costs on ECDs. During FY2023, there were over 2900 users registered on the platform, and over 11,000 hours of content was delivered to Tennessee’s 911 telecommunicators.</p> <p>The 911 Funding Modernization and IP Transition Act, which took effect January 1, 2015, created a uniform 911 surcharge of \$1.16 on all services capable of contacting 911 in Tennessee. This rate increased to \$1.50 on January 1, 2021.</p> <p>The TECB’s Annual Report on 911 progress and expenditures can be found here:<br/> <a href="https://www.tn.gov/commerce/e911/financial-information/annual-report.html">https://www.tn.gov/commerce/e911/financial-information/annual-report.html</a></p>   |
| TX    | <p>(The majority of this response is the same as provided for CY 2022.)</p> <p>CSEC state 9-1-1 Program: CSEC and its RPC stakeholders are required to submit 9-1-1 strategic plans: CSEC to the Governor and Texas Legislative Budget Board for 9-1-1 service within the CSEC state 9-1-1 Program; and the RPCs to CSEC, approval of which is a prerequisite to being awarded grants of appropriated 9-1-1 fees and equalization surcharge (Health and Safety Code §§ 771.055(e) and 771.055(a)-(c), respectively). CSEC Statewide 9-1-1 Strategic Plan: For each fiscal biennium, CSEC prepares a strategic plan for statewide 9-1-1 service for the following five state fiscal years ‘using information from the strategic information contained in the regional plans and provided by emergency communication districts and home-rule municipalities that operate 9-1-1 systems independent of the state system.’ The plan must:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) include a survey of the current performance, efficiency, and degree of implementation of emergency communications services throughout the whole state;</li> <li>(2) provide an assessment of the progress made toward meeting the goals and objectives of the previous strategic plan and a summary of the total expenditures for emergency communications services in this state;</li> <li>(3) provide a strategic direction for emergency communications services in this state;</li> <li>(4) establish goals and objectives relating to emergency communications in this state;</li> <li>(5) provide long-range policy guidelines for emergency communications in this state;</li> <li>(6) identify major issues relating to improving emergency communications in this state;</li> <li>(7) identify priorities for this state’s emergency communications system; and</li> <li>(8) detail the financial performance of each regional planning commission in implementing emergency communications service including an accounting of administrative expenses.</li> </ol> <p>Included in the plan as Appendix 1 is CSEC’s Next Generation Master Plan detailing CSEC’s vision of Texas NG9-1-1 System as being comprised of interconnected and interoperable NG9-1-1 systems of local, regional, and other emergency services networks. As a ‘system-of-systems’ and ‘network-of-networks,’ the Texas NG9-1-1 System will provide Texas 9-1-1 Entities the choice to connect their PSAPs directly to emergency services networks and utilize NG9-1-1 Core Services (NGCS) provisioned by NG9-1-1 systems deployed by the CSEC, the Regional Planning Commissions (RPCs), the Emergency Communications Districts (ECDs) and collaborating 9-1-1 Entities at the local and regional level in Texas. These interconnected NG9-1-1 systems will serve as multiple input points for all 9-1-1 calls in the State of Texas. The current plan including the NG9-1-1 appendix can be obtained at <a href="https://www.csec.texas.gov/s/next-generation-9-1-1?language=en_US">https://www.csec.texas.gov/s/next-generation-9-1-1?language=en_US</a>.</p> <p>RPC Strategic Planning</p> <p>Per Health and Safety Code § 771.055: (a) Each regional planning commission shall develop a regional plan for the establishment and operation of 9-1-1 service throughout the region that the regional planning commission serves. The 9-1-1 service must meet the standards established by the commission.</p> <p>(b) A regional plan must describe how the 9-1-1 service is to be administered. The 9-1-1 service may be administered by an emergency communication district, municipality, or county, by a combination formed by</p> |

| State | Assessment of Effects Achieved from the Expenditure of State 911/E911 or NG911 Funds, Including Any Criteria Used to Measure the Effectiveness of the Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges  |
|-------|---|
|       | <p>interlocal contract, or by other appropriate means as determined by the regional planning commission. In a region in which one or more emergency communication districts exist, a preference shall be given to administration by those districts and expansion of the area served by those districts.</p> <p>(c) A regional plan must be updated at least once every state fiscal biennium and must include:</p> <p>(1) a description of how money allocated to the region under this chapter is to be allocated in the region;</p> <p>(2) projected financial operating information for the two state fiscal years following the submission of the plan; and</p> <p>(3) strategic planning information for the five state fiscal years following submission of the plan.</p> <p>Statutory 772 ECDs<br/>As noted earlier the director of a statutory 772 ECD is required to, as soon as practicable after the end of each ECD fiscal year, prepare and present to the board and to all participating public agencies in writing a sworn statement of all money received by the ECD and how the money was disbursed or otherwise disposed of during the preceding fiscal year, and the report must show in detail the operations of the district for the period covered by the report. In addition, the board of managers of a statutory ECD shall perform an annual independent financial audit.</p> <p>Municipal ECDs<br/>Several commented about the declining overall amount in 9-1-1 fees or that 9-1-1 fees alone were insufficient in providing effective 9-1-1 service; hence the municipality relies upon general revenues in order to provide effective 9-1-1 service. A couple of Municipal ECDs provided their performance objectives (e.g., staffing levels, call-wait times, certification/licensing levels), paid with 9-1-1 fees to the extent sufficient, as indicators of effectiveness.</p> <p>Plano: Answering 95% of all 9-1-1 calls within 15 seconds and 99% of all calls within 40 seconds. Maintain 100% passing rate for State TCOLE licensing exam Continued progress towards implementation of NG9-1-1 ESINet and Core Services.</p> <p>Portland: E911 call answer times average less than 5 rings and officer average response time 5 minutes or less. No formal reports.</p> <p>Highland Park: We collect so little compared to our overall budget that no assessment is needed.</p> <p>Longview utilizes E911 fees to fund our admin staff, training staff, employee professional development, maintenance of our 911 system, and public education. The effectiveness of that spending is essentially judged based upon the quality of service</p> |
| UT    | <p>The Utah Communications Authority Governing Board approved a Statewide 911 Emergency Services Strategic Plan that outlines work to be done for further NG9-1-1 technology in Utah. UCAs 911 Strategic Plan can be found on our website:<br/><a href="http://www.uca911.org">www.uca911.org</a>; 911; UCA-NG911 Strategic Plan</p> <p>The UCA Governing Board also approved Minimum Standards and Best Practices for Utah PSAPs and a mechanism for the UCA 911 Division to assess how the PSAPs are performing each year. Minimum Standards and Best Practices can be located on our website:<br/><a href="http://www.uca911.org">www.uca911.org</a>; 911; Minimum Standards and Best Practices</p> <p>A self reporting questionnaire is sent to the PSAPs January of each year, for the prior year, the 911 Center Performance Reports can be located on our website:<br/>2023 PSAP Performance Reports</p>   |
| VA    | <p>The Code of Virginia (§56-484.14) (<a href="https://law.lis.virginia.gov/vacode/title56/chapter15/section56-484.14/">https://law.lis.virginia.gov/vacode/title56/chapter15/section56-484.14/</a>) requires the 9-1-1 Services Board to report annually to the Governor, the Senate Committee on Finance, the House Committee on Appropriations, and the Virginia State Crime Commission on the following: (i) the state of enhanced 9-1-1 services in the Commonwealth, (ii) the impact of, or need for, legislation affecting enhanced 9-1-1 services in the Commonwealth, (iii) the need for changes in the E-911 funding mechanism provided to the Board, as appropriate, and (iv) monitor developments in enhanced 9-1-1 service and multi-line telephone systems and the impact of such technologies upon the implementation of Article 8 (§ 56-484.19 et seq.) of Chapter 15 of Title 56.</p>  |
| VT    | <p>The Board has a number of numerical standards related to system availability that are monitored by Board staff along with our system provider, INdigital. In addition, the Board has access to MIS reporting tools that provide information on call volumes, call routing, call answer times, call duration times etc. Board staff perform annual ALI and GIS audits to ensure accuracy. Call-taker performance is tracked through a call review process which</p>   |

| State                      | Assessment of Effects Achieved from the Expenditure of State 911/E911 or NG911 Funds, Including Any Criteria Used to Measure the Effectiveness of the Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges   |
|----------------------------|--|
|                            | measures how well call-takers are adhering to established call-handling standards.   |
| WA                         | <p>Washington State strives to be a national leader at the forefront of the 911 evolution. Since 1998, Washington State has dedicated hundreds of millions of state taxpayer dollars for the provision and enhancement of a statewide 911 system. In the period from 2012 through 2021, Washington State alone expended well over \$100M on NG911 modernization – including the first-ever statewide ESInet, a replacement of this ESInet with a NENA i3 standards-based ESInet which includes NGCS, and NG911 modernization of the Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) – all from state 911 funds. This is in addition to the millions of dollars of county/local 911 funds dedicated to NG911 modernization.</p> <p>Washington State views 911 as a statewide enterprise, developed in a collaborative effort with the counties, the PSAPs, the State 911 Coordination Office, the commercial 911 service providers, and a dedicated community of stakeholder representatives, to ensure 911 access from the call-maker to the call-taker. Washington State has implemented the Emergency Call Routing Function (ECRF) for all cellular calls within the state, resulting in more calls being delivered to the PSAP having jurisdiction for the event and fewer transfers due to mis-routes. The completion of the NENA i3 standards-based ESInet/NGCS allows for multi-media (i.e. Voice, Text, Data, etc.) 911 access and provides an even faster, more reliable, resilient, geo-diverse and scalable system, with cyber-security planned into the design. The Washington State NG911 enterprise has the capabilities and tools needed to provide a more efficient and effective 911 service, while keeping pace with the ever-evolving communications technologies used by our citizens. In addition, due to the increased reliability, resilience and security, as well as the designed interoperability with other 911 centers – intrastate, interstate, and international (Canada) – the Washington State NG911 enterprise system will be able to be more effective at collecting and disseminating initial situational awareness during major emergencies and disasters.</p> <p>Finally, although we are well along the path of transitioning to the jurisdictional end-state of NG911, we still need strong federal support to completely realize and take full advantage of NG911 features and capabilities - especially when considering the ingress connectivity of the actual dial-tone providers. In addition to legislative and regulatory support, additional support through continuing Federal Grants is needed to fully achieve the goal of the jurisdictional end-state of NG911. We strongly endorse continued support and further investment in 911 at the national level to assist all states as they move toward NG911</p> |
| WI                         | <p>Wisconsin has not undertaken a specific program to measure the effective utilization of 911/E911/NG911 fees or funds. The Wisconsin Department of Military Affairs published the first NG911 State Biennial Report in November 2022, which details the progress made in NG911 implementation, operation, and maintenance: <a href="https://oec.wi.gov/wp-content/library/2022/2020-22_NG911_Biennial_Report_FINAL.pdf">https://oec.wi.gov/wp-content/library/2022/2020-22_NG911_Biennial_Report_FINAL.pdf</a></p> <p>This new state biennial report is due to the Governor and State Legislature on November 1 of every even numbered year. Each report will provide the Governor and State Legislature with the NG911 expenditures during the reporting period. The next report will be due in 2024.</p>   |
| WV                         | [No Response]  |
| WY                         | <p>PSAPS have self-reported their NG911 readiness; Communities heavily depend on the 911 taxes to maintain operational status. There has been an effort by the local government to support equipment upgrades for NG911 capabilities. Funding continues to plague their efforts for implementation of 100% within the PSAP. The State has compiled a snapshot of the self-reported information for GIS, CAD., Phone Systems, Recording and Phone Trunk status for updates and capabilities of NG911.</p>   |
| <b>Other Jurisdictions</b> |  |
| AS                         | [DNF]  |
| DC                         | <p>All 911/E911 or NG911 funds collected by the Government of the District of Columbia government support the operations of the Office of Unified Communications (OUC). These funds are used to support the acquisition of critical services, software, supplies and equipment necessary to provide 911 communications in the District. Additionally, the OUC has leveraged E911 funds to bolster cybersecurity and implement NG911 technology. The D.C. government utilizes the following Key Performance Indicators to measure the overall effectiveness of the OUC: Percent of 911 calls answered within 10 seconds; Percent of 911 calls in which call to queue is 90 seconds or less; Percent of 911 calls which move from queue to dispatch in 60 seconds or less; Percentage of QA/QI 911 call reviews that receive a rating of 80% or better; and Total number of sustained complaints. The DC Office of Unified Communications assesses effects achieved from the expenditure of state 911/E911 or NG911 funds, to measure the effectiveness of the use of 911/E911 fees and charges through a variety of</p>   |

| State | Assessment of Effects Achieved from the Expenditure of State 911/E911 or NG911 Funds, Including Any Criteria Used to Measure the Effectiveness of the Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges   |
|-------|--|
|       | mechanisms. The District of Columbia manages the effectiveness of the 9-1-1 telephony call handling equipment, Computer Aided Dispatch system (CAD), and the District’s first responder public safety radio through monitoring tools to ensure the infrastructure’s system stability, cyber security monitor and alerting against cyber-attacks and anti-virus attacks, reports to support and maintain a P.01 grade of service and utilize five 9’s to manage network and system reliability.   |
| Guam  | The Guam Fire Department E911/Communications Bureau uses and implements NENA standards for call takers, i.e. Operational level of service, Order of answering priority, Answering protocol, Information gathering and Call transfers. These measures provides GFD with an effective overview and the effectiveness of our operations, thus allowing us the most efficient means of the expenditures of 911 funds.  |
| NMI   | [DNF]  |
| PR    | Puerto Rico’s criteria for use and measure the use of 911/E911 funds, is established in Act No. 20 of April 10, 2017, Section 4.06.- Distribution and Use of the Funds Collected on Account of Charges Billed to Telephone Service Subscribers. Also Act No. 55 of June 21, 2019 amends Act No. 3-2017 to establish the following: (translated by the Bureau): It is prohibited for funds from the Puerto Rico 9-1-1 Emergency System Bureau and other telecommunications funds to be diverted for purposes other than to ensure the provision and stability of 9-1-1 and telecommunications services.<br>The Bureau generates a monthly report called ‘Budget vs Actual’ required by the Office of Management and Budget of the Government of Puerto Rico.<br>This report is available upon request |
| USVI  | N/A  |

**L. Underfunding of 911**

59. Section 902(d)(2) provides that the Commission “shall include in each [annual] report . . . all evidence that suggests the diversion by a State or taxing jurisdiction of 9-1-1 fees or charges, including any information regarding the impact of any underfunding of 9-1-1 services in the State or taxing jurisdiction.”<sup>238</sup> In the *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*, the Commission directed the Bureau to modify the annual fee report questionnaire to “seek additional information on the underfunding of 911 systems, including both (1) information on the impact of fee diversion on 911 underfunding, and (2) information on 911 underfunding in general.”<sup>239</sup> Accordingly, as of the Fourteenth Report, the Bureau revised the annual questionnaire to include a new Section L that specifically addresses underfunding. Question L1 asked respondents to describe the impact of any underfunding of 911 services in the state or jurisdiction, and Question L2 asked respondents to describe how any fee diversion affected 911 underfunding.<sup>240</sup>

60. Generally, respondents report that underfunding results in degradation of 911 service and contributes to delays in maintenance to 911 systems, equipment replacement, and deployments of new technology. Alaska reports that 20% of residents are underserved, “with unincorporated communities unable to support basic location information or advanced 911 technology.”<sup>241</sup> Similarly, Oklahoma reports that “[d]uring this reporting period the State had 13 counties that do not have sufficient funding to pay for core 911 services,” that must be supplemented by state grant funds to ensure they have enough funding to operate.<sup>242</sup> Oklahoma also reports that there is “a statewide funding shortage to deploy

<sup>238</sup> Section 902(d)(2) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1 Statutory Notes (as amended)).

<sup>239</sup> *911 Fee Diversion Report and Order*, 36 FCC Rcd at 10840-41, para. 82.

<sup>240</sup> FCC Questionnaire at 21 (Section L).

<sup>241</sup> Alaska Response at 24.

<sup>242</sup> Oklahoma Response at 22.



NG911.”<sup>243</sup> Louisiana notes that underfunding “hamper[s] our ability to implement NG9 9-1-1 Services.”<sup>244</sup> Georgia notes that “[m]any local governments cannot afford to pay NG911 transitional and maintenance costs, while continuing to pay legacy expenses.”<sup>245</sup> In Table 29 below, Georgia, Idaho, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming indicate that underfunding limits their abilities to implement or transition to NG911. Washington says that although it is “well along the path of transitioning” to NG911, “we still need strong federal support to completely realize and take full advantage of NG911 features and capabilities,” and says that, in addition to legislative and regulatory support, “additional support through continuing Federal Grants is needed.”<sup>246</sup>

61. As shown in Table 29 below, Alabama, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming, and the U.S. Virgin Islands report at Question L1 that underfunding has led to staff shortages, vacancies, and/or retention issues, which Wyoming reports have “plagued” its PSAPs.<sup>247</sup> Arkansas indicates that underfunding results in personnel having multiple job duties (“such as Jailer/Dispatcher”), as well as PSAPs being unable to purchase and upgrade software and equipment.<sup>248</sup> Most states and jurisdictions indicate that 911/E911 fee revenues alone do not fully cover the cost of 911 service, and that the state and/or local governments must provide additional funding (e.g., from the General Fund) to attempt to make up for some of the shortfalls.<sup>249</sup>

62. In response to Question L2, no state or jurisdiction specifically reported that 911 fee diversion had caused underfunding. The vast majority of respondents answered “N/A” and one explicitly stated that there had been no diversion.<sup>250</sup> Nevada notes that its statute “allows PSAPS to use 911 fees to purchase body worn [sic] cameras.”<sup>251</sup>

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

---

<sup>243</sup> *Id.*

<sup>244</sup> Louisiana Response at 22.

<sup>245</sup> Georgia Response at 26.

<sup>246</sup> Washington Response at 23-24 (Question K1).

<sup>247</sup> Wyoming Response at 21-22; *see also* Alabama Response at 24 (reporting some districts state they do not receive enough 911 surcharge funding to pay competitive salaries to recruit and retain employees and adequately train staff, and noting other programs Alabama uses to try to provide additional funding).

<sup>248</sup> Arkansas Response at 23.

<sup>249</sup> States and jurisdictions report this issue in responses to Question L1 and also in other entries in the annual questionnaire. *See, e.g.*, Maryland Response at 11, 22 (“Counties make up funding shortfalls with their general funds.”); North Dakota Response at 11, 22 (stating “911 fee revenues have never been sufficient to cover the full cost of 911 service,” and noting “local government must dig deeper into their general funds each year to support 911 services”); Texas Response at 20, 37-38 (reporting, e.g., “Highland Park: Our 9-1-1 services are primarily funded by our Town’s general budget. 9-1-1 is horrifically underfunded and not sustainable. We are fortunate to have a healthy budget, but most entities do not have this luxury.”); Washington Response at 12, 24 (“We continue to estimate that only a third of the true, total end-to-end cost to operate 911 in the State of Washington comes from the 911 tax; the remainder has to be made up through agency user fees, other tax bases (sales, property, etc[.]) and other general funding.”); Wyoming Response at 11, 21-22.

<sup>250</sup> Arizona Response at 21 (“No fee diversion occurred.”); *see also* Rhode Island Response at 23 (“None”).

<sup>251</sup> Nevada Response at 22.

**Table 29 – Underfunding of 911**

| State | Impact of Any Underfunding of 911 Services During the Annual Period  | How Any Fee Diversion Affected 911 Underfunding During the Annual Period |
|-------|--|--|
| AK    | Alaska’s geography is mostly wilderness where 911 calls are forwarded to a State operated PSAP via call forwarding which land on dispatcher’s desk without caller information. Approximately 20% of Alaskan’s are underserved with unincorporated communities unable to support basic location information or advanced 911 technology.   | N?A [sic]  |
| AL    | Districts are made whole based on current statute for 911 funding distribution, however some districts state that they do not receive enough funding from the 911 surcharge to maintain up to date equipment, pay competative [sic] salaries to recruit and retain employees and, adequately train staff. In multiple districts in the state, there is no local funding contributed on top of the what is distributed by the state 911 program from the 911 surcharge collection. In the remainder of the disticts, [sic] funding is supplemented for the provision of emergency communication services. The Alabama 9-1-1 Board has created programs to assist districts with additional funding including ones that reimburse districts for certain legacy 9-1-1 costs that have not yet ceased, even with the installation of an IP based emergency call delivery system. The Alabama 9-1-1 Board also provides grants for districts to assist with funding projects from equipment replacement to facility renovation. | Not applicable.  |
| AR    | Personnel having multiple job duties such as Jailer/Dispatcher, PSAPs unable to purchase Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) software or upgrade call handling equipment.  | N/A  |
| AZ    | Arizona continues to have the lowest Excise Tax in the nation at \$.20. While we are in the process of migrating all agencies to our NG911 statewide network, we are still missing out on new and improved technologies that could improve public safety. Arizona spends the least amount per capita on 9-1-1 services nationwide.   | No fee diversion occurred.   |
| CA    | N/A  | N/A  |
| CO    | Because local 9-1-1 governing bodies are able to set their own local emergency telephone charge rates, which generate the bulk of the 9-1-1 funds available to them, the adequacy of funding may vary widely from jurisdiction to jurisdiction in Colorado. We are unable to provide specific examples of impacts from underfunding.   | N/A  |
| CT    | [No Response]  | [No Response]  |
| DE    | n/a  | n/a  |
| FL    | Florida counties general taxes contributed 66% of the cost for 911 operations.   | N/A  |
| GA    | In 2021, the Georgia Emergency Communications Authority (GECA) consulted with Mission Critical Partners to complete an NG911 needs assessment. According to this assessment, it will cost around \$58 million to transition the state to NG911. To secure NG911 funding, the state sought to amend Article 12 of Chapter 3 of Title 38 and Part 4 of Article 2 of Chapter 5 of Title 46 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, relating to emergency communications authority and emergency telephone number 9-1-1   | N/A  |

|    |  |               |
|----|--|---------------|
|    | <p>system, respectively, so as to provide for Next Generation 911 systems and services. This bill, however, was not passed. The Authority applied for funding from the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), citing negative economic impact, but the Authority was not awarded funding.</p> <p>According to the budget survey distributed in 2020, telecom fees cover approximately 55% of PSAPs' operational expenses. Many local governments cannot afford to pay NG911 transitional and maintenance costs, while continuing to pay legacy expenses.</p> <p>A three-year trend shows that GECA collects approximately \$2.3 to \$2.4 million annually without any foreseeable increase. The funding disbursed to GECA pays for the Authority's operational costs; therefore, it's unlikely the Authority can encumber funds to transition to and sustain NG911.</p> <p>The Authority will continue seeking legislative changes and grant funding to transition and sustain NG911 throughout the state; however, funding continues to limit the state's NG911 implementation efforts.</p> |               |
| HI | N/A  | N/A           |
| IA | <p>Unfortunately, underfunding of the State's 911 Program is becoming a concern and we will likely look towards right-sizing surcharge allocation for the Network management of the 911 system. The State program has absorbed a number of costs previously funded locally in an effort to lower costs at the local level. Because of the popularity of the programs now funded through the State, the State's expenditures have outpaced the revenues and we may seek a legislative solution in the near future. The surcharge in Iowa has not been raised since 2013.</p>  | NA            |
| ID | Limited and localized funding has prevented the purchase of NG911, especially for rural counties   | [No Response] |
| IL | N/A  | N/A           |
| IN | N/A  | N/A           |
| KS | <p>Underfunding of 911 services through 911 fee funds results in increased burden on local property tax payers. 911 in Kansas is seen as a mandatory service and local governments, have funded shortfalls in 911 fee funding through property tax levies.</p>   | N/A           |
| KY | <p>Each PSAP is governed by a local government. Each has it's [sic] own unique challenges when considering funding. Most use grant funds as a solution to funding needs.</p>   | NA            |
| LA | <p>Underfunding of 9-1-1 Services in the State of Louisiana hamper our ability to implement NG 9-1-1 Services</p>  | N/A           |
| MA | N/A  | N/A           |
| MD | <p>Counties make up funding shortfalls with their general funds. Funds dedicated to 9-1-1 cannot be used for other county uses.</p>  | N/A           |
| ME | NA   | NA            |
| MI | <p>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.</p>   | N/A           |
| MN | N/A  | N/A           |
| MO | <p>The Missouri 911 Service Board received ARPA dollars to fund NG911 in the state, these dollars are being utilized to provide NG911 services in the eight counties that do not have 911 service. Additionally, 16 counties are receiving money to upgrade and transition to NG911 and 39 counties are receiving grants to upgrade</p>  | Unknown       |

|    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
|    | their GIS data to NG911 standards, without the ARPA funding these projects would not be possible.<br>Many of the local jurisdictions indicate in their annual survey that they are underfunded and have inadequate resources.  |  |
| MS | N/A  | N/A  |
| MT | N/A  | N/A  |
| NC | N/A  | N/A  |
| ND | 911 fee revenues have never been sufficient to cover the full cost of 911 service. In addition, as the cost of technology and human resources increases the surcharge fees and percentages do not increase comensurate [sic] with those additional expenses. This means that local government must dig deeper into their general funds each year to support 911 services.  | N/A  |
| NE | Nebraska has one of the lower wireless surcharge rates in the country. With the funds collected, the Public Service Commission funds a statewide ESInet and Next Generation 911 Core Services, as well as, text-to-911, GIS, and provides an allocation to each PSAP in the state. In 2023, the Public Service Commission was able to meet the financial obligations for the 911 projects in the state while still maintaining a lower surcharge rate  | N/A  |
| NH | N/A  | N/A  |
| NJ | Unknown  | N/A  |
| NM | The State of New Mexico's scope of eligible expenses for 911 fees is narrower than the FCC's which place a significant funding responsibility for PSAP operations on the local government(s). All E-911 capital equipment requests from PSAPs were approved and authorized by the State and fund balance was utilized when necessary.  | [No Response]  |
| NV | The maximum surcharged allowed in Nevada is \$1 which is limited by statute. Underfunding can occur within the smaller counties in Nevada. There isn't enough population in the rural areas. Counties are not able to levy the surcharge on prepaid cellular phones or minutes sold. Nevada is a tourist area. The tourism surcharges cannot be routed to E911 funding and in most cases goes towards core services, equipment, and interoperability upgrades.   | Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 244A.7643 allows PSAPS to use 911 fees to purchase body warn cameras. |
| NY | Unknown  | N/A  |
| OH | Operational impacts include staffing shortages, training deficiencies, lack of equipment and technology and infrastructure maintenance. Long term effects include delayed moderization [sic] and loss of ability to leverage state and federal grants as most require sustainable local funding support.   | N/A  |
| OK | During this reporting period the State had 13 counties that do not have sufficient funding to pay for core 911 services. These counties are supplemented by State grant funds to ensure they have enough funding to operate. The funding distribution model was critically impacted by the 2020 census. This impact caused a loss of revenue to 50% of the states PSAPs and approximatly [sic] 10% had a catastrophic loss that impacted their ability to provide enhanced 9-1-1 service. There is also a statewide funding shortage to deploy NG911. A bill was ran in 2023 to help the funding of NG9-1-1 and provide additional funding to the PSAPs that were not able to function under the 2023 funding model. This new bill went into effect Nov. 2023 with funding being available January 2024. | N/A  |
| OR | Undetermined   | N/A  |

|    |   |      |
|----|---|------|
| PA | Recruitment and retention remain a critical issue for Pennsylvania PSAPs. Additionally, the technologies used within the PSAP are constantly evolving to protect against cybersecurity threats and to meet public and first respond needs. Pennsylvania counties collectively contributed over \$122 million to support 911 service in 2023 which has impacted efforts to recruit and retain personnel, maintain mission critical systems, develop GIS data, further invest in security and future technologies, and much more.   | N/A  |
| RI | None  | None |
| SC | N/A   | N/A  |
| SD | PSAP's that are underfunded must have their operating budgets supplemented by the local city or county controlling government entity. Rising PSAP operational costs have widened this funding gap consistently over the past several years, leading to potential cuts to staffing or other programs based on the priority of the local agencies.  | N/A  |
| TN | N/A   | N/A  |
| TX | <p>Underfunding is an issue that impacts, if at all, Texas' 77 9-1-1 Entities differently. The primary reason for is that the primary source of dedicated 9-1-1 funding is wireless/prepaid wireless fees. Both fees are state fees and in the case of the wireless fee has been set at \$.50 since its inception in 1999; and the prepaid wireless fee set at two percent of the purchase price of each prepaid wireless telecommunications service since its inception in 2009. purchased by any method. [sic] These fees are distributed according to statutory formulas based on population. The purpose being to distribute the revenues to the 9-1-1 Entities back to each area in proportion to the population of the area responsible for remitting the fees. As a result, small tax base areas generate and receive far less wireless/prepaid wireless revenues than the more populated areas</p> <p>The CSEC state 9-1-1 service program, a mostly rural program with a small tax bases, does not experience underfunding as it receives sufficient state appropriations -- including equalization surcharge to subsidize those RPCs whose population base does not generate adequate 9-1-1 fee revenues at the current rates. Additionally, in 2023 the 88th Texas Legislature appropriated \$21 million over the biennium in General Revenue to ensure, inter alia, stable funding of the state program and the transition to NG9-1-1.</p> <p>Similarly, Greater Harris County's (772 ECD) population provides a solid tax base to, for the most part, generate sufficient wireless/prepaid wireless fees at the current rates. Additionally, neither the state 9-1-1 service program nor that of the 772 ECDs pay for all the costs associated with 9-1-1 service --- including allowable expenses per FCC regulation 9.23. For the CSEC state 9-1-1 service program, telecommunicators/dispatcher costs are not an eligible expense except in rare circumstances. Same holds true for many 772 ECDs.</p> <p>By comparison, small 772 and Municipal ECDs lack the population to sufficiently fund 9-1-1 service. Moreover, in the case of Municipal ECDs they are fully responsible for all the costs of 9-1-1 service -- including the costs allowable under 9.23. Because of the funding disparity, during the last two Texas legislative sessions over \$310 million has been appropriated to fund the transition to NG9-1-1 service. Much of that funding too, however, is distributed based on population--with a percentage carveout in the case of the 772 ECDs which is shared amongst all of the 28 772 ECDs. Accordingly, most</p> | N/A  |

|    |  |     |
|----|--|-----|
|    | <p>of the underfunding issues are found in the Municipal ECDs, excerpts from follow:</p> <p>Longview: As landline revenue has continued to decrease, our dependency upon the City of Longview General fund has grown. Our city won't allow us to 'suffer' operationally, but the trend has required us to adjust and pivot operating costs over into that budget.</p> <p>Highland Park: Our 9-1-1 services are primarily funded by our Town's general budget. 9-1-1 is horrifically underfunded and not sustainable. We are fortunate to have a healthy budget, but most entities do not have this luxury. I'm not sure how they accomplish the services.</p> <p>Sherman: Must use funds from the City's General Fund to ensure all aspects of 911 service are covered. Over 74% of our operational costs must be covered this way. The 911 funds collected help, but do not come close to covering our needs.</p> <p>Non-identified responses from prior CYs include:<br/> Underfunding will cause equipment failure and delayed response for emergency calls. It will also causes staffing shortages.<br/> We are tremendously impacted by underfunding of 911 services. 91% of our budget is funded directly by our municipality as the cost way outweighs the money collected to support 911<br/> E911 funds are not sufficient to cover the cost of procurement, implementation, and management of an NG911 solution.<br/> Additionally, dispatcher salaries (32) positions all must be funded from the City general fund.<br/> New technology in 911 is putting more of a strain on the PSAP, if the city is unable to supplement or expend the money for new or upgraded technology that the center needs then we are unable to provide a better public safety service to the community.<br/> Underfunding has affected the timeframe as to implementation of NG911 projects and hiring adequate staff for the center.<br/> Reliance on grant funds to pursue and pay for projects and services.<br/> Wireline fees have been raised to a level that is not optimal for our jurisdiction to offset declining revenue.<br/> Since our wireline fee is decreasing, and we have to do with the \$0.50 wireless fee, underfunding will cause a degradation of our 9-1-1 services. We won't be able to keep up with the rapidly changing technology that our citizens expect and deserve.<br/> Our budget only allows for 1 full time and 1 part time employee. Since our wireline fee is decreasing, and we have to do with the \$0.50 wireless fee, underfunding will cause a degradation of our 9-1-1 services. We will not be able to keep up with the rapidly changing technology that our citizens expect and deserve.<br/> Have had to keep businesses paying a higher fee even though they account for less than 2% of our 911 calls. Would possibly be able to reduce this fee if wireless fees were increased. Have also had to decrease amounts that we are able to budget towards donating/assisting other public safety agencies. Have not been able to create and hire new positions to help with the increased responsibilities required by NG911.<br/> Not been able to fully implement NG9-1-1 services, full range of mitigation strategies, or full security measures.<br/> Replacement of UPS systems at end of life had to be delayed due to lack of funding in current budget.</p> |     |
| UT | N/A  | N/A |

|                            |  |               |
|----------------------------|--|---------------|
| VA                         | Unknown.   | N/A.          |
| VT                         | None   | N/A           |
| WA                         | We continue to estimate that only a third of the true, total end-to-end cost to operate 911 in the State of Washington comes from the 911 tax; the remainder has to be made up through agency user fees, other tax bases (sales, property, etc) and other general funding. There are PSAPs who have had to delay/defer replacement and/or maintenance of key equipment due to underfunding. Another area where underfunding has impacted 911 services is the inability in some areas to compensate public safety telecommunicators to a level that will either keep them in the industry or allow them to live proximal to the PSAP. Salary level is not the only cause of the current telecommunicator shortage, but it does play a factor in some of our PSAPs and Counties. | [No Response] |
| WI                         | Costs to provide 911/E911 services in Wisconsin are recovered by participating [sic] local exchange carriers through the wireline 911 surcharge on their subscriber bills. The collection from the 911 surcharge reimburses the service suppliers for their network costs. Any costs beyond what the surcharge covers is paid for through respective county and municipal budgets. Due to a decrease in wireline subscribers, the wireline 911 surcharges do not always cover the complete costs for providing the network and jurisdictions are required to pay the difference in network costs which reduces available local funding for equipment replacement, staffing, training, etc.   | N/A           |
| WV                         | Retention of employees, outdated and end of life equipment, outdated dispatch center, telephone system, lacking upgrades to take advantage of newest technology, etc..   | [No Response] |
| WY                         | here is a documented 3 million dollar deficit between funds collected and the current cost of providing 911 services by local government in the state. This deficit has heavily impacted the ability of the development of a state wide Esi-Net and a state GIS Portal for the implementation of NG911 services in the state. Vacancies have plagued our PSAP's; this may be a direct effect of the underfunding from the 911/E911 Fees.   | NA            |
| <b>Other Jurisdictions</b> |  |               |
| AS                         | [DNF]  | [DNF]         |
| DC                         | N / A  | N / A         |
| Guam                       | NONE   | N/A           |
| NMI                        | [DNF]  | [DNF]         |
| PR                         | N/A  | N/A           |
| USVI                       | Staffing shortages, Training, Telecommunicator Certifications  | N/A           |

64. Finally, other sections of the questionnaire and responses also provide information on potential underfunding. For example, as discussed above,<sup>252</sup> Table 14 has a column of “Fees as a Percentage of Cost.” Many states and jurisdictions have percentages in that column that are less than 100%, which may indicate underfunding or reliance on other sources of 911 funding, such as state or local General Funds or grants. Similarly, Table 16 above lists respondents’ estimates of the proportional contributions of various funding sources for 911 service, including fees, General Funds, and grants.

<sup>252</sup> See *supra* para. 25.

**Appendix A**

**Summary of State and Other Jurisdiction Responses Regarding Collections During 2023 Annual Period**

| State/<br>Other<br>Jurisdiction | Type of<br>Fund<br>Collection | Authority to<br>Approve 911<br>Expenditures | Total Estimated<br>Cost to Provide 911<br>Service                             | Total 911 Funds<br>Collected | Total Funds<br>Used for Non-911<br>Related Purposes | NG911 Funding<br>Permissible Under<br>911/E911 Funding<br>Authority | Total Funds Used for<br>NG911   | NG911 Expenditures as a<br>Percentage of Total Funds<br>Collected |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| AK                              | Local                         | Local                                       | \$14,046,805.91   | \$14,046,805.91              | \$0.00  | No  | [NA]  | 0.00%   |
| AL                              | State                         | Hybrid                                      | \$130,372,190.53  | \$130,372,190.53             | \$0.00  | Yes   | \$14,907,772.80   | 11.43%  |
| AR                              | Hybrid                        | Hybrid                                      | \$84,218,483.36   | \$63,130,225.27              | \$0.00  | Yes   | \$2,787,084.49  | 4.41%   |
| AZ                              | State                         | State                                       | \$20,446,256.49   | \$20,623,625.29              | \$0.00  | Yes   | \$20,446,256.49   | 99.14%  |
| CA                              | State                         | State                                       | \$197,093,000.00  | \$184,515,000.00             | \$0.00  | Yes   | \$94,751,000.00   | 51.35%  |
| CO                              | Hybrid                        | Local                                       | \$121,743,925.40  | \$93,565,555.67              | \$0.00  | Yes   | [No Response]   | 0.00%   |
| CT                              | State                         | State                                       | \$35,683,264.00   | \$35,683,264.00              | \$0.00  | Yes   | \$12,307,940.00   | 34.49%  |
| DE                              | State                         | Hybrid                                      | \$9,203,284.43  | \$10,463,899.12              | \$0.00  | Yes   | n/a   | 0.00%   |
| FL                              | State                         | Hybrid                                      | \$380,475,598.00  | \$134,018,849.13             | \$0.00  | Yes   | \$20,912,797.00   | 15.60%  |
| GA                              | State                         | Hybrid                                      | \$577,393,447.15  | \$246,473,466.67             | \$0.00  | Yes   | [NA]  | 0.00%   |
| HI                              | State                         | State                                       | N/A   | \$11,913,470.00              | \$0.00  | No  | \$0.00  | 0.00%   |
| IA                              | Hybrid                        | Hybrid                                      | \$166,753,366.92  | \$42,505,350.95              | \$0.00  | Yes   | ... approximately<br>\$12,717,626.09 was<br>spent on Next<br>Generation programs.<br>... <sup>[253]</sup> | 29.92%  |
| ID                              | Local                         | Local                                       | \$22,320,000.00   | \$26,320,037.00              | \$0.00  | Yes   | [NA]  | 0.00%   |
| IL                              | Hybrid                        | Hybrid                                      | ... Total cost to<br>provide 911/E911 is<br>\$218,991,238.87 <sup>[254]</sup> | \$230,547,467.08             | \$0.00  | Yes   | \$439,061.00  | 0.19%   |
| IN                              | State                         | State                                       | \$286,719,714.24  | \$93,119,035.14              | \$0.00  | Yes   | [No Response]   | 0.00%   |
| KS                              | State                         | Hybrid                                      | \$103,086,754.00  | \$35,312,051.00              | \$0.00  | Yes   | \$16,125,142.00   | 45.66%  |

<sup>253</sup> Iowa’s full response to Question I2a is “We do not track amounts by ‘NG programs.’ At the state level, a reasonable estimate is that approximately \$12,717,626.09 was spent on Next Generation programs. At this time, it is difficult to determine how much was spent on next-generation programs by local jurisdictions.” Iowa Response at 19.

<sup>254</sup> Illinois’ full response to Question B3 is, “Local 9-1-1 Authorities reported \$206,535,190.38 in 911 Expenses and the State paid \$12,456,048.49 for 911 network costs[;] Total cost to provide 911/E911 is \$218,991,238.87[.]” Illinois Response at 3.



| State/ Other Jurisdiction | Type of Fund Collection | Authority to Approve 911 Expenditures | Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service                                       | Total 911 Funds Collected | Total Funds Used for Non-911 Related Purposes | NG911 Funding Permissible Under 911/E911 Funding Authority | Total Funds Used for NG911  | NG911 Expenditures as a Percentage of Total Funds Collected |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| KY                        | Hybrid                  | Hybrid                                | \$162,686,094.00  | \$83,416,195.23           | \$0.00  | Yes  | \$973,224.14  | 1.17%   |
| LA                        | Hybrid                  | Local                                 | \$99,818,888.57   | \$102,507,468.04          | \$0.00  | Yes  | Louisiana does not track the funds expended on NG-911 projects as a separate amount | 0.00%   |
| MA                        | State                   | State                                 | The estimated amount to provide 911 Service is: \$49,102,581 ... <sup>[255]</sup> | \$167,086,223.47          | \$0.00  | Yes  | \$49,102,581.00   | 29.39%  |
| MD                        | State                   | Hybrid                                | \$177,429,053.00  | \$130,704,763.41          | \$0.00  | Yes  | [No Response]   | 0.00%   |
| ME                        | State                   | State                                 | \$7,103,397.00  | \$6,661,954.00            | \$0.00  | Yes  | \$5,209,128.00  | 78.19%  |
| MI                        | Hybrid                  | Hybrid                                | \$318,271,962.99  | \$146,334,362.24          | \$0.00  | Yes  | \$23,380,407.25   | 15.98%  |
| MN                        | State                   | State                                 | \$48,835,266.00   | \$67,117,640.01           | \$0.00  | Yes  | \$43,318,551.38   | 64.54%  |
| MO                        | Hybrid                  | Hybrid                                | \$443,529,191.00  | [No Response]             | \$0.00  | Yes  | \$247,937.65  | [Could Not Calculate]                                       |
| MS                        | Hybrid                  | [Hybrid]                              | \$54,530,183.22   | \$25,311,317.60           | \$0.00  | Yes  | [NA]  | 0.00%   |
| MT                        | State                   | State                                 | \$47M   | \$15M                     | \$0.00  | Yes  | [NA]  | 0.00%   |
| NC                        | State                   | State                                 | \$202,592,031.00  | \$93,340,056.00           | \$0.00  | Yes  | \$34,038,794.00   | 36.47%  |
| ND                        | Hybrid                  | Hybrid                                | \$30,700,000.00   | \$17,860,000.00           | \$0.00  | Yes  | \$2,296,810.68  | 12.86%  |
| NE                        | Hybrid                  | Hybrid                                | \$65,263,070.00   | \$16,792,489.00           | \$0.00  | Yes  | \$4,705,027.00  | 28.02%  |
| NH                        | State                   | State                                 | \$18,426,904.33   | \$14,766,957.25           | \$0.00  | Yes  | \$1,076,794.63  | 7.29%   |
| NJ                        | State                   | State                                 | Unknown   | \$131,187,673.63          | \$106,445,673.63                              | Yes  | \$10,250,000.00   | 7.81%   |
| NM                        | State                   | State                                 | \$10,797,932.00   | \$12,912,289.65           | \$0.00  | Yes  | \$3,726,940.00  | 28.86%  |
| NV                        | Local                   | Local                                 | \$40,786,025.80   | \$10,004,935.78           | [unknown]                                     | Yes  | \$220,908.00  | 2.21%   |
| NY                        | Hybrid                  | Hybrid                                | \$1,276,892,251.68  | \$379,253,833.00          | \$109,244,801.05                              | Yes  | \$12,759.86   | 0.00%   |
| OH                        | Hybrid                  | Hybrid                                | \$356,606,081.55  | \$30,918,205.53           | \$0.00  | Yes  | State of Ohio expended: \$377,146.59,   | 14.28%  |

<sup>255</sup> Massachusetts' full response to Question B3 is, "The estimated amount to provide 911 Service is: \$49,102,581[.] This estimated amount includes the costs associated with the Next Generation 911 service provider contract, MassGIS, Radio, and the mobile PSAP. This estimated amount does not include costs associated with grant programs, training programs, disability access programs, public education, administrative costs, or other costs for the administration and programs of the State 911 Department." Massachusetts Response at 3-4.

| State/<br>Other<br>Jurisdiction | Type of<br>Fund<br>Collection | Authority to<br>Approve 911<br>Expenditures | Total Estimated<br>Cost to Provide 911<br>Service | Total 911 Funds<br>Collected  | Total Funds<br>Used for Non-911<br>Related Purposes | NG911 Funding<br>Permissible Under<br>911/E911 Funding<br>Authority | Total Funds Used for<br>NG911  | NG911 Expenditures as a<br>Percentage of Total Funds<br>Collected |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|
|                                 |                               |   |   |   |   |   | Local/Counties<br>expended<br>\$4,036,521.00   |   |
| OK                              | Hybrid                        | State                                       | \$104,802,192.91                                  | \$41,834,464.58   | \$0.00  | Yes   | [NA]   | 0.00%   |
| OR                              | Hybrid                        | State                                       | \$188,760,834.75                                  | \$80,618,568.00   | \$0.00  | Yes   | [NA]   | 0.00%   |
| PA                              | State                         | Hybrid                                      | \$445,988,758.07                                  | \$323,701,500.03  | \$0.00  | Yes   | \$19,674,396.28  | 6.08%   |
| RI                              | State                         | State                                       | \$7,147,444.00                                    | \$8,339,808.90  | \$0.00  | Yes   | \$581,551.60   | 6.97%   |
| SC                              | Hybrid                        | Hybrid                                      | unknown   | \$38,367,338.49   | \$0.00  | Yes   | \$7,620,516.00   | 19.86%  |
| SD                              | State                         | State                                       | \$38,885,755.57                                   | \$11,471,034.88   | \$0.00  | Yes   | \$4,371,540.00   | 38.11%  |
| TN                              | State                         | Hybrid                                      | Unknown   | \$150,486,381.03  | \$0.00  | Yes   | \$14,496,988.00  | 9.63%   |
| TX                              | Hybrid                        | Hybrid                                      | \$269,353,292.00                                  | \$278,769,195.00  | \$0.00  | Yes   | \$66,842,012.00  | 23.98%  |
| UT                              | State                         | Hybrid                                      | \$91 million                                      | \$43,390,014.00   | \$0.00  | Yes   | \$8,198,956.40   | 18.90%  |
| VA                              | State                         | Hybrid                                      | Unknown   | [No Response]   | \$0.00  | Yes   | \$10,294,849.37  | [Could Not Calculate]   |
| VT                              | State                         | State                                       | \$4,755,333.00                                    | [No Response]   | \$0.00  | Yes   | \$4,755,333.00   | [Could Not Calculate]   |
| WA                              | Hybrid                        | Hybrid                                      | \$451,135,106.00                                  | State:<br>29,217,705.32<br>County:<br>81,203,096.64<br>Total:<br>110,420,801.96 | \$0.00  | Yes   | ~\$12M   | 10.87%  |
| WI                              | [No<br>Response]              | [No<br>Response]                            | Unknown   | Unknown   | \$0.00  | No  | \$596,804.49   | [Could Not Calculate]   |
| WV                              | Hybrid                        | Hybrid                                      | \$370,922,521.19                                  | \$69,910,352.72   | \$0.00  | Yes   | [No Response]  | 0.00%   |
| WY                              | Hybrid                        | Local                                       | \$11,210,090.05                                   | \$8,217,973.71  | \$0.00  | Yes   | Local jurisdictions<br>have spent money on<br>systems and equipment<br>in preparation for<br>being NG911 ESI-Net<br>ready. There is not an<br>audit amount reported<br>to the state. The State<br>of Wyoming has not<br>spend funds directly<br>on any NG911<br>program. | 0.00%   |

| State/<br>Other<br>Jurisdiction | Type of<br>Fund<br>Collection | Authority to<br>Approve 911<br>Expenditures | Total Estimated<br>Cost to Provide 911<br>Service | Total 911 Funds<br>Collected | Total Funds<br>Used for Non-911<br>Related Purposes | NG911 Funding<br>Permissible Under<br>911/E911 Funding<br>Authority | Total Funds Used for<br>NG911 | NG911 Expenditures as a<br>Percentage of Total Funds<br>Collected |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Other Jurisdictions</b>      |                               |   |   |                              |   |   |                               |   |
| AS                              | [DNF]                         | [DNF]                                       | [DNF]   | [DNF]                        | [DNF]   | [DNF]   | [DNF]                         | [DNF]   |
| DC                              | State                         | Local                                       | \$51,749,217.00                                   | \$12,904,133.60              | \$0.00  | Yes   | \$2,992,012.73                | 23.19%  |
| Guam                            | State                         | State                                       | \$2,587,596.00                                    | \$2,009,197.00               | \$0.00  | Yes   | \$1,191,098.52                | 59.28%  |
| NMI                             | [DNF]                         | [DNF]                                       | [DNF]   | [DNF]                        | [DNF]   | [DNF]   | [DNF]                         | [DNF]   |
| PR                              | State                         | State                                       | \$18,418,568.00                                   | \$25,098,437.79              | \$0.00  | Yes   | \$546,838.37                  | 2.18%   |
| USVI                            | State                         | State                                       | \$3,427,854.00                                    | See F2a                      | \$0.00  | No  | [NA]                          | 0.00%   |

## Appendix B1

### Overview of State and Other Jurisdiction Total Collected 911 Fees – 2009 to 2016 Reports<sup>256</sup>

| State | Report Year   |               |               |               |               |               |               |               |
|-------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
|       | 2009          | 2010          | 2011          | 2012          | 2013          | 2014          | 2015          | 2016          |
|       | 1st Report    | 2nd Report    | 3rd Report    | 4th Report    | 5th Report    | 6th Report    | 7th Report    | 8th Report    |
| AK    | [DNP]         | \$8,199,046   | \$8,649,083   | \$12,320,888  | \$12,256,620  | \$12,448,651  | \$13,969,231  | \$12,837,114  |
| AL    | \$60,465,104  | \$29,857,571  | \$28,680,846  | \$28,401,585  | \$28,401,585  | \$41,974,724  | \$108,787,856 | \$116,440,103 |
| AR    | \$24,799,338  | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNF]         | [DNP]         | \$25,290,790  | \$26,985,555  |
| AZ    | \$15,056,353  | \$17,460,160  | \$16,238,766  | \$16,747,691  | \$16,445,301  | \$16,628,695  | \$17,589,404  | \$19,227,222  |
| CA    | \$106,817,447 | \$101,450,093 | \$100,000,000 | \$85,952,018  | \$82,126,695  | \$75,714,948  | \$97,077,234  | \$87,838,234  |
| CO    | \$45,000,000  | \$45,000,000  | \$45,000,000  | \$1,907,087   | \$42,900,000  | \$42,900,000  | \$52,257,085  | \$52,732,731  |
| CT    | \$20,116,091  | \$21,397,573  | \$20,723,228  | \$22,413,228  | \$24,001,890  | \$35,755,788  | \$37,176,000  | \$32,564,308  |
| DE    | [DNP]         | \$2,259,728   | \$8,044,859   | \$8,775,757   | \$7,623,392   | \$7,786,659   | \$8,159,730   | \$8,159,730   |
| FL    | \$130,962,053 | \$125,531,674 | \$123,059,300 | \$122,550,767 | \$108,896,142 | \$107,884,715 | \$108,324,754 | \$108,226,957 |
| GA    | [DNP]         | \$8,537,319   | \$8,950,569   | \$13,700,097  | [DNP]         | \$18,462,645  | \$17,538,556  | \$17,659,037  |
| HI    | \$8,842,841   | \$9,578,764   | \$9,544,397   | \$9,755,031   | \$10,020,045  | \$9,599,983   | \$10,489,700  | \$10,237,032  |
| IA    | \$29,054,622  | \$31,458,531  | \$31,304,377  | \$30,664,253  | \$30,297,168  | \$20,657,733  | \$27,820,552  | \$40,547,767  |
| ID    | \$19,191,410  | \$18,673,809  | \$18,013,902  | \$17,013,000  | \$19,313,000  | \$20,768,995  | \$20,879,778  | \$20,952,379  |
| IL    | [DNP]         | \$67,000,000  | \$69,700,000  | \$71,900,000  | \$69,200,000  | \$71,200,000  | \$213,983,628 | \$95,500,349  |
| IN    | \$71,000,000  | \$39,600,000  | \$30,000,000  | [DNP]         | \$69,515,800  | \$73,114,656  | \$72,075,593  | \$79,108,858  |
| KS    | [DNP]         | \$6,705,539   | [DNP]         | \$22,125,937  | \$20,477,020  | \$20,573,217  | \$20,337,748  | \$20,821,974  |
| KY    | \$23,569,921  | \$22,979,828  | \$54,900,000  | \$56,500,000  | \$55,700,000  | \$53,506,843  | \$53,920,232  | \$53,500,000  |
| LA    | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | \$3,017,672   | [DNF]         | \$4,912,926   | [DNF]         | [DNF]         | \$42,750,000  |
| MA    | [DNP]         | \$69,694,702  | \$75,125,185  | \$73,408,835  | \$73,677,263  | \$74,561,728  | \$74,947,715  | \$95,508,773  |
| MD    | \$57,176,923  | \$55,556,616  | \$54,560,255  | \$52,099,601  | \$52,240,761  | \$51,716,232  | \$54,766,848  | \$53,314,406  |
| ME    | \$6,664,062   | \$6,108,985   | \$7,786,855   | \$8,416,235   | \$8,342,459   | \$8,034,327   | \$8,340,150   | \$8,402,473   |
| MI    | \$69,835,672  | \$93,000,132  | \$87,673,893  | \$196,215,849 | \$181,204,131 | \$178,224,826 | \$88,932,891  | \$93,333,483  |
| MN    | \$51,281,641  | \$51,269,514  | \$58,821,937  | \$58,654,182  | \$62,353,897  | \$62,056,116  | \$61,446,108  | \$62,110,858  |

<sup>256</sup> All numbers in the two B Appendices are rounded to the nearest dollar. Appendix B2 below covers report years 2017 to 2024. In these Appendices, “[DNP]” indicates that the state or jurisdiction filed a report but did not provide the information.

| State | Report Year   |               |               |               |               |               |               |               |
|-------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
|       | 2009          | 2010          | 2011          | 2012          | 2013          | 2014          | 2015          | 2016          |
|       | 1st Report    | 2nd Report    | 3rd Report    | 4th Report    | 5th Report    | 6th Report    | 7th Report    | 8th Report    |
| MO    | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNF]         | [DNF]         |
| MS    | \$11,758,733  | [DNP]         | \$56,335,986  | \$60,813,014  | \$65,290,042  | \$58,175,490  | \$31,280,357  | \$26,510,538  |
| MT    | \$13,172,462  | \$13,172,462  | \$13,715,064  | \$13,626,940  | \$13,177,752  | \$13,099,542  | \$13,000,000  | \$13,000,000  |
| NC    | \$84,613,672  | \$87,367,015  | \$80,001,662  | [DNP]         | \$69,424,897  | \$71,688,784  | \$78,161,246  | \$81,135,377  |
| ND    | [DNP]         | \$8,369,366   | [DNP]         | \$9,506,000   | \$9,506,000   | \$9,998,322   | \$10,337,907  | \$10,337,907  |
| NE    | \$13,278,907  | \$5,507,240   | \$8,128,042   | \$14,808,421  | \$15,555,734  | \$15,663,631  | \$13,940,368  | \$13,900,448  |
| NH    | \$10,854,203  | [DNP]         | \$9,832,831   | [DNF]         | \$10,493,486  | \$10,467,787  | \$10,582,269  | \$12,317,418  |
| NJ    | \$130,000,000 | \$128,900,000 | [DNF]         | \$125,000,000 | \$126,000,000 | \$121,000,000 | \$120,000,000 | \$122,632,000 |
| NM    | \$12,786,328  | \$12,073,923  | \$13,081,062  | \$13,424,002  | \$12,028,770  | \$11,970,079  | \$11,600,163  | \$11,146,012  |
| NV    | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | \$2,010,342   | \$1,944,447   | [DNP]         | \$1,591,367   |
| NY    | \$83,700,000  | [DNP]         | \$193,194,759 | \$194,787,113 | \$190,281,716 | \$183,219,891 | \$185,513,240 | \$185,262,082 |
| OH    | \$28,544,924  | \$28,164,050  | \$29,175,929  | [DNP]         | \$28,837,121  | \$25,689,296  | \$25,736,970  | \$40,382,365  |
| OK    | [DNP]         | [DNF]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         |
| OR    | \$87,447,640  | \$40,155,054  | \$39,592,560  | \$39,370,086  | \$39,229,319  | \$39,115,990  | \$39,470,386  | \$39,470,386  |
| PA    | \$190,239,805 | \$116,656,193 | \$194,554,260 | \$192,297,459 | \$184,044,508 | \$192,779,782 | \$190,711,113 | \$239,800,218 |
| RI    | \$19,400,000  | \$18,200,000  | \$15,488,729  | [DNF]         | \$16,500,000  | \$17,454,000  | \$17,640,703  | \$16,345,364  |
| SC    | \$22,000,000  | [DNP]         | \$21,988,052  | \$22,215,748  | \$28,948,882  | \$27,690,958  | \$28,458,896  | \$39,054,282  |
| SD    | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | \$8,100,000   | \$8,200,000   | \$9,111,476   | \$13,275,031  | \$13,095,234  | \$13,093,702  |
| TN    | \$51,536,089  | \$55,965,000  | \$58,500,000  | \$94,497,881  | \$60,852,140  | \$98,199,801  | \$67,404,840  | \$78,729,854  |
| TX    | \$197,228,796 | \$203,547,360 | \$199,025,787 | \$209,202,098 | \$212,788,623 | \$213,215,483 | \$208,478,516 | \$222,938,735 |
| UT    | \$23,366,301  | \$2,724,374   | \$23,909,566  | \$23,070,307  | \$26,188,051  | \$29,354,710  | \$24,572,000  | \$27,130,872  |
| VA    | [DNP]         | \$52,022,170  | \$53,217,635  | \$54,079,487  | \$51,658,843  | \$55,212,204  | \$85,187,560  | \$85,431,606  |
| VT    | \$4,832,374   | \$5,487,046   | \$4,605,803   | \$4,993,132   | \$5,416,336   | \$4,628,027   | [DNP]         | \$6,256,658   |
| WA    | \$69,523,163  | \$71,036,718  | \$71,244,435  | \$100,952,115 | \$95,417,114  | \$95,887,087  | \$91,529,550  | \$94,445,461  |
| WI    | \$9,602,745   | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         |
| WV    | \$32,278,728  | \$33,760,563  | \$35,375,580  | \$36,176,377  | \$37,928,204  | \$58,001,075  | \$56,323,471  | \$56,649,322  |
| WY    | \$6,700,000   | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         |

| State                      | Report Year            |                        |                        |                        |                        |                        |                        |                        |
|----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
|                            | 2009                   | 2010                   | 2011                   | 2012                   | 2013                   | 2014                   | 2015                   | 2016                   |
|                            | 1st Report             | 2nd Report             | 3rd Report             | 4th Report             | 5th Report             | 6th Report             | 7th Report             | 8th Report             |
| <b>Other Jurisdictions</b> |                        |                        |                        |                        |                        |                        |                        |                        |
| AS                         | [DNP]                  | [DNP]                  | [DNP]                  | [DNP]                  | [DNF]                  | [DNF]                  | [DNP]                  | [DNP]                  |
| DC                         | \$12,744,103           | \$12,714,347           | \$12,700,000           | [DNF]                  | \$12,064,842           | \$13,700,000           | \$10,488,988           | \$12,189,231           |
| Guam                       | \$1,468,363            | [DNF]                  | [DNF]                  | \$1,779,710            | [DNF]                  | [DNF]                  | [DNF]                  | [DNF]                  |
| NMI                        | [DNF]                  | [DNF]                  | [DNF]                  | [DNF]                  | [DNF]                  | [DNF]                  | [DNF]                  | [DNF]                  |
| PR                         | \$20,952,459           | \$21,876,277           | [DNF]                  | \$21,367,260           | \$20,323,324           | \$19,507,889           | [DNF]                  | \$21,896,789           |
| USVI                       | [DNF]                  | \$590,812              | \$554,245              | [DNF]                  | [DNF]                  | [DNF]                  | [DNF]                  | \$1,297,671            |
| <b>Total</b>               | <b>\$1,877,863,272</b> | <b>\$1,749,609,554</b> | <b>\$2,002,117,111</b> | <b>\$2,149,689,191</b> | <b>\$2,322,983,616</b> | <b>\$2,404,510,788</b> | <b>\$2,527,625,361</b> | <b>\$2,631,705,009</b> |

**Appendix B2**

**Overview of State and Other Jurisdiction Total Collected 911 Fees – 2017 to 2024 Reports**

| State | Report Year   |               |               |               |               |               |               |               |
|-------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
|       | 2017          | 2018          | 2019          | 2020          | 2021          | 2022          | 2023          | 2024          |
|       | 9th Report    | 10th Report   | 11th Report   | 12th Report   | 13th Report   | 14th Report   | 15th Report   | 16th Report   |
| AK    | \$11,595,445  | \$15,211,064  | [DNP]         | \$14,922,887  | \$14,529,982  | \$13,883,187  | \$14,313,304  | \$14,046,806  |
| AL    | \$115,944,883 | \$114,271,364 | \$116,456,606 | \$122,551,466 | \$125,543,047 | \$129,772,205 | \$132,143,646 | \$130,372,191 |
| AR    | \$20,161,873  | \$22,734,249  | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | \$62,176,075  | \$67,360,463  | \$62,382,232  | \$63,130,225  |
| AZ    | \$20,389,514  | \$16,991,893  | \$16,127,405  | \$19,870,228  | \$18,877,349  | \$19,008,964  | \$19,303,923  | \$20,623,625  |
| CA    | \$79,648,535  | \$76,916,882  | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | \$179,471,000 | \$184,515,000 |
| CO    | \$53,987,426  | \$58,574,919  | \$74,243,804  | \$63,987,233  | \$81,778,479  | \$117,493,888 | \$112,792,447 | \$93,565,556  |
| CT    | \$1,658,219   | \$28,651,233  | \$27,359,070  | \$32,489,998  | \$29,355,329  | [DNP]         | \$35,198,214  | \$35,683,264  |
| DE    | \$8,718,169   | \$8,246,009   | \$9,151,657   | \$9,542,756   | \$9,286,530   | \$9,836,049   | \$9,656,734   | \$10,463,899  |
| FL    | \$111,799,871 | \$114,480,143 | \$117,947,467 | \$119,669,746 | \$122,106,617 | \$124,319,181 | \$129,208,618 | \$134,018,849 |
| GA    | \$19,840,298  | \$14,969,525  | \$21,473,448  | \$225,670,526 | \$230,153,414 | \$236,472,389 | \$242,257,795 | \$246,473,467 |
| HI    | \$10,634,306  | \$11,700,000  | \$11,600,900  | \$10,779,781  | \$11,007,307  | \$11,124,644  | \$11,297,898  | \$11,913,470  |
| IA    | \$39,849,592  | \$39,920,992  | \$39,349,123  | \$41,385,737  | \$42,379,489  | \$41,185,131  | \$41,566,227  | \$42,505,351  |
| ID    | \$22,456,722  | \$22,401,523  | \$24,172,149  | \$23,096,305  | \$24,360,214  | \$23,433,016  | [DNF]         | \$26,320,037  |
| IL    | \$234,070,304 | \$169,572,608 | \$357,853,280 | \$185,697,848 | \$199,782,643 | \$233,681,341 | \$233,804,170 | \$230,547,467 |
| IN    | \$86,865,020  | \$87,125,936  | \$88,906,439  | \$89,079,970  | \$91,474,115  | \$91,151,563  | \$92,963,982  | \$93,119,035  |
| KS    | \$19,193,708  | \$22,900,621  | \$23,361,954  | \$28,633,281  | \$34,049,478  | \$34,627,233  | \$35,047,858  | \$35,312,051  |
| KY    | \$111,089,076 | \$59,093,367  | \$56,867,707  | \$72,261,427  | \$71,486,870  | \$65,595,357  | [DNP]         | \$83,416,195  |
| LA    | \$66,235,990  | \$88,718,075  | \$92,275,591  | \$93,561,892  | \$95,519,601  | \$79,966,995  | \$95,910,119  | \$102,507,468 |
| MA    | \$117,883,899 | \$102,917,091 | \$105,511,936 | \$153,818,991 | \$148,631,181 | \$172,788,940 | \$164,881,344 | \$167,086,223 |
| MD    | \$53,974,012  | \$55,852,809  | \$55,880,355  | \$56,097,287  | \$62,910,929  | \$102,977,311 | \$118,613,227 | \$130,704,763 |
| ME    | \$8,506,670   | \$8,452,998   | \$8,533,879   | \$8,535,045   | \$6,492,764   | \$6,898,514   | \$7,159,475   | \$6,661,954   |
| MI    | \$102,388,366 | \$103,526,157 | \$38,924,595  | \$130,275,141 | \$140,317,136 | \$152,264,881 | \$145,142,920 | \$146,334,362 |
| MN    | \$76,542,107  | \$77,151,433  | \$70,820,782  | \$79,278,839  | \$77,782,284  | \$76,595,214  | \$67,948,180  | \$67,117,640  |
| MO    | [DNF]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | \$3,377,845   | \$4,984,961   | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         |
| MS    | \$31,884,472  | \$31,533,680  | \$29,759,156  | \$28,492,593  | \$10,751,578  | \$23,342,003  | \$23,437,704  | \$25,311,318  |
| MT    | [DNF]         | \$13,000,000  | \$13,000,000  | \$13,000,000  | \$13,000,000  | \$13,500,000  | \$14,000,000  | \$15,000,000  |

| State                      | Report Year           |                       |               |               |               |               |               |               |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
|                            | 2017                  | 2018                  | 2019          | 2020          | 2021          | 2022          | 2023          | 2024          |
|                            | 9th Report            | 10th Report           | 11th Report   | 12th Report   | 13th Report   | 14th Report   | 15th Report   | 16th Report   |
| NC                         | \$81,801,499          | \$82,891,066          | \$88,279,782  | \$93,907,694  | \$90,399,400  | \$102,902,575 | \$99,746,051  | \$93,340,056  |
| ND                         | \$12,814,683          | \$14,607,294          | \$14,672,353  | \$18,907,531  | [DNP]         | \$18,643,276  | [DNP]         | \$17,860,000  |
| NE                         | \$14,061,973          | \$8,282,774           | \$13,541,990  | \$13,926,145  | \$13,085,400  | \$12,844,177  | \$15,689,781  | \$16,792,489  |
| NH                         | \$15,288,598          | \$15,427,022          | \$15,543,492  | \$15,661,198  | \$15,655,122  | \$16,007,591  | \$16,359,317  | \$14,766,957  |
| NJ                         | \$122,150,000         | \$121,909,000         | \$122,905,000 | \$124,393,000 | \$127,370,000 | \$126,224,000 | \$127,124,000 | \$131,187,674 |
| NM                         | \$10,919,490          | \$11,203,574          | \$11,228,627  | \$12,237,705  | \$12,242,923  | \$12,295,318  | \$13,046,173  | \$12,912,290  |
| NV                         | \$437,144             | \$2,291,102           | \$1,122,187   | [\$2,857,298] | [DNP]         | \$710,374     | \$2,891,426   | \$10,004,936  |
| NY                         | [DNF]                 | \$189,094,916         | [DNP]         | \$33,867,659  | \$34,313,654  | \$109,693,132 | \$318,496,669 | \$379,253,833 |
| OH                         | \$44,720,083          | \$39,736,489          | \$33,421,679  | [DNP]         | \$34,192,222  | \$29,646,883  | \$27,842,727  | \$30,918,206  |
| OK                         | [DNF]                 | \$34,986,975          | \$44,712,874  | \$38,248,507  | \$42,595,575  | \$39,733,951  | \$39,417,924  | \$41,834,465  |
| OR                         | \$42,832,475          | \$43,919,835          | \$45,550,841  | \$44,541,808  | \$53,508,690  | \$77,641,699  | \$79,156,270  | \$80,618,568  |
| PA                         | \$315,963,650         | \$316,592,551         | \$316,216,704 | \$315,238,084 | \$317,290,983 | \$325,646,069 | \$322,246,239 | \$323,701,500 |
| RI                         | \$14,021,695          | \$16,817,000          | \$15,684,553  | \$15,340,800  | \$7,595,987   | \$8,811,218   | \$7,980,851   | \$8,339,809   |
| SC                         | \$40,880,762          | \$30,108,371          | \$31,274,227  | \$32,818,798  | \$33,615,719  | \$34,696,379  | \$38,298,711  | \$38,367,338  |
| SD                         | \$12,976,019          | \$13,087,266          | \$13,306,863  | \$13,476,892  | \$13,533,579  | \$13,540,493  | \$13,285,625  | \$11,471,035  |
| TN                         | \$102,699,664         | \$102,819,090         | [DNP]         | \$105,652,433 | \$110,023,959 | \$141,523,441 | \$149,174,362 | \$150,486,381 |
| TX                         | \$223,315,125         | \$219,673,860         | \$220,165,001 | \$224,756,152 | \$226,212,339 | \$241,157,251 | \$243,559,032 | \$278,769,195 |
| UT                         | \$27,162,203          | \$23,485,454          | \$29,262,881  | \$32,775,607  | \$37,397,817  | \$38,478,764  | \$42,052,450  | \$43,390,014  |
| VA                         | \$86,028,766          | \$86,909,858          | \$60,974,472  | \$63,742,980  | \$64,374,744  | \$67,098,002  | \$74,806,311  | [DNP]         |
| VT                         | \$6,170,851           | \$5,981,135           | [DNP]         | \$5,427,095   | \$4,951,056   | \$5,362,000   | \$4,050,065   | [DNP]         |
| WA                         | \$95,242,119          | \$98,653,163          | \$99,923,008  | \$101,002,074 | \$104,837,836 | \$106,418,863 | \$106,724,659 | \$110,420,802 |
| WI                         | [DNP]                 | \$0                   | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         |
| WV                         | \$56,340,460          | \$60,189,650          | \$63,686,697  | \$63,081,749  | \$68,560,173  | \$72,339,137  | \$75,088,035  | \$69,910,353  |
| WY                         | [DNP]                 | [DNP]                 | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | \$7,125,243   | \$7,623,734   | \$8,217,974   |
| <b>Other Jurisdictions</b> |                       |                       |               |               |               |               |               |               |
| AS                         | Does Not Collect Fees | Does Not Collect Fees | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | [DNP]         | \$0           | [DNP]         |
| DC                         | \$11,354,347          | \$11,428,064          | \$11,832,609  | \$11,913,519  | \$12,156,071  | \$12,410,065  | \$12,395,923  | \$12,904,134  |
| Guam                       | [DNF]                 | \$2,209,374           | \$2,183,716   | \$2,109,415   | \$2,210,810   | \$2,137,514   | \$2,090,912   | \$2,009,197   |
| NMI                        | [DNF]                 | \$0                   | \$0           | [DNF]         | [DNF]         | [DNF]         | [DNF]         | [DNF]         |



| State        | Report Year            |                        |                        |                        |                        |                        |                        |                        |
|--------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
|              | 2017                   | 2018                   | 2019                   | 2020                   | 2021                   | 2022                   | 2023                   | 2024                   |
|              | 9th Report             | 10th Report            | 11th Report            | 12th Report            | 13th Report            | 14th Report            | 15th Report            | 16th Report            |
| PR           | [DNF]                  | \$19,889,006           | \$20,204,116           | \$20,254,043           | \$20,898,411           | \$21,608,815           | \$22,439,061           | \$25,098,438           |
| USVI         | \$1,416,865            | [DNP]                  | [DNP]                  | [DNP]                  | [DNF]                  | \$863,765              | \$779,377              | [DNP]                  |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>\$2,763,916,948</b> | <b>\$2,937,108,459</b> | <b>\$2,675,270,976</b> | <b>\$3,032,215,008</b> | <b>\$3,175,759,843</b> | <b>\$3,492,838,462</b> | <b>\$3,850,866,703</b> | <b>\$4,029,325,858</b> |

**Appendix C**

**State and Other Jurisdiction 911/E911 Fees by Service Type<sup>257</sup>**

| State | Service Type and Fee |                              | Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance |       |                |             |
|-------|----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|----------------|-------------|
|       | Type                 | Fee                          | State                             | Local | Combo or Other | No Response |
| AK    | Wireline             | \$2.00                       |                                   | X     |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$2.00                       |                                   | X     |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | [No Response]                |                                   |       |                | X           |
|       | VoIP                 | [No Response]                |                                   |       |                | X           |
|       | Other                | [No Response]                |                                   |       |                | X           |
| AL    | Wireline             | \$1.86                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$1.86                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | \$1.86                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | \$1.86                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Other                | \$1.86                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
| AR    | Wireline             | 5 - 12%                      |                                   | X     |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$1.30                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | 10%                          | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | \$1.30                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Other                | [No Response]                |                                   |       |                | X           |
| AZ    | Wireline             | \$0.20                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$0.20                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | \$0.80 [/] 3%                | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | \$0.20                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Other                | [No Response]                |                                   |       |                | X           |
| CA    | Wireline             | \$0.30                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$0.30                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | \$0.30                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | \$0.30                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Other                | N/A                          |                                   |       |                | X           |
| CO    | Wireline             | \$0.79-4.00 <sup>[258]</sup> |                                   |       | X              |             |

<sup>257</sup> Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming provided substantive entries in Addendum Section F1 of the Questionnaire, associated with responses captured in this table. State and jurisdiction filings are available for public inspection at <https://www.fcc.gov/sixteenth-annual-fee-report-state-filings>. West Virginia provided a list of wireline and VoIP fees by county. West Virginia Response at 14-16.

<sup>258</sup> At Addendum Section F1, Colorado states: “Colorado has local emergency telephone charges, which are applied by local 9-1-1 governing bodies, that apply to wireline, wireless, and VoIP services, excluding prepaid wireless services. The rate of these charges varies by jurisdiction, ranging from \$0.70 per line per month to \$4.00 per line per month. Colorado also has a state 9-1-1 surcharge, currently set at \$0.09 per line per month. This charge also applies to wireline, wireless, and VoIP services, excluding prepaid wireless. Together, these two charges mean that, depending on the address of the customer, the total rate being charged is between \$0.79 and \$4.09 per line per month.” Colorado Response at 10.

| State | Service Type and Fee |                              | Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance |       |                |             |
|-------|----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|----------------|-------------|
|       | Type                 | Fee                          | State                             | Local | Combo or Other | No Response |
|       | Wireless             | \$0.79-4.00                  |                                   |       | X              |             |
|       | Prepaid              | \$1.71                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | \$0.79-4.00                  |                                   |       | X              |             |
|       | Other                | [No Response]                |                                   |       |                | X           |
| CT    | Wireline             | \$0.70/0.68 <sup>[259]</sup> | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$0.70/0.68                  | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | \$0.70/0.68                  | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | \$0.70/0.68                  | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Other                | [No Response]                | X                                 |       |                |             |
| DE    | Wireline             | \$0.60                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$0.60                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | \$0.60                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | \$0.60                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Other                | [No Response]                |                                   |       |                | X           |
| FL    | Wireline             | \$0.40                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$0.40                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | \$0.40                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | \$0.40                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Other                | \$0.40                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
| GA    | Wireline             | \$1.50                       |                                   |       | X              |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$1.50                       |                                   |       | X              |             |
|       | Prepaid              | \$1.50                       |                                   |       | X              |             |
|       | VoIP                 | \$1.50                       |                                   |       | X              |             |
|       | Other                | [No Response]                |                                   |       |                | X           |
| HI    | Wireline             | \$0.27                       |                                   |       |                | X           |
|       | Wireless             | \$0.66                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | \$0.00                       |                                   |       |                | X           |
|       | VoIP                 | \$0.66                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Other                | \$0.00                       |                                   |       |                | X           |
| IA    | Wireline             | \$1.00                       |                                   | X     |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$1.00                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | \$0.51                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | \$1.00                       |                                   |       | X              |             |
|       | Other                | [No Response]                |                                   |       |                | X           |
| ID    | Wireline             | \$1.00                       |                                   | X     |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$1.00                       |                                   | X     |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | \$1.00                       |                                   | X     |                |             |

<sup>259</sup> At Addendum Section F1, Connecticut states: “\*The E911 Surcharge is set for the State of Connecticut’s fiscal year. Therefore fees imposed for 2023 were: Jan-June 2023 \$0.70, July-Dec \$0.68[.]” Connecticut Response at 9.

| State                                       | Service Type and Fee |  | Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance |       |                |             |
|---|----------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------|----------------|-------------|
|   | Type                 | Fee  | State                             | Local | Combo or Other | No Response |
|   | VoIP                 | \$1.00   |                                   | X     |                |             |
|   | Other                | [No Response]  |                                   | X     |                |             |
| IL (outside City of Chicago) <sup>260</sup> | Wireline             | \$1.50   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|   | Wireless             | \$1.50   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|   | Prepaid              | 3%   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|   | VoIP                 | \$1.50   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|   | Other                | A fee of which ever is greater: \$25 for each month or an amt. equal to the product of 1% and the sum of all delinquent amounts each month that payment is delinquent. | X                                 |       |                |             |
| IN  | Wireline             | \$1.00   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|   | Wireless             | \$1.00   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|   | Prepaid              | \$1.00   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|   | VoIP                 | \$1.00   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|   | Other                | [No Response]  |                                   |       |                | X           |
| KS  | Wireline             | \$0.90 per subscriber account  | X                                 |       |                |             |
|   | Wireless             | \$0.90 per subscriber account  | X                                 |       |                |             |
|   | Prepaid              | 2.06%  | X                                 |       |                |             |
|   | VoIP                 | \$0.90 per subscriber account  | X                                 |       |                |             |
|   | Other                | \$0.90 per subscriber account  | X                                 |       |                |             |
| KY  | Wireline             | \$1.39   |                                   | X     |                |             |
|   | Wireless             | \$0.70   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|   | Prepaid              | \$0.93   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|   | VoIP                 | \$1.43   |                                   | X     |                |             |
|   | Other                | \$0.00   |                                   |       |                | X           |
| LA  | Wireline             | Up to 5% of Tariff Rate on Exchange  |                                   | X     |                |             |
|   | Wireless             | Up to \$1.25 for all Parishes except for Jefferson Parish  |                                   | X     |                |             |
|   | Prepaid              | 4%   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|   | VoIP                 | varies   |                                   | X     |                |             |
|   | Other                | [No Response]  |                                   |       |                | X           |
| MA  | Wireline             | \$1.50 per month for the period ending December 31, 2023.  | X                                 |       |                |             |
|   | Wireless             | \$1.50 per month for the period ending December 31, 2023.  | X                                 |       |                |             |
|   | Prepaid              | \$1.50 per month for the period ending December 31, 2023.  | X                                 |       |                |             |
|   | VoIP                 | \$1.50 per month for the period ending December 31, 2023.  | X                                 |       |                |             |
|   | Other                | [No Response]  |                                   |       |                | X           |

<sup>260</sup> At Addendum Section F1, Illinois states: “The City of Chicago is exempt from the Statewide uniform 9-1-1 surcharge legislative requirements. The State does not collect surcharge revenue for Chicago nor does it pay for its network costs.

Wireline, Wireless, VoIP \$5.00 City of Chicago (local authority)  
Prepaid Wireless 7% City of Chicago (local authority)[.]” Illinois Response at 9-10.

| State             | Service Type and Fee |  | Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance |       |                |             |
|-------------------|----------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------|----------------|-------------|
|                   | Type                 | Fee  | State                             | Local | Combo or Other | No Response |
| MD                | Wireline             | \$2.00   |                                   |       | X              |             |
|                   | Wireless             | \$2.00   |                                   |       | X              |             |
|                   | Prepaid              | \$0.60   |                                   |       | X              |             |
|                   | VoIP                 | \$2.00   |                                   |       | X              |             |
|                   | Other                | [No Response]  |                                   |       |                | X           |
| ME                | Wireline             | \$0.35   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|                   | Wireless             | \$0.35   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|                   | Prepaid              | \$0.35   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|                   | VoIP                 | \$0.35   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|                   | Other                | [No Response]  |                                   |       |                | X           |
| MI <sup>261</sup> | Wireline             | \$0.25   |                                   |       |                | X           |
|                   | Wireless             | \$0.25   |                                   |       |                | X           |
|                   | Prepaid              | 6%   |                                   |       |                | X           |
|                   | VoIP                 | \$0.25   |                                   |       |                | X           |
|                   | Other                | Varies by county                                     |                                   |       |                | X           |
| MN                | Wireline             | \$0.80   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|                   | Wireless             | \$0.80   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|                   | Prepaid              | \$0.80   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|                   | VoIP                 | \$0.80   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|                   | Other                | [No Response]  |                                   |       |                | X           |
| MO                | Wireline             | [No Response]  |                                   |       |                | X           |
|                   | Wireless             | [No Response]  |                                   | X     |                |             |
|                   | Prepaid              | 3%   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|                   | VoIP                 | [No Response]  |                                   | X     |                |             |
|                   | Other                | [No Response]  |                                   | X     |                |             |
| MS                | Wireline             | \$1.00 residential/\$2.00 commercial line            |                                   | X     |                |             |
|                   | Wireless             | \$1.00   |                                   |       | X              |             |
|                   | Prepaid              | \$1.00   |                                   |       |                |             |
|                   | VoIP                 | 1.00 per line  |                                   | X     |                |             |
|                   | Other                | [No Response]  |                                   |       |                | X           |
| MT                | Wireline             | \$1.00   |                                   |       | X              |             |
|                   | Wireless             | \$1.00   |                                   |       | X              |             |
|                   | Prepaid              | \$1.00   |                                   |       |                | X           |
|                   | VoIP                 | [No Response]  |                                   |       |                | X           |
|                   | Other                | [No Response]  |                                   |       |                | X           |
| NC                | Wireline             | \$0.65 1/1/23 - 6/30/23;<br>\$0.55 7/1/23 - 12/31/23 | X                                 |       |                |             |
|                   | Wireless             | \$0.65 1/1/23 - 6/30/23;<br>\$0.55 7/1/23 - 12/31/23 | X                                 |       |                |             |
|                   | Prepaid              | \$0.65 1/1/23 - 6/30/23;<br>\$0.55 7/1/23 - 12/31/23 | X                                 |       |                |             |

<sup>261</sup> At Addendum Section F1, Michigan provides additional fee information: “Wireline \$0.00-\$3.00 (local, varies by county); Wireless \$0.00-\$3.00 (local, varies by county); Prepaid wireless state only, retailers point of sale for services purchased 6%; VoIP \$0.00-\$3.00 (local, varies by county).” Michigan Response at 10-11.

| State | Service Type and Fee |  | Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance |       |                |             |
|-------|----------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------|----------------|-------------|
|       | Type                 | Fee  | State                             | Local | Combo or Other | No Response |
|       | VoIP                 | \$0.65 1/1/23 - 6/30/23;<br>\$0.55 7/1/23 - 12/31/23               | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Other                | [No Response]  |                                   |       |                | X           |
| ND    | Wireline             | \$1.50-2.00  |                                   | X     |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$1.50-2.00  |                                   | X     |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | 2.5%   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | \$1.50-2.00  |                                   | X     |                |             |
|       | Other                | [No Response]  |                                   |       |                | X           |
| NE    | Wireline             | \$0.50 to \$1.00 per line  |                                   | X     |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$0.70 per line statewide except Douglas County is \$0.50 per line | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | 1.4% statewide except Douglas County which is 1                    | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | \$0.50 to \$1.00 per line  |                                   | X     |                |             |
|       | Other                | [No Response]  |                                   |       |                | X           |
| NH    | Wireline             | \$0.75   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$0.75   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | \$0.75   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | \$0.75   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Other                | N/A  |                                   |       |                | X           |
| NJ    | Wireline             | \$0.90   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$0.90   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | [No Response]  |                                   |       |                | X           |
|       | VoIP                 | \$0.90   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Other                | [No Response]  |                                   |       |                | X           |
| NM    | Wireline             | \$0.51   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$0.51   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | 1.38%  | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | \$0.51   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Other                | [No Response]  |                                   |       |                | X           |
| NV    | Wireline             | \$1.00   |                                   | X     |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$1.00   |                                   | X     |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | \$1.00   |                                   | X     |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | \$1.00   |                                   | X     |                |             |
|       | Other                | \$10.00  |                                   | X     |                |             |
| NY    | Wireline             | \$0.35 - \$1.65  |                                   | X     |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$0.30- \$1.40<br>\$1.20 <sup>[262]</sup>                          |                                   |       | X              |             |
|       | Prepaid              | \$0.30- \$1.40<br>\$.90  |                                   |       | X              |             |
|       | VoIP                 | \$0.35-\$1.65  |                                   | X     |                |             |

<sup>262</sup> At Addendum Section F1, New York states, “Where two charges are listed above, the first line reflects the Wireless Communications Surcharge (New York Tax Law § 186-g) and the second line reflects the Public Safety Communications Surcharge (New York Tax Law § 186-f). Ranges are used to summarize the different amounts that some counties are permitted to impose[.]” New York Response at 10.

| State | Service Type and Fee |                                       | Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance |       |                |             |
|-------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|----------------|-------------|
|       | Type                 | Fee                                   | State                             | Local | Combo or Other | No Response |
|       | Other                | [No Response]                         |                                   |       |                | X           |
| OH    | Wireline             | \$0.50                                |                                   | X     |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$0.25                                |                                   |       | X              |             |
|       | Prepaid              | 0.5%                                  |                                   |       | X              |             |
|       | VoIP                 | [No Response]                         |                                   |       |                | X           |
|       | Other                | [No Response]                         |                                   |       |                | X           |
| OK    | Wireline             | \$0 [1] 3-15% of the base tariff rate |                                   | X     |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$0.75                                | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | \$0.75                                | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | \$0.75                                | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Other                | \$0.00                                |                                   |       |                | X           |
| OR    | Wireline             | \$1.25                                | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$1.25                                | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | \$1.25                                | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | \$1.25                                | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Other                | \$1.25                                | X                                 |       |                |             |
| PA    | Wireline             | \$1.65                                | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$1.65                                | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | \$1.65                                | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | \$1.65                                | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Other                | [No Response]                         |                                   |       |                | X           |
| RI    | Wireline             | \$0.50                                | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$0.50                                | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | 2.5%                                  | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | Included in wireless charge           | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Other                | None                                  |                                   |       |                | X           |
| SC    | Wireline             | \$0.45 - \$1.00                       |                                   | X     |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$0.62                                | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | \$0.62                                | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | \$0.45 - \$1.00                       |                                   | X     |                |             |
|       | Other                | [No Response]                         |                                   |       |                | X           |
| SD    | Wireline             | \$1.25                                | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$1.25                                | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | 2%                                    | X                                 |       |                |             |

| State | Service Type and Fee |  | Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance |       |                |             |
|-------|----------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------|----------------|-------------|
|       | Type                 | Fee                                      | State                             | Local | Combo or Other | No Response |
|       | VoIP                 | \$1.25                                   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Other                | N/A                                      |                                   |       |                | X           |
| TN    | Wireline             | \$1.50                                   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$1.50                                   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | \$1.50                                   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | \$1.50                                   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Other                | \$1.50                                   | X                                 |       |                |             |
| TX    | Wireline             | \$0.50 <sup>[263]</sup>                  | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$0.50                                   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | 2%                                       | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | \$0.50                                   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Other                | [No Response]                            |                                   |       |                | X           |
| UT    | Wireline             | \$0.96 per line                          | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$0.96 per line                          | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | 4.9%                                     | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | \$0.96 per line                          | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Other                | [No Response]                            |                                   |       |                | X           |
| VA    | Wireline             | \$0.75                                   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$0.82                                   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | \$0.55                                   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | 0.55%                                    | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Other                | [No Response]                            |                                   |       |                | X           |
| VT    | Wireline             | 2.4% customer telecommunications charges | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | 2.4% customer telecommunications charges | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | 2.4% customer telecommunications charges | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | 2.4% customer telecommunications charges | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Other                | [No Response]                            |                                   |       |                | X           |
| WA    | Wireline             | \$0.25 State / \$0.70 County             |                                   |       | X              |             |

<sup>263</sup> At Addendum Section F1, Texas states, “VoIP monthly rates correspond to CSEC/RPC and ECD wireline rates. Texas’ 57 Municipal and Chapter 772 ECDs individually set their Landline/VoIP fee rates, which are imposed on service users’ local exchange access lines and equivalent local exchange access lines as defined in CSEC rule 255.4 (1 Tex. Admin. Code § 255.4). ECD Landline/VoIP rates generally are set at different rates for residential and business users, including trunks. ECD Landline/VoIP rates range from:  
Residential: \$.20 - \$1.44; 6% - 8% of base rate of charges of predominate telecommunications provider.  
Business: \$.50 - \$8.70; 6% - 8% of base rate of charges of predominate telecommunications provider.  
Trunks: \$.50 - \$8.70; 6% - 8% of base rate of charges of predominate telecommunications provider. For the CSEC state 9-1-1 Program, Wireline/VoIP fee and the statewide wireless, prepaid wireless, and equalization surcharge fees, the amounts are either set by or capped by the Texas Legislature.” Texas Response at 17.



| State                      | Service Type and Fee |  | Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance |       |                |             |
|----------------------------|----------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------|----------------|-------------|
|                            | Type                 | Fee  | State                             | Local | Combo or Other | No Response |
|                            | Wireless             | \$0.25 State / \$0.70 County   |                                   |       | X              |             |
|                            | Prepaid              | \$0.25 State / \$0.70 County   |                                   |       | X              |             |
|                            | VoIP                 | \$0.25 State / \$0.70 County   |                                   |       | X              |             |
|                            | Other                | [No Response]  |                                   |       |                | X           |
| WI                         | Wireline             | Varies by county, up to \$0.40 per exchange access line <sup>264</sup> |                                   |       |                | X           |
|                            | Wireless             | \$0 [ ] 0%   |                                   |       |                | X           |
|                            | Prepaid              | \$0 [ ] 0%   |                                   |       |                | X           |
|                            | VoIP                 | \$0 [ ] 0%   |                                   |       |                | X           |
|                            | Other                | \$0 [ ] 0%   |                                   |       |                | X           |
| WV                         | Wireline             | SEE BELOW SPREADSHEET SHOWING COUNTY FEES <sup>265</sup>               |                                   | X     |                |             |
|                            | Wireless             | \$3.64   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|                            | Prepaid              | 6%   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|                            | VoIP                 | SEE BELOW SPREADSHEET  |                                   |       |                | X           |
|                            | Other                | [No Response]  |                                   |       |                | X           |
| WY                         | Wireline             | \$0.75   |                                   | X     |                |             |
|                            | Wireless             | \$0.75   |                                   | X     |                |             |
|                            | Prepaid              | 1.5%   |                                   |       | X              |             |
|                            | VoIP                 | \$0.75   |                                   | X     |                |             |
|                            | Other                | [No Response]  |                                   |       |                | X           |
| <b>Other Jurisdictions</b> |                      |  |                                   |       |                |             |
| AS                         | Wireline             | [DNF]  |                                   |       |                |             |
|                            | Wireless             | [DNF]  |                                   |       |                |             |
|                            | Prepaid              | [DNF]  |                                   |       |                |             |
|                            | VoIP                 | [DNF]  |                                   |       |                |             |
|                            | Other                | [DNF]  |                                   |       |                |             |
| DC                         | Wireline             | \$0.76   |                                   | X     |                |             |

<sup>264</sup> At Addendum Section F1, Wisconsin states, “None of the ‘Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance’ for Wireline - monthly fee apply in calendar year 2023 for Wisconsin as the fee goes directly to the service suppliers for their costs to provide the 911 service.” Wisconsin Response at 10.

<sup>265</sup> At Addendum Section F1, West Virginia provides a list of county fees for Wireline and VoIP. West Virginia Response at 14-16.

| State | Service Type and Fee |  | Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance |       |                |             |
|-------|----------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------|----------------|-------------|
|       | Type                 | Fee  | State                             | Local | Combo or Other | No Response |
|       | Wireless             | \$0.76   |                                   | X     |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | \$0.76   |                                   | X     |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | \$0.76   |                                   | X     |                |             |
|       | Other                | \$.62 - Centrex / \$4.96 per PBC Trunks (\$0.62 x 8). per private branch exchange station in the District of Columbia.<br>The PBX fee per station shall be converted into a per-trunk fee based on a ratio of 8 PBX stations to one PBX Trunk. At an 8 to 1 ratio, the PBX Trunk assessment is \$4.96. |                                   |       | X              |             |
| Guam  | Wireline             | \$1.00 monthly per account <sup>266</sup>  |                                   | X     |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$1.00 monthly per account   |                                   | X     |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | \$1.00 monthly per account   |                                   | X     |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | N/A  |                                   |       |                | X           |
|       | Other                | N/A  |                                   |       |                | X           |
| NMI   | Wireline             | [DNF]  |                                   |       |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | [DNF]  |                                   |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | [DNF]  |                                   |       |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | [DNF]  |                                   |       |                |             |
|       | Other                | [DNF]  |                                   |       |                |             |
| PR    | Wireline             | .50 a month for residential subscribers, nonprofit and religious organizations<br>\$1.00 for commercial, professional and government subscribers   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | .50 a month for residential subscribers, nonprofit and religious organizations<br>\$1.00 for commercial, professional and government subscribers   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | .50 a month for residential subscribers, nonprofit and religious organizations<br>\$1.00 for commercial, professional and government subscribers   | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | VoIP                 | .50 a month for residential subscribers, nonprofit and religious organizations<br>\$1.00 for commercial, professional and government subscribers   | X                                 |       |                |             |

<sup>266</sup> At Section F1, Guam checked the boxes for “County or Local Authority” for jurisdiction receiving remittance of its listed fees. Guam Response at 9. At Section C1b, Guam indicates there was no change in the law in 2023. Guam Response at 5. However, in its Thirteenth Response at Section F1, which did not have checkboxes, Guam indicated that the “Government of Guam Treasurer” receives remittances. Guam Thirteenth Response at 8-9. For the Thirteenth Report, Bureau staff classified this response as “State.” Thirteenth Report at 109, Appx. C. As Bureau staff concluded in the Fourteenth Report for calendar year 2021 and the Fifteenth Report for calendar year 2022, we again conclude now that, for calendar year 2023, the fees likely were still going to the Government of Guam Treasurer, i.e., “State.” See Fourteenth Report at 134, Appx. C, n.262; Fifteenth Report at 144, Appx. C, n.272.

| State | Service Type and Fee |               | Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance |       |                |             |
|-------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|-------|----------------|-------------|
|       | Type                 | Fee           | State                             | Local | Combo or Other | No Response |
|       | Other                | [No Response] |                                   |       |                | X           |
| USVI  | Wireline             | \$0.80        | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Wireless             | \$0.80        | X                                 |       |                |             |
|       | Prepaid              | \$0.00        |                                   |       |                | X           |
|       | VoIP                 | \$0.00        |                                   |       |                | X           |
|       | Other                | \$0.80        | X                                 |       |                |             |

**Appendix D**  
**Information Collection Questionnaire**

**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.<sup>1</sup>

**Instructions for Filling Out the Questionnaire**

**Please read and follow these general instructions:**

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

**A. Filing Information**

**A1. Name of State or Jurisdiction**

|                              |
|------------------------------|
| <b>State or Jurisdiction</b> |
|------------------------------|

---

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

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

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

| Name | Title | Organization |
|------|-------|--------------|
|      |       |              |

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

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

**B1. Please provide the total number of active primary and secondary Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) in your state or jurisdiction that received funding derived from the collection of 911/E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2023. 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 <sup>2</sup> | Number of PSAPs |
|------------------------|-----------------|
| Primary                | ■               |
| Secondary              | ■               |
| <b>Total</b>           | ■               |

| Addendum Section B1 |
|---------------------|
| ■                   |

**B2. Please provide the total number of active telecommunicators<sup>3</sup> in your state or jurisdiction**

<sup>2</sup> A Primary PSAP is one to which 911 calls are routed directly from the 911 Control office. A secondary PSAP is one to which 911 calls are transferred from a Primary PSAP. See National Emergency Number Association (NENA), Master Glossary of 9-1-1 Terminology at 174 (June 22, 2021), [https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/standards-archived/na-na-adm-000.24-2021\\_final\\_2.pdf](https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/standards-archived/na-na-adm-000.24-2021_final_2.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> For the purposes of this questionnaire, a telecommunicator, also known as a call taker or a dispatcher, is a person employed by a PSAP who is qualified to answer incoming emergency voice, text, and multi-media calls and/or who

(continued....)

that were funded through the collection of 911 and E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2023. Telecommunicators that were not funded through the collection of 911 and E911 fees need not be included in the response boxes, but may be reported in Addendum Section B2.

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

| Addendum Section B2 |
|---------------------|
| [Redacted]          |

**B3. For the annual period ending December 31, 2023, please provide an estimate of the total cost to provide 911/E911 service in your state or jurisdiction.**

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

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

|            |
|------------|
| [Redacted] |
|------------|

| Addendum Section B3 |
|---------------------|
| [Redacted]          |

**B4. Please provide the total number of 911 voice calls that your state or jurisdiction received during the period January 1, 2023 to December 31, 2023.**

| Type of Service | Total 911 Voice Calls |
|-----------------|-----------------------|
|-----------------|-----------------------|

(Continued from previous page) \_\_\_\_\_  
 provides for the appropriate emergency response either directly or through communication with the appropriate PSAP.  
 See <https://nenawiki.org/wiki/Telecommunicator>.

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Wireline  | █ |
| Wireless  | █ |
| VoIP  | █ |
| Other (report 911 texts separately below in B.4a) | █ |
| <b>Total</b>                                      | █ |

**B4a. Please provide the total number of 911 texts that your state or jurisdiction received during the period January 1, 2023 to December 31, 2023.**

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
| Texts to 911 | █ |
|--------------|---|

|                            |
|----------------------------|
| <b>Addendum Section B4</b> |
| █                          |

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

**C1. Has your State, or any political subdivision, Indian Tribe, village or regional corporation therein as defined by Section 6(f)(1) of the NET 911 Act, established a funding mechanism designated for or imposed for the purposes of 911 or E911 support or implementation (please include a citation to the legal authority for such mechanism)? Check one.**

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

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

|   |
|---|
| █ |
|---|

**C1b. If YES to C1, during the annual period January 1, 2023 to December 31, 2023, 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.**

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

|                            |
|----------------------------|
| <b>Addendum Section C1</b> |
|                            |

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

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

|                            |
|----------------------------|
| <b>Addendum Section C2</b> |
|                            |

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

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

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

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

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



**D1a. Please briefly describe any limitations on the approval authority per jurisdiction (e.g., limited to fees collected by the entity, limited to wireline or wireless service, etc.).**

[Redacted]

**Addendum Section D1**

[Redacted]

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

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

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

[Redacted]

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

[Redacted]

**E. Description of Uses of Collected 911/E911 Fees**

**E1. Provide a statement identifying with specificity all activities, programs, and organizations for whose benefit your state, or political subdivision thereof, has obligated or expended funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes and how these activities, programs, and organizations support 911 and E911 services or enhancements of such services.**

[Redacted]

| <b>E2. Please identify the uses of the collected funds.<sup>4</sup> Check all that apply.</b>  |  |   |                          |
|--|--|---|--------------------------|
| <b>Type of Cost</b>  |  | <b>Yes</b>  | <b>No</b>                |
| <b>PSAP operating costs, including technological innovation that supports 911</b>  | Lease, purchase, maintenance, replacement, and upgrade of customer premises equipment (CPE) (hardware and software)  | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | Lease, purchase, maintenance, replacement, and upgrade of computer aided dispatch (CAD) equipment (hardware and software)  | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | Lease, purchase, maintenance, replacement, and upgrade of PSAP building/facility   | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | NG911, cybersecurity, pre-arrival instructions, and emergency notification systems (ENS)   | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>PSAP personnel costs</b>  | Telecommunicators' Salaries  | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | Training of Telecommunicators  | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>PSAP administrative costs</b>   | Program Administration   | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | Travel Expenses  | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>Costs for integration and interoperability of 911 systems and public safety/first responder radio systems</b>   | Integrating public safety/first responder dispatch and 911 systems, including lease, purchase, maintenance, and upgrade of CAD hardware and software to support integrated 911 and public safety dispatch operations | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | Providing for the interoperability of 911 systems with one another and with public safety/first responder radio systems  | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>Grant programs</b>  |  | <input type="checkbox"/><br><b>If YES, see E2a.</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>E2a. During the annual period ending December 31, 2023, describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of such grants.</b> |  |   |                          |
| <div style="background-color: #cccccc; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div>  |  |   |                          |

|                            |
|----------------------------|
| <b>Addendum Section E2</b> |
|----------------------------|

<sup>4</sup> See 47 CFR § 9.23(b)(1)–(5).

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

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

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

|                            |
|----------------------------|
| <b>Addendum Section F1</b> |
|                            |

**F2. For the annual period ending December 31, 2023, please report the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees or charges described in Question F1.**

| Service Type                        | Total Amount Collected (\$) |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Wireline                            | █                           |
| Wireless                            | █                           |
| Prepaid Wireless                    | █                           |
| Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) | █                           |
| Other                               | █                           |
| <b>Total</b>                        | █                           |

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

**Addendum Section F2**

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

| Question  | Yes                      | No                       |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>F4. For the annual period ending December 31, 2023, 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 <u>one</u>.</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

|            |
|------------|
| <b>Per</b> |
|            |

|                            |
|----------------------------|
| <b>Addendum Section F4</b> |
|                            |

| <b>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.</b> | <b>Percent (%)</b> |
|--|--------------------|
| State 911 Fees   |                    |
| Local 911 Fees   |                    |
| General Fund - State   |                    |
| General Fund - County  |                    |
| Federal Grants   |                    |
| State Grants   |                    |

|                            |
|----------------------------|
| <b>Addendum Section F5</b> |
|                            |

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

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

| <b>Question</b>  | <b>Yes</b>               | <b>No</b>                |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>G1. In the annual period ending December 31, 2023, 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</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| <b>47 CFR § 9.23? Check <u>one</u>.</b>   |  |  |  |
| <b>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.</b> |  |  |  |
| <b>Amount of Funds (\$)</b>   | <b>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.)</b> |  |  |
| ■   | ■  |  |  |
| ■   | ■  |  |  |
| ■   | ■  |  |  |
| ■   | ■  |  |  |
| ■   | ■  |  |  |

|                            |
|----------------------------|
| <b>Addendum Section G1</b> |
| ■                          |

| <b>Question</b>  | <b>Yes</b>               | <b>No</b>                |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>G2. In the annual period ending December 31, 2023, 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 <u>one</u>.</b>                              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>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</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| between the 911 request for assistance and the emergency responders.   |   |  |  |
| <b>G2a(i). If NO to G2a, please explain.</b>   |   |  |  |
|  |   |  |  |
| <b>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.</b> |   |  |  |
| <b>Amount of Funds (\$)</b>  | <b>Description of such obligations or expenditures. (If you need more rows for your response, please enter the information in Addendum Section G2.)</b> |  |  |
| █  | █   |  |  |
| █  | █   |  |  |
| █  | █   |  |  |
| █  | █   |  |  |
| █  | █   |  |  |

|                            |
|----------------------------|
| <b>Addendum Section G2</b> |
| █                          |

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

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

or charges supports 911 services?<sup>5</sup> Check one.

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

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

| Question   | Yes                      | No                       |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>G3a. Does the state or taxing jurisdiction specify the amount or percentage of such fees or charges that is dedicated to 911 services? Check <u>one</u>.</b>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Question   | Response                 |                          |
| <b>G3a(i). Cite to the authority by which the state or taxing jurisdiction specifies the amount or percentage.</b>   | █                        |                          |
| <b>G3a(ii). Indicate the amount or percentage of such a fee dedicated to 911 services. Provide <i>either</i> dollar amount or percentage. (Leave inapplicable cell blank.)</b>   | \$ █                     |                          |
|  | █ %                      |                          |
| Question   | Yes                      | No                       |
| <b>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 <u>one</u>.</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>G3b(i). Cite to the authority by which the state or taxing jurisdiction segregates such fees.</b>   |                          |                          |
| █  |                          |                          |
| Question   | Yes                      | No                       |
| <b>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 <u>one</u>.</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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



**G3c(i). If NO to G3c, please explain.**

█

**Addendum Section G3**

█

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

| Question  | Yes                      | No                       |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>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 <u>one</u>.</b>                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>H1a. If YES, provide a description of: (i) the mechanisms or procedures and (ii) any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2023. (Enter “None” if no actions were taken.)</b> |                          |                          |
| █   |                          |                          |

**Addendum Section H1**

█

| Question | Yes | No |
|----------|-----|----|
|----------|-----|----|

|   |                          |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>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 <u>one</u>.</b>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>Question</b>   | <b>Yes</b>               | <b>No</b>                |
| <b>H2a. Did your state conduct an audit of service providers in connection with such auditing authority during the annual period ending December 31, 2023? Check <u>one</u>; check N/A if Question H2 response above is NO.</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>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, 2023. (Leave blank if not applicable / no actions were taken.)</b> |                          |                          |
| <div style="background-color: #cccccc; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div>   |                          |                          |

|   |
|---|
| <b>Addendum Section H2</b>  |
| <div style="background-color: #cccccc; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div> |

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

| <b>Question</b>  | <b>Yes</b>               | <b>No</b>                |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>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 <u>one</u>.</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>I1a. If YES, please cite any specific legal authority:</b>  |                          |                          |
| <div style="background-color: #cccccc; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div>  |                          |                          |

| <b>Question</b>  | <b>Yes</b>               | <b>No</b>                |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>I2. In the annual period ending December 31, 2023, has your state or jurisdiction expended funds on NG911</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

|   |            |  |  |
|---|------------|--|--|
| programs? Check <u>one</u> .  |            |  |  |
| <b>I2a. If YES, please enter the dollar amount that has been expended during the annual period.</b> |            |  |  |
| <b>Amount (\$)</b>  | [Redacted] |  |  |

|                            |
|----------------------------|
| <b>Addendum Section I2</b> |
| [Redacted]                 |

| <b>I3. For the annual period ending December 31, 2023, please provide the number of PSAPs that operated on each type of NG911 Emergency Service IP Network(s) (ESInets) that operated within your state.</b> |                          |                          |  |   |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--------------------------|
| Type of ESInet   | Yes                      | No                       | If Yes, Enter Total PSAPs Operating on the ESInet  | If Yes, does the type of ESInet interconnect with other state, regional or local ESInets? |                          |
|  |                          |                          |  | Yes   | No                       |
| I3a. A single, state-wide ESInet   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | [Redacted]   | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| I3b. Local (e.g., county) ESInet(s)  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | [Redacted]   | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| I3c. Regional ESInets  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | [If one Regional ESInet is in operation, provide the total PSAPs on the first line below. If more than one Regional ESInet is in operation, provide the total PSAPs operating on each ESInet.] |   |                          |
| Name of Regional ESInet 1:<br>[Redacted]   |                          |                          | [Redacted]   | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> |

|  |            |                          |                          |
|--|------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Name of Regional ESInet 2:<br>[REDACTED]   | [REDACTED] | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Name of Regional ESInet 3:<br>[REDACTED]   | [REDACTED] | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Name of Regional ESInet 4:<br>[REDACTED]   | [REDACTED] | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Name of Regional ESInet 5:<br>[REDACTED]   | [REDACTED] | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Name of Regional ESInet 6:<br>[REDACTED]   | [REDACTED] | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Name of Regional ESInet 7:<br>[REDACTED]   | [REDACTED] | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>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:</b> |            |                          |                          |
| [REDACTED]   |            |                          |                          |

|                            |
|----------------------------|
| <b>Addendum Section I3</b> |
| [REDACTED]                 |

**I4. Please provide a description of any NG911 projects completed or underway during the annual period ending December 31, 2023.**

|            |
|------------|
| [REDACTED] |
|------------|

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

|  |                          |
|--|--------------------------|
| Hardware or Software Purchases or Upgrades | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| GIS  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| NG911 Security Planning                    | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Training                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**I5. As of December 31, 2023, 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, 2023 | █ |
|---|---|

|                     |
|---------------------|
| Addendum Section I5 |
| █                   |

**I6. By the end of the *next* annual period ending December 31, 2024, 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, 2024 | █ |
|---|---|

|                     |
|---------------------|
| Addendum Section I6 |
| █                   |

**J. Cybersecurity Expenditures**

| Question  | Check the appropriate box       |                                | If Yes, Amount Expended (\$) |
|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
|   | Yes                             | No                             |                              |
| J1. During the annual period ending December 31, 2023, did your state expend funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs? | Yes<br><input type="checkbox"/> | No<br><input type="checkbox"/> | █                            |

|                            |
|----------------------------|
| <b>Addendum Section J1</b> |
|                            |

| Question  | Total PSAPs |
|---|-------------|
| <b>J2. During the annual period ending December 31, 2023, how many PSAPs in your state either had a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program?</b> |             |

|                            |
|----------------------------|
| <b>Addendum Section J2</b> |
|                            |

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

|                            |
|----------------------------|
| <b>Addendum Section J3</b> |
|                            |

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

**K1. Please provide an assessment of the effects achieved from the expenditure of state 911/E911 or NG911 funds, including any criteria your state or jurisdiction uses to measure the effectiveness of the use of 911/E911 fees and charges. If your state conducts annual or other periodic assessments, please provide an electronic copy (e.g., Word, PDF) of the latest such report upon submission of this questionnaire to the FCC or provide links to online versions of**

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

such reports in the space below.

**L. Underfunding of 911**

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

**L1. Describe the impact of any underfunding of 911 services in your state or taxing jurisdiction during the annual period ending December 31, 2023. Indicate N/A if your state or taxing jurisdiction did not experience underfunding.**

**L2. Describe how any fee diversion affected 911 underfunding in your state or taxing jurisdiction during the annual period ending December 31, 2023. Indicate N/A if your state or taxing jurisdiction did not divert.**

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