



National 911 Program
Blue Ribbon Panel on 911 Funding

Current State of 911 Funding and Oversight

Washington, DC

March 20, 2013



About the National 911 Program

The National 911 Program provides Federal leadership to support and promote optimal 911 services. It was created by Congress to provide information for all 911 stakeholders to improve the 911 system, and to coordinate information sharing and activities among Federal agencies and public and private 911 stakeholders. The Program fulfills this mission by developing and distributing a variety of tools and resources for the national 911 community.

The National 911 Program is housed within the Office of Emergency Medical Services at the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration – part of the U.S. Department of Transportation.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Background	1
Current 911 Funding Mechanisms	2
Funding Issues	5
Current 911 Governance and Oversight	6
Governance Structures	6
Governance Considerations	7
Conclusion	9
Appendix A: State Governance Levels of Authority	10
Appendix B: Previous 911 Funding Studies	122
Federal Studies	122
Industry Studies	133
State Studies	144
Appendix C: Current 911 Funding Examples	155
NG911 Cost Data	155
Cost Data for E911	177
Appendix D: 911 Surcharges by State for Funding 911 Systems	188

Introduction

While there is no national consensus on how to fund or oversee 911 services, there is agreement that the transition to Next Generation 911 (NG911) will require the development of new funding and oversight models. Stakeholders agree that current 911 funding is unstable and inadequate to support the migration to NG911. In order to determine future costs, it is imperative to examine the current state of 911 funding and oversight. As 911 authorities migrate to NG911, both government and industry must understand current challenges and carefully establish a long-term approach. It is essential to institute a model that can produce consistent, sustainable funding and oversight as the transition is made to NG911.

Blue Ribbon Panel on 911 Funding. In response to a recommendation made by the FCC’s Communications Security, Reliability, and Interoperability Council (CSRIC), the National 911 Program procured the services of a company to provide specific expertise in economics, and apply that expertise to develop models for funding and oversight of 911 systems that could be applied at local, and/or State levels of government. In addition to using its economic expertise, the contractor was expected to utilize stakeholder input and guidance from a Blue Ribbon Panel to help inform its analysis. The Blue Ribbon Panel was comprised of representatives from a variety of backgrounds, including academic economists, private equity companies, and people with experience with funding large infrastructure projects. While stakeholder input was critical to the success of the project, the contractor retained responsibility for preparation and submission of the final report, containing options for local, State and national 911 funding and oversight models, based on appropriate economic theories and principles.

Current State of 911 Funding and Oversight. Utilizing *Appendix C.1: 911 Fee Summary and Overview by State* from the FCC’s Communications Security, Reliability, and Interoperability Council (CSRIC) Working Group 4B Final Report¹ and other relevant and available oversight, cost, and fee revenue data, the National 911 Program has developed this report. It includes an overview of current funding models and oversight to enable understanding of current 911 funding models across all forms of government, as preparation for participants in convening the Blue Ribbon Panel on 911 Funding. It is essential that the current 911 funding and oversight environment be understood to effectively develop new and novel approaches to the issues surrounding funding 911 systems nationwide.

Background

Today’s 911 system, designed mostly in the 1970s, is based on the operation of analog, circuit-switched network technology. During this time, 911 call processing was basic, using three-digit dialing and circuit-based transmission to public safety answering points (PSAPs), and neither automatic number identification (ANI) nor automatic location identification (ALI) functions were available. Over the years, the legacy 911 system shifted from its circuit-switched and voice-centric system operating through the existing public switched telephone network (PSTN), to a series of Internet Protocol (IP) network platforms and systems that will comprise NG911. This transition has had three major milestones. First, legacy 911 evolved to Enhanced 911 (E911) to accommodate wireless calls. E911 Phase I enabled the call taker to see the wireless callback number, as well as the location of the cell tower closest to the caller (i.e., ANI and ALI information). E911 Phase II encompasses Phase I, but also allows call takers to view the location of the caller by latitude and longitude with improved accuracy. The third milestone will be

¹ The CSRIC Working Group 4B report is available at: <http://transition.fcc.gov/pshs/docs/csrc/CSRIC-WG4B-Final-Report.pdf>

transitioning to NG911, which will allow callers to text, as well as send pictures, videos and other data to PSAPs over an IP network. It will also allow 911 calls and all forms of data to be transferred to emergency responders and other PSAPs.

The growing consumer market penetration of both wireless and VoIP telephony, and the increasing use of the advanced technologies they represent, has underscored the limitations of the current 911 infrastructure. The nation’s 911 system, based on this decades-old technology, cannot handle the multimedia and expansive data that are increasingly prevalent in personal communications. The pace of change in technology will not slow. If government wants to ensure that the general public has access to 911 from multiple communications devices, it will need to ensure that the 911 infrastructure can accommodate new technologies. If left unchanged, the current 911 system will face increasing challenges in providing 911 service as society and technology continue to advance.

Since its inception, 911 has been funded by subscriber fees on telephone landline services, but as more people used cellular technology, a new model was needed. Today, 911 fees are typically collected monthly by local telephone and wireless carriers and are remitted to the appropriate 911 entities. States are seeing a decline in 911 revenues due to a move away from landlines and the adoption of new technologies such as Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) or prepaid cellular telephones. For many states, newer technologies are not incorporated within enabling legislation that allow for 911 surcharges.

Since current structures are based on a landline only model, the funding model for 911 needs to be reexamined. Up until approximately 10 years ago, most people used landline telephones to reach 911, but with the advent of new technology, people are now using a multitude of devices to reach 911. These forms of technology include smartphones; VoIP, which includes devices such as tablets and laptops; automatic collision notification systems and text-to-911. Many of these devices can transmit new forms of data to 911 call centers, and introduce fundamental changes to the way NG911 could be funded.

Current 911 Funding Mechanisms

Like most aspects of the 911 system, funding mechanisms evolved over many years and vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Methods include surcharges on phone lines, new or portions of existing taxes, state and federal grants, and others. The table below, modified from the FCC’s CSRIC Working Group 4B document, outlines the different types of funding methods, issues facing each method today, and future issues each method will likely face with a wider implementation of NG911.

Table 1 – Current 911 Funding Mechanisms

Funding Method	Today’s Funding Issues	Future NG911 Funding Challenges
Surcharge on Wireline Telephone Subscribers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of wireline subscribers continues to decline. • Funds are insufficient in most cases to fund necessary system improvements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subscribership is predicted to continue to erode. • Funds will continue to be insufficient for current operations, investment required to implement NG911 and the system transition period.

Funding Method	Today's Funding Issues	Future NG911 Funding Challenges
Surcharge on Wireless Telephone Subscribers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funds may not be sufficient in some applications. • Cost recovery (if applicable) to carriers decreases available funding. • Audit process of carriers is not universally defined or performed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of subscribers may continue to increase for a period of time and then plateau or decrease over time. • Subscribers are shifting service from wireless to VoIP or prepaid cellular. • Long-term funding outlook may not be sufficient. Good fund maintenance and fiscal responsibility will be key.
Surcharge on Voice over IP (VoIP) Subscribers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surcharge reporting and remitting is voluntary in most states. • Even with legislation, methods to collect are inconsistent. • Audit process of service providers is not universally defined or performed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collections methods will continue to be a challenge for some time to come and are complicated further by non-US-based providers. In states where legislation has been adopted to equalize collections on VoIP 911 access (as with wireline and wireless), this fund will continue to grow. • As the number of VoIP subscribers is currently small, it is not known whether funds will be sufficient.
Prepaid Cellular Point of Sale (POS) Charge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disparate collection mechanisms are used. • Few states have legislative requirements in place. • Services have resisted collecting the 911 fee from their customers on the basis that the law, as written, does not apply to them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No monthly billing/contract exists as a mechanism for collections. • Eighty percent of prepaid services are sold by third parties who do not have a relationship with the customer. The number of POS transactions continues to increase. • Retail POS legislation is needed to ensure collections. • It is unknown whether funds will be sufficient for NG911.
General Fund Tax	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the current economic environment, increases in taxes are politically unpopular. • Sometimes levy limits prohibit additional taxing for public safety application. • Taxing mechanism is not consistent with costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Already stressed funding mechanism will likely not be able to provide all necessary additional funding needed for NG911.

Funding Method	Today's Funding Issues	Future NG911 Funding Challenges
State "Universal Service" Fee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Vermont, this fee is universal service in name, but it is not a true "universal service" as defined federally. • Thirteen states have their own state Universal Service Fee (USF)-type collection mechanism but none, other than Vermont, can use it for 911. • In all cases, state USF-type mechanisms must be coordinated with Federal USF. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Vermont, funds are collected to pay for 911 at the point of billing—not the POS. Before widespread cellular and VoIP usage, these two points were the same, but this is not true today. Out-of-state visitors call 911; out-of-state college students use cellular telephones billed to their home area; in-state residents have out-of-state service (either cellular or VoIP). In all of these cases, a local agency provides 911 service but sees no 911 revenue. This is complicated by competition in the telecommunications marketplace driving down the amount subscribers pay, and thus the percentage-based 911 funding decreases as well. • It is unclear whether a state USF would be sufficient for NG911.
Percentage of Local Service Revenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This mechanism is applicable to wireline only. • It does not take into account most of the calling methods employed today. • This is an inconsistent and declining source of funds. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With the number of wireline subscribers decreasing, this mechanism does not provide sufficient funding for NG911 needs.
Percentage of Toll Revenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Texas and California, legacy 911 is funded, in part, with explicit assessments against intrastate (predominantly wireline) toll revenue. • The Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 opened all communications markets to competition, thus continuation/expansion of such legacy methodology is neither competitively nor technologically neutral. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Owing to wireless and VoIP substitution, toll is a seriously declining revenue source for service providers. As such, it is an unsustainable source of funding. • Assessment and collection methodologies should be equitable among all communications service providers that have an obligation to provide subscribers with access to 911.
State and Federal Grants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This mechanism is often one time and limited in scope. • Ongoing operations and maintenance uses are rarely eligible for funding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This funding source is unreliable and limited in scope.

Funding Method	Today's Funding Issues	Future NG911 Funding Challenges
Public-Private Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private sector participation is common in design, building, finance, operations and maintenance of next generation technology of core social infrastructure assets. • The goal of such procurement methods is to take advantage of market efficiencies while reducing public sector exposure to risk. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficulty in developing a commercial valuation of 911 call centers for private investment and operation interest. • Difficulty in developing an attractive partnership agreement with the private sector that meets operational expectations for the public sector and investment return expectations for the private investor.
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In New York, the Targeted Accessibility Fund (TAF) assesses, and collects financial support for E911, Lifeline, and Telephone Relay Service. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This mechanism has limited application for funds.

Funding Issues

While there are many different mechanisms currently in place to fund 911 today, no accurate and sufficiently-detailed estimate exists for the funds needed to transition to NG911 or to operate an NG911 system. Some states have pilot systems in place or are in the process of implementing NG911 components, but it is uncertain if the costs incurred by these states will be replicated in other states. A formal study must be conducted to analyze and project necessary technical and operational costs, thus providing states with a benchmark of the funds needed to make the transition.

Complicating the outlook for 911 funding is the changing telecommunications landscape for consumers. There has been a moderate and consistent decline in wireline subscribers and an associated migration to wireless, VoIP and prepaid cellular services. For those states that have different levels of fees associated with each type of access method, consistent and sustainable funding can be directly affected as subscriber levels change.

Regardless of the amount of revenue collected, many states have experienced a diversion of funds from 911 to other uses. Dollars raised specifically for 911 have been diverted to state general funds, in some cases to balance state budgets, and as a result are not used for their intended purpose. The FCC releases a yearly report on the state collection of 911 revenue in their *Annual Report on State Collection and Distribution of 911/E911 Fees*². Some federal grant applications have attempted to discourage this practice by including stipulations requiring applicants to certify that 911 fees have not been used for non-911 purposes in the six months prior to the grant application. This has had limited success in keeping states from diverting 911 funds. Unfortunately, in today's difficult fiscal environment, the loss of 911 grant funding has not provided sufficient disincentive to prevent the transfer of 911 fees to the general fund.

² Available at: http://transition.fcc.gov/Daily_Releases/Daily_Business/2013/db0114/DOC-318391A1.pdf

Current 911 Governance and Oversight

As PSAP operations differ greatly from one jurisdiction to another, so do their associated governance structures. Historically, 911 authorities have been coordinated and maintained at the state or local government level with no specific mandate or requirement to coordinate interaction across jurisdictions. Because of the inability of PSAPs to interconnect, each one had to operate independently – both technically and financially. By migrating to NG911, PSAPs become part of an interconnected system of systems. This new model facilitates cost sharing and shared governance – and a major shift for 911 Authorities. The FCC has made it a priority to develop a NG911 governance structure as step four of their Five-Step Plan for NG911³. Until a more consistent structure is in place, the 911 community will have to work together to ensure success. This section will look at current methods of 911 governance nationwide, analyze the pros and cons of each, and discuss topics that should be accounted for in developing a nationwide governance structure.

Governance Structures

Existing 911 systems are managed by each jurisdiction, often at the local government level and the level of state coordination varies from state-to-state. Federal oversight is limited as well and mostly to the telecommunications carriers. Achieving optimal benefits of NG911 relies on a model where PSAPs are connected regionally, at the state level, and across the nation via secure IP networks. Implementing NG911 in this manner increases overall system resiliency and redundancy and provides an enhanced level of service to its citizens. This interconnectivity requires a new governance structure to oversee and manage the system and to achieve nationwide coordination. As jurisdictions across the country are at different levels of NG911 technology implementation, so too are the varied stages of governance.

Understandably, the original 911 governance model has led to a lack of consistency in the authority and management of these programs among jurisdictions, complicating the move to NG911. To address this lack of consistency, some jurisdictions are forming regional agreements, such as the Counties of Southern Illinois (CSI), who provides for economies of scale through the consolidation of PSAPs and ensures a common network infrastructure. Regional agreements like theirs provide the benefits of financial savings while leaving a majority of 911 authority with local 911 regulators and stakeholders.

State-level 911 authority also varies from state to state. Many states have state-level 911 programs, but the methods of funding, implementation, and management of these programs differ. Some state 911 programs are statutorily defined and have comprehensive authority while others are statutorily defined but have limited authority or an informal approach to governance. Additionally, there are a few states that have no state-level 911 authority. State level governance can be supported by policy boards made up of 911 stakeholders from different areas of the system and may include representatives of first responder agencies in addition to PSAP representatives and state and local government representatives. Many state 911 programs have responsibility for the full scope of 911 services and activities throughout their state. These states benefit from the greatest economies of scale by cost sharing and PSAP consolidation and can implement NG911 components statewide with fewer challenges arising between jurisdictions.

The current state-level governance structure and authority for state-level 911 entities, if such a structure exists, may focus only on collecting and distributing 911 funds to localities, rather than administering and managing a statewide 911 system. Although the design of NG911 lends itself to the architecture and

³ FCC Fact Sheet: *Five Step Action Plan to Improve the Deployment of Next Generation 9-1-1 (NG911)*. Available at: <https://www.fcc.gov/document/fact-sheet-five-step-action-plan-improve-deployment-next-generation-9-1-1-ng911>

functions of the system being more efficiently managed at a regional, state or even multistate level, 911 call-handling operations and response can and will remain primarily a local function. Appendix A outlines the state-level governance models.

At the national level, there is no single federal department or agency with single or ultimate authority for 911 governance and oversight. There are multiple agencies that address issues across the continuum of emergency communications: 1) caller access, 2) 911, and 3) emergency responders. The FCC exerts its regulatory authority over telecommunications providers who provide 911 service, but has no authority over state and local jurisdictions who implement that service and no authority for regulating PSAPs. The National 911 Program, housed within the U.S. Department of Transportation's (DOT) NHTSA, is charged with facilitating coordination among public and private sector 911 stakeholders at the local, state and federal levels, but has no jurisdiction to mandate policy. A number of federal agencies address the issues of emergency responders, including the Office of Emergency Communications and the U. S. Fire Administration at the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), the National Telecommunications and Information Administration at the U.S. Department of Commerce (DOC), the Office of Emergency Medical Services at the U.S. Department of Transportation and the U.S. Department of Justice, to name just a few.

Governance Considerations

The transition to NG911 brings with it an opportunity to assess governance concerns not previously existent within legacy 911. New levels of coordination, education, and funding aspects of the governance structure need to be defined or redefined. Addressing these concerns during the planning and implementation phases of NG911 will help ensure a more smooth transition to NG911.

With the diversity of existing laws and regulations that exist at all levels of government, there may be a need for legislative action to resolve regulatory and statutory issues in order to permit NG911 implementation. Some of these issues include, but are not limited to⁴:

- Collection and eligible use of 911 funds;
- State 911 program authority;
- 911 system definition;
- Technology and interconnection requirements;
- Rules concern access and sharing of 911 related data;

In September 2009, the National E-911 Implementation Coordination Office's *A National Plan for Migrating to IP-Enabled 9-1-1 Systems* identified options to address governance and policy barriers:

- Clarify jurisdictional frameworks and responsibilities and identify the coordination required at each level of government to make IP-enabled 9-1-1 possible;
- Consider developing model State legislation that would address update of regulations, legislation, and other policies to reflect modern communications and IP-enabled 9-1-1 system capabilities;
- Assign clear responsibility and authority for ensuring the availability of 9-1-1 within specific geopolitical boundaries by statute or administrative rule; and

⁴ National E-911 Implementation Coordination Office, *A National Plan for Migrating to IP-Enabled 9-1-1 Systems*. Available at: http://www.911.gov/pdf/National_NG911_Migration_Plan_FINAL.pdf

- Factor IP-enabled 9-1-1 network considerations in national broadband planning, especially as it relates to extending high-speed Internet access to currently underserved areas.

As a comprehensive review of the funding methods for NG911 is undertaken, it must include a review of the governance methods in place or needed for successful oversight of NG911. Policy development will guide the technical and operational design, acquisition, implementation, operations, and maintenance for NG911. Fundamental policy objectives will need support by adoption of effective laws and regulations to provide a legal infrastructure for all aspects of NG911.

The responsibility to identify these policy changes is under the purview of elected and appointed officials, senior government executives, 911 authorities, and PSAP managers. A community of these diverse partners can foster and support effective NG911 partnerships and the appropriate statutory and regulatory policies, while ensuring that the general public is part of the deployment and education process.

Conclusion

Funding and oversight are some of the most critical aspects necessary in making NG911 a reality. As current funding methods are becoming less effective in supporting 911 systems, new and novel approaches must be considered. Today's traditional funding approach relies mostly on taxes, fees, and surcharges, primarily from wireline and wireless subscribers. Some states have experienced success in obtaining revenues from VoIP and prepaid cellular service, however that is not universal. Currently only about half of all states are able to recover revenue from prepaid wireless phones, typically at the point-of-sale. Nearly 80% of states are able to collect fees from domestic interconnected VoIP providers. Beyond taxes, fees, and surcharges, there are a few states that have alternate methods of funding, including a state-based USF. Each of these current funding methods exhibit challenges in maintaining a consistent level of funding and may not be a viable solution for the operation of a NG911 system.

Oversight of 911 varies greatly across 911 systems. Some states have a strong, state-run 911 system, while others have no state organization responsible for managing 911, leaving 911 funding, governance, and operations up to the individual locales. However, the majority of states have a state 911 function that has the responsibility for providing statewide geographic planning, coordination, and funding responsibility for full scope of 911. Some studies have advocated for a strong state presence. There may be an opportunity to compare state-run 911 systems with less formal state 911 programs to determine the risks and benefits and to identify how the benefits could be applied as a model for other states to follow.

This document provides an overview of the current state of 911 funding and oversight and was developed to inform the Blue Ribbon Panel on 911 Funding project team. Analysis of this information and other data, plus input from a select group of funding and finance experts (the Blue Ribbon Panel) will provide the project team with the information needed to identify opportunities and ideas for improving funding and oversight that will facilitate the transition to a nationwide NG911 system.

Appendix A: State Governance Levels of Authority

Table 2 outlines the level of authority for each state’s 911 governance body.

Table 2: State Governance Levels of Authority

States	Description	Characteristics
DC	State-level 911 authority owns or operates a single statewide system with a single, state-operated PSAP	Washington, DC, is the only independent entity and is counted as a “state” for the purpose of categorization. In New Hampshire and Rhode Island, the 911 authority is part of another state agency.
CT, DE, MA, ME, NJ, VT,	State-level 911 authority owns/operates a single statewide system, and funds and operationally supports PSAPs	Vermont operates independently. In Maine, Massachusetts, Delaware ⁵ , Connecticut, and New Jersey, the 911 authority is part of another state agency.
AL, AK, AZ, CA, FL, GA, HI, ID, IL, IN, KS, MD, MI, MN, MT, NH, NM, NY, NC, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TN, UT, VA, WA, WV, WY	State-level 911 authority with statewide geographic planning, coordination, and funding responsibility for full scope of 911	Only one of the 31 state 911 programs in this category operates as a completely independent state agency or function. The remainder all are part of another state agency, though beyond that there is a great deal of diversity. For most states in this category, the 911 function is a full-fledged organizational component of another state agency, and works within the context and authority of that agency. However, a few state programs are simply attached to another state agency for administrative support, and otherwise operate independently. In some cases there is also a separate board or commission that sets policy and exerts decision authority.
TX	State-level 911 authority with less than statewide geographic planning, coordination, and funding responsibility for full scope of 911	Texas is the only state in this category, and operates as an independent state agency. In those parts of Texas outside of the state program’s geographic responsibility, regional and/or local 911 authorities have independent responsibility.
AR, IA, KY, MS, NE, OH, WI	State-level agency or board with statewide responsibility for a limited aspect of 911 (generally wireless)	Mississippi and Arkansas reflect independent agencies or boards of this sort; while Nebraska, Ohio, Iowa, Kentucky and Wisconsin are part of a larger state agency.

⁵ Responsibility for 911 in Delaware is divided between an independent Board that provides oversight and funding for locally operated PSAPs; and the State’s Department of Information and Technology, which is responsible for state technology procurements, including the 911 system.

States	Description	Characteristics
CO, ND	Informal state-level 911 focus or coordination mechanism	Two states fall into this category. North Dakota and Colorado.
LA, MO, NV	No state-level 911 focus or coordination mechanism	Three states fall into this category: Missouri, Louisiana and Nevada.

Appendix B: Previous 911 Funding Studies

Multiple studies and reports about challenges with 911 funding have been developed at the federal, state, and industry levels over several years. A survey of available resources has been conducted to summarize current challenges and funding needs, governance, and analyses of alternative funding methods in an effort to create a more sustainable model for the transition to and ongoing operation of NG911. Incorporating the findings from a combination of these studies will help paint the current picture of 911 funding and ensure a duplication of effort does not occur. In addition to assessments of current funding models, it is also important to understand the lessons learned from NG911 early adopters. These early adopters can provide the 911 stakeholder community with a snapshot of costs, including equipment and operating expenses, as well best practices for transition, operation, and maintenance. As future adopters model and adapt their 911 systems to resemble states with similar infrastructure, trends in cost savings and alternative methods will reveal themselves. Moving forward, these studies will be integral to the successful funding and implementation of NG911. The following sections describe the studies conducted at the federal, state, and industry levels.

Federal Studies

Federal agencies have conducted studies and develop reports that have assessed the approximate cost for a transition to NG911, funding issues, and have made recommendations. The FCC and DOT have reported on 911 fee structure, current levels of funding, funding challenges, and the proposed framework for NG911. These and other reports are vital to understanding the current challenges facing PSAPs and 911 authorities nationwide.

From 2006 to 2009, DOT conducted the NG911 Initiative, a research and development effort focused on outlining the architecture required for a NG911 system capable of voice, data, and video transmission to PSAPs. One of the outcomes of the NG911 Initiative was the *Final Analysis of Cost, Value, and Risk*⁶, a document that assessed the current 9-1-1 operating environment, analyzed and compared the current 9-1-1 environment with NG9-1-1, and provided a summary of value, costs, and risks across the current and NG9-1-1 scenarios.

In 2009, DOT's National E-911 Implementation Coordination Office (now known as the National 911 Program) released *A National Plan for Migrating to IP-Enabled 9-1-1 Systems*⁷ to define and document a vision for NG911 system. Key funding recommendations included:

- Ensuring NG911 upgrades are considered a fiscal priority;
- Transforming the current funding mechanisms to resolve the diminishing revenue base;
- Funding models for shared resources; and
- Ensuring 911 funds are preserved for 911 and emergency communications systems.

In 2011, FCC's Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau published a white paper on NG911 network connectivity costs: *A Basis for Public Funding Essential to Bringing a Nationwide Next Generation 911 Network to America's Communications Users and First Responders*.⁸ This cost study examines two cost models for funding the construction and ongoing costs for nationwide NG911 network connectivity and call routing between the PSAP and the commercial service provider. It does not address other costs that

⁶ Documents from DOT's NG9-1-1 Initiative project are available at: <http://www.its.dot.gov/ng911/>

⁷ Available at: http://www.911.gov/pdf/National_NG911_Migration_Plan_FINAL.pdf

⁸ Available at: http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-309744A1.pdf

PSAPs or carriers may incur in migrating to NG911, such as new systems located within the PSAP or upgrades to service provider networks to support NG911. This is one specific aspect of the overall funding needs for implementation of NG911.

This mission of the FCC CSRIC⁹ is to: “provide recommendations to the FCC to ensure, among other things, optimal security and reliability of communications systems, including telecommunications, media, and public safety.” Within the CSRIC Working Group 4B, the Funding Subgroup investigated and evaluated currently available funding models related to 911 and E911 for effectiveness and attempted to identify gaps, including challenges related to implementation of best practices and models by stakeholders within the 9-1-1 system. The CSRIC Working Group 4B’s Final Report¹⁰ describes their efforts in more detail. Select recommendations of the Funding subgroup include:

- Existing surcharges and taxes alone may no longer be adequate to fund both a legacy 9-1-1 system and a transition to next generation services, and as such, new and existing funding models should be evaluated.
- Funding sources must be predictable and sustainable and not reliant on one specific service type.
- Fund diversion or raiding should be prohibited. Sound account management practices call for transparency and accountability in the collection of funds by the government.
- A comprehensive next generation plan and strategy must be developed in sufficient detail to provide direction to states and to establish the framework at a national level and to ensure that the transition to NG9-1-1 is effective.

FCC also submits an *Annual Report on State Collection and Distribution of 911/E911 Fees*¹¹ to Congress that examines whether 911 fees are being properly used for 911 related activities, or being diverted for unrelated purposes (e.g., diverted to the State’s general fund). The 2012 report found that 45 states and Puerto Rico indicated fees are used exclusively for 911 purposes, while 5 states and Guam reported they used at least some 911 fees for other purposes/programs. Compared to previous iterations of this report, this is a reported reduction in the number of states diverting 911 fees¹². It was also indicated that 33 states allow 911 fee distribution to support NG911 implementation.

Industry Studies

At the Industry level, the National Emergency Number Association’s (NENA) Next Generation Partner Program (NGPP) and the Industry Council for Emergency Response Technologies (iCERT) (formerly known as the 911 Industry Alliance) have both produced a number of reports related to 911 funding. Gaining insight from 911 experts at NENA and iCERT is necessary in order to gain perspectives and recommendations from the industry and non-government entities.

In 2007, NENA produced a report, *Funding 911 into the Next Generation*¹³, which examined a number of funding models related to funding E911 and NG911. Options for funding models included:

- Fixed amount surcharge on all calling services;

⁹ More information on FCC CSRIC II is available at: <http://transition.fcc.gov/pshs/advisory/csric/> and CSRIC III at: <https://www.fcc.gov/encyclopedia/communications-security-reliability-and-interoperability-council-iii>

¹⁰ The CSRIC Working Group 4B report is available at: <http://transition.fcc.gov/pshs/docs/csric/CSRIC-WG4B-Final-Report.pdf>

¹¹ Available at: http://transition.fcc.gov/Daily_Releases/Daily_Business/2013/db0114/DOC-318391A1.pdf

¹² The FCC also opened a public comment period: <https://www.fcc.gov/document/fcc-seeks-comment-net-911-fee-report>

¹³ Available at: http://www.nena.org/?NGPP_911FundingRpt

- Surcharge on companies providing access to communications infrastructure;
- Universal service user fees; and
- A general fund tax.

The outcome of the paper was that a combination of these funding methods should be adopted, as well as ensuring technological advancements are continuously reflected.

In 2008, iCERT (known then as the 911 Industry Alliance) carried out a study on the *Health of the Emergency Communications Network*¹⁴ to analyze issues impacting the 911 system such as technology, governance, and funding. Key findings included:

- Consumer technology has surpassed current 911 capabilities;
- Current 911 fees are often diverted for other general purposes;
- Current funding models may be insufficient; and
- State coordination and leadership in legislating, budgeting and planning is necessary.

Resulting recommendations from the report concluded that 911 services must be better aligned with the expectations and demands of consumers and citizens, a viable funding strategy for achieving NG911 must be a priority for policymakers, and greater oversight should be used to monitor fund collection and diversion.

State Studies

State studies on cost data and alternative funding models for E911 and NG911 have also been conducted. As mentioned above, early adopters are extremely integral to the implementation of NG911 moving forward as they provide models that can be adjusted to fit each state's individual needs. They can also serve as models for lessons learned and best practices, especially relating to expenditures and deployment.

With prevalent 911 revenue disparities, some states have been proactive in determining new funding models. A case study in North Carolina was conducted in 2010 when the state directed East Carolina University to recommend a funding model for their 911 and NG911 systems. The resulting recommendation¹⁵ was a move from separate wireline and wireless fees to a single fee for all wireless, wireline, and VoIP devices. This novel approach to funding has already proven to be a success in the state, with the state being able to **decrease** its monthly 911 service charge to \$0.60.

In 2012, the Vermont Enhanced 911 Board released an *Emergency 9-1-1 Service Funding Study*¹⁶ that urged the Vermont Legislature to explore the creation of a new funding model, such as an experienced-based, call-share reimbursement model. This model that would assign a "per call" rate and would be based on the annual costs to operate the 911 system and the projected number of 911 calls for the upcoming year, with carriers remitting payments to the state 911 fund.

¹⁴ Available at: http://www.theindustrycouncil.org/publications/download_report.cfm

¹⁵ *A Report on Findings and Recommendations on 911 Costs and Funding Models for the North Carolina 911 System*. Available at: https://www.nc911.nc.gov/Board/agenda/Book/20100108_Item%2006a%20ECU%20E911-final-report-jan-6-2010.pdf

¹⁶ Available at: <http://www.leg.state.vt.us/reports/2012ExternalReports/274190.pdf>

Appendix C: Current 911 Funding Examples

Many state and local jurisdictions are planning how to support the adoption of advanced emergency communication systems in their jurisdictions. For some early adopters, this means transitioning to an IP-based statewide NG911 system. For others, this planning may focus on completing the implementation of Phase II E911 before heading into the NG911 realm. The sections below discuss how many states have planned to implement E911 and NG911 in the upcoming years. Additionally, a comprehensive list of how each state currently funds their 911 programs (e.g., taxes, surcharges, etc.) can be found in Appendix D.

NG911 Cost Data

Transition to NG911 requires a reassessment of the way that 911 is being funded. Not only must funding to update the current 911 infrastructure be obtained, but also sufficient ongoing support and maintenance funding must be made available for legacy systems during and beyond the transition period. Dual operation of old and new systems must also be supported as the migration process is completed. Leveraging the experience gleaned from early adopters will help identify new or novel approaches to funding ongoing operations and implementation, operations, and maintenance of NG911.

Some NG911 early adopters have changed the way that they collect fees and surcharges from citizens. For example, Washington State has increased monthly state and local surcharges on wireline and wireless customers in addition to implementing a monthly surcharge to VoIP customers in their state. Vermont and other states are implementing fees for prepaid wireless service at the retail point-of-sale.

At a local level, the Counties of Southern Illinois (CSI) has formed an association of counties to manage the 911 fees of member counties. It also applied for and received grant funding to assist in planning and initial network development of its NG911 system.

Many states have used grant funding from the National 911 Program¹⁷ to help develop strategic plans for NG911. The Program dispersed over \$35 million to states for a combination of wireless deployment and for assistance in implementing NG911. This program also spurred the development of State NG911 strategic plans.

Table 3 shows current cost data of a select group of NG911 early adopter states. It outlines estimated expenditures and timeframes for build out, if that detailed information was publicly made available. As early adopters are paving the way for NG911, these data are valuable for future indications of how much the transition will cost. As more systems transition to NG911, it will be helpful to compare cost data and pinpoint any potential cost savings. This will make the transition more efficient, especially as many states lack funding for 911.

Table 3: NG911 Early Adopter Cost Data

State	Time Frame	Estimated Expenditures
Alabama	2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$1.9 million for build out of 115 PSAPs¹⁸ • \$12,522 per PSAP • \$460,000 in router hardware (2 routers)
Arkansas	2012 onward	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$1 million initial investment • \$400-600,000 in ongoing costs

¹⁷ More information is available at: <http://911.gov/grants.html>

¹⁸ GCN, *A Look Inside the Future of 911 Services*. Available at: <http://gcn.com/Articles/2012/08/06/Alabama-Next-Gen-911.aspx?Page=1> (last accessed March 12, 2013).

State	Time Frame	Estimated Expenditures
<u>Connecticut</u>	2012-2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$20,000,000 total over a two-year period¹⁹ • \$60,000 in contract services implementation • \$825,000 in emergency notifications • \$11,865,468 in equipment and software
<u>Illinois</u>	2011 onward	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$450,000 per 911 agency²⁰
<u>Michigan</u>	2010-2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$0 in 2010 • \$21,473,147 in 2011 • \$10,638,747 in 2012 • \$13,640,947 in 2013 • \$11,474,280 in 2014 • \$11,474,280 in 2015 • \$11,474,280 in 2016
<u>North Dakota</u>	2009-2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$184,880 in 2009 • \$101,179 in 2010 • \$6,786,606 in 2011 • \$11,253,875 in 2012 • \$5,996,638 in 2013 • \$4,364,400 in 2014
<u>Oregon</u>	2012-2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$10,823,503 in 2012 (non-recurring cost) • \$7,115,976 in 2013-2021 (recurring cost per year)
<u>Tennessee</u>	2009-2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$44 million over 5 years in build out costs • \$90 million in installation costs • \$16.5 million per year in recurring operational costs
<u>Virginia</u>	2012 - Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$10 million²¹ • Planned cost study for statewide NG911 deployment²²
<u>Washington</u>	2009-2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$1.3 million in 2009 • \$7,598,000 in 2010 • \$15,818,267 in 2011 • \$13,452,267 in 2012 • \$16,919,067 in 2013 • \$12,962,400 in 2014 • \$12,962,400 in 2015 • \$12,962,400 in 2016 • Costs include border gateway functions, emergency services routing protocol, and NG911 equipment

¹⁹ TMCnet, *Connecticut Public Utilities Regulatory Authority Issues Final Decision – Telecom Regarding Annual Assessment Proceeding to Fund the Development and Administration of the Enhanced 911 Program*. Available at: <http://www.tmcnet.com/submit/2012/06/02/6342750.htm> (last accessed March 12, 2013).

²⁰ Clearwave Communications, *Regional 911 Project Moves Forward*. Available at: <http://clearwavebroadband.com/news/regional-9-1-1-project-moves-forward> (last accessed March 12, 2013).

²¹ GovWin Network, *Virginia NextGen 911 and Enterprise Modernization*. Available at: http://govwin.com/govwin-match-alert_blog/virginia-nextgen-911-and-enterprise/425023 (last accessed March 12, 2013).

²² *Next Generation 911 Strategic Initiative Charter*. Available at: http://www.vita.virginia.gov/uploadedfiles/VITA_Main_Public/unmanaged/NG9-1-1%20IAT%20Charter%20Final%20with%20Outcomes.pdf (last accessed March 12, 2013).

Cost Data for E911

While some states are prepared for deployment of NG911, there are many states still in the process of deploying E911 Phase II systems. Before coordinating a statewide IP-based system, current technology in these states is being updated to ensure a more common level of service.

Table 4 shows current cost data for states which are upgrading PSAPs to E911 Phase II capabilities. The table outlines a breakdown of estimated expenditures and timeframes for E911 upgrades sources. These breakdowns of costs (i.e. implementation vs. recurring, suburban vs. rural) will also help states model their NG911 cost plans after states with similar infrastructure.

Table 4: State E911 Cost Data

State	Time Frame	E911 Expenditures
Florida	2008-2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$200,509,531 in 2008 • \$205,897,678 in 2009 • \$204,533,995 in 2010 • \$215,281,659 in 2011 • \$222,919,812 in 2013
Illinois (911 Future Technology & Financial Needs Book 1)	1998-2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase II Upgrade Costs: • \$7,115,810 in rural • \$5,914,343 in suburban • \$5,912,307 in urban
Maine	2012 - ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$8.9 million in implementation • 9 million in recurring years
Vermont	2013-2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$350,000 in 2013 • \$250,000 in 2014
Washington	2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$155,627,214 in operational expenses • \$8,234,986 in E911 services

Appendix D: 911 Surcharges by State for Funding 911 Systems

Table 5 details specific legislation by state under which surcharges are collected on devices capable of calling 911 (currently wireline, wireless, VoIP and prepaid phones). The research also calls to attention the organizational structure, and there does not appear to be linkage between oversight methods and fee structure. For example, some states collect surcharges from wireline, wireless, VoIP, and prepaid, while other states collect fees only from wireline and wireless. Correcting these funding disparities so that all devices capable of reaching 911 provide some revenue would help equalize revenues. (Where possible, the State name has been hyperlinked to provide access to the actual statute.)

Table 5: 911 Surcharges by State

State	911 Funding Information
Alabama	Under Title 11, Chapter 98, Code of Alabama , a surcharge is collected and divided between the Alabama Wireless 911 Board, the wireless provider and local districts providing E911 service. The current surcharge is \$0.70 for wireless and prepaid. VoIP varies per exchange access facility and wireline surcharges are up to 5% of the maximum tariff rate. Counties with a population of less than 25,000 may charge up to \$2.00 or the 5% tariff rate. The organizational structure is local for wireline and state fee/oversight and local for wireless
Alaska	Under Alaska Statutes 29.35.131. - 911 Surcharge , a municipality is allowed to impose an enhanced 911 surcharge to fund anticipated enhanced 911 system needs. The current surcharge for wireless and wireline can range up to \$2.00. There is no surcharge for VoIP or prepaid. The organizational structure is local
Arizona	Under Title 42, Article 6: Telecommunications Services Excise Tax , a surcharge is levied for each wireline and wireless service account to finance emergency telecommunication services. The current surcharge is \$0.20 for wireline, wireless and VoIP. There is no surcharge for prepaid. The organizational structure is state fee/oversight and local
Arkansas	Under the Arkansas Public Safety Communications Act of 1985 (Act 683 of 1985, Arkansas Code §12-10-303) a service charge for 911 funding was established. The current surcharge is \$0.65 for wireless, while wireline is 5% - 12% of tariff rates. There is no surcharge for VoIP or prepaid. The organizational structure is local for wireline and state fee/oversight & local for wireless
California	Under the California Revenue and Taxation Code Sections 41001 – 41176 , the State of California 911 Emergency Communications Office manages and reimburses agencies for 911 related equipment and services. The current surcharge for wireless, wireline and VoIP is .50% of intrastate calls. There is no surcharge for prepaid. The organizational structure is state fee/oversight and local
Colorado	Under § 29-11-104 , a 911 surcharge is imposed to pay for costs of emergency telephone service, such as equipment and installation. The current surcharge for wireless, wireline, and VoIP (every billed service user) is up to \$.70 or higher with PUC approval. Prepaid is 1.4% at point of sale. The organizational structure is local

State	911 Funding Information
<u>Connecticut</u>	Under the State Statute for the E911 Telecommunications Fund, Connecticut General Statutes, Section 28-30a Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, and the Enhanced 911 Telecommunications Fund Regulations, Sections 28-24-1 through 28-24-11 , E911 is funded by the state’s 911 surcharge, which is \$0.50 for wireline and \$0.67 for wireless, VoIP (per line), and prepaid (point of sale). The organizational structure is state fee/oversight
<u>District of Columbia</u>	Under District of Columbia Code § 34-1803 , the surcharge for wireline (per exchange access line), wireless and VoIP (line, trunk, path with access to 911) is \$0.76. Prepaid is 2% of the point of sale. The organizational structure is DC Government Oversight
<u>Delaware</u>	Under Delaware Code - Section 10103: E-911 Emergency Reporting System Fund , the Emergency Reporting System is supported by a monthly surcharge of up to \$0.60 cents per month for wireline, wireless and VoIP (per access line). There is no surcharge for prepaid. The organizational structure is state fee/oversight and local
<u>Florida</u>	Under Florida Statute 365.171: Florida Emergency Telephone Act , a surcharge was imposed to help implement the 911 system. The current surcharge is \$0.50 for wireless and VoIP (per service number), while wireline ranges from \$0.41 – \$0.50. There is no surcharge for prepaid. The organizational structure is state fee/oversight and local
<u>Georgia</u>	Under Part 4, Article 2, Chapter 5 of Title 46 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated , a 911 surcharge provides for the Emergency 911 Assistance Fund. The current surcharge ranges from \$1.00 - \$1.50 for wireless, \$0.75 for prepaid and \$1.50 for wireline and VoIP. The organizational structure is local
<u>Hawaii</u>	Under Hawaii Revised Statutes 138-4 , a monthly wireless enhanced 911 surcharge is imposed upon each commercial mobile radio service connection. The current surcharge is \$0.66 for wireless and VoIP and \$0.27 for wireline. There is no surcharge for prepaid. The organizational structure is bill and keep for wireline and state fee/oversight and local for wireless
<u>Idaho</u>	Under Title 31, Chapter 48 Emergency Communications Act , Idaho has a wireless surcharge to provide for 911 services directly related to establishing, maintaining, or enhancing a 911 emergency communications service. The current surcharge is \$1.00 (max) for wireless, wireline and VoIP. There is no surcharge for prepaid. The organizational structure is local with state advisory
<u>Illinois</u>	Under 50 ILCS 753 , the Wireless E911 Surcharge ensures that funding for 911 service is maintained throughout the state. The current surcharge is \$0.73 for wireless, 1.5% of sales for prepaid and \$0.30 - \$5.00 for wireline and VoIP. The organizational structure is local for wireline and state fee/oversight and local for wireless
<u>Indiana</u>	Under Senate Bill 345 , the 911 surcharge placed on wireline and VoIP is 3%-10% of monthly access charge. The current surcharge is \$0.90 for wireless. The surcharge for prepaid is \$0.50 at the point-of-sale. The organizational structure is local for wireline and state fee/oversight and local for wireless
<u>Iowa</u>	Under Iowa Code 34A.7A Wireless Communications Surcharge Fund , a monthly surcharge is imposed on each wireless communications number provided in the state. The current surcharge is \$0.65 for wireless and VoIP and up to \$1.00 for wireline. There is a \$0.33 surcharge for prepaid per retail transaction. The organizational structure is state fee/oversight and local

State	911 Funding Information
Kansas	Under the Kansas 911 Act , funding for emergency communications is provided by the current surcharge of \$0.53 for wireless, wireline and VoIP (per number), while prepaid is \$1.06% of retail sales. The organizational structure is state fee/oversight
Kentucky	Under Revised Statute 65.760, Establishment of 911 emergency telephone service by city, county, or urban-county government – Funding , all funds are disbursed for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of the 911 emergency communications system. The current surcharge is \$0.70 for wireless and \$0.39 for prepaid; while the surcharge for wireline and VoIP (per access line) varies by county (current range is \$0.50 to \$4.50). The organizational structure is local for wireline and state fee/local and oversight for wireless
Louisiana	Under House Bill No. 782 - Prepaid Wireless 911 Service Charge , the proposed surcharge for prepaid is 2% of retail sales. The surcharge for wireless is \$0.85, the surcharge for VoIP varies per wireline structure, while the surcharge for wireline is 5% of tariff rates. The organizational structure is local
Maine	Under Maine Revised Statutes Title 25: Part 8: Chapter 352, Section 2927 , funding mandates are provided by the 911 phone surcharge, which is currently \$0.45 for wireless, prepaid (point of sale), wireline and VoIP. The organizational structure is state program
Maryland	Under Maryland Code Public Safety Title 1 – Definitions, General Provisions; Subtitle 3 - 911 Emergency Telephone System Section 1-310 - 911 surcharge , the 911 surcharge is remitted to the 911 Trust Fund. The current surcharge is \$1.00 for wireless, wireline and VoIP (per all local access lines). There is no surcharge for prepaid. The organizational structure is state fee/oversight and local
Massachusetts	Under Chapter 223 of the Acts of 2008 , the state imposes a surcharge to be used for expenses associated with: the lease, purchase, upgrade or modification of primary and regional PSAP equipment; network development, operation and maintenance; and training of 911 telecommunicators regarding the use of enhanced 911. The current surcharge is \$0.75 for wireless, wireline and VoIP (per access line). Prepaid retailers can either collect a monthly surcharge from the subscriber or calculate and remit the surcharge monthly. The organizational structure is state program
Michigan	Under Senate Bill 410 , the 911 surcharge provides for the installation, operation, modification, and maintenance of universal emergency 911 service. The current surcharge for wireless, wireline and VoIP (per access point or line) is a \$0.19 State fee and \$0.00 - \$3.00 by County. The surcharge for prepaid (monthly state fee) is \$0.90. The organizational structure is state and local for wireline and state fee/oversight and local for wireless
Minnesota	Under House Bill 441 , the surcharge helps to maintain the 911 emergency network throughout Minnesota. The current surcharge is \$0.80 for wireless, wireline, prepaid and VoIP (per number). The organizational structure is state fee/oversight and local
Mississippi	Under Senate Bill 2938 , the Enhanced 911 surcharge is \$1.00 for wireless and \$0.85 to \$2.05 for wireline. There is no surcharge for VoIP or prepaid. The organizational structure is local for wireline and state fee/oversight and local for wireless
Missouri	Under Senate Bill 966 , Missouri’s 911 surcharge provides public agencies with a source of revenue for costs of establishing, upgrading, operating and maintaining an emergency telephone system. There is no surcharge for wireless, prepaid or VoIP. The surcharge for wireline is 15% of tariff rate or \$0.75. The organizational structure is local

State	911 Funding Information
Montana	Under Montana Code Annotated 10-4-21 , the surcharge covers administrative costs for basic and enhanced 911 emergency telephone service accounts. The current surcharge is \$1.00 for wireline, wireless and VoIP (all accessible 911 service). There is no surcharge for prepaid. The organizational structure is state fee/oversight and local
Nebraska	Under Nebraska Revised Statute 86-435 , the surcharge pays for 911 services. The current surcharge is \$0.50-\$0.70 for wireless and \$0.50 or higher (under certain conditions) for wireline. There is no surcharge for VoIP or prepaid. The organizational structure is local for wireline and state fee/oversight and local for wireless
Nevada	No 911 state level surcharge legislation could be obtained for Nevada. The surcharge for wireline and wireless is \$0.25 or tax base. There is no surcharge for VoIP or prepaid. The organizational structure is local
New Hampshire	Under House Bill 388 , surcharges are deposited in the enhanced 911 system fund. The current surcharge is \$0.25 for wireless and wireline. There is no surcharge for prepaid and VoIP. The organizational structure is state program
New Jersey	Senate Bill 1716 imposes an "Emergency Preparedness and 911 System Assessment" surcharge used for replacing the current 911 infrastructure with a state-of-the-art enhanced 911 system. The current surcharge is \$0.90 for wireless, wireline and VoIP (per access line). There is no surcharge for prepaid. The organizational structure is state program
New Mexico	No 911 state level surcharge legislation could be obtained for New Mexico. The surcharge is intended to cover annual debt service charges on all outstanding enhanced 911 bonds. The current surcharge is \$0.51 for wireless and wireline. There is no surcharge for prepaid and VoIP. The organizational structure state fee/oversight and local
New York	Under NY Code – Article 6, Section 303 , a surcharge is imposed to pay for the costs associated with obtaining, operating and maintaining the telecommunications equipment and telephone services needed to provide enhanced 911. The current surcharge is \$0.35 or \$1.00 for wireline and \$0.35 - \$1.25 for wireless. There is no surcharge for prepaid or VoIP. The organizational structure is local for wireline and state fee/oversight and local for wireless
North Carolina	Under sections 62A-4 and 62A-8 of the General Statutes of North Carolina , a surcharge is imposed to pay for the costs of operating a 911 system. The current surcharge is \$0.60 for wireless, wireline and VoIP (per access line). There is no surcharge for prepaid. The organizational structure is state fee/oversight
North Dakota	Under Chapter 645 of the 1985 Session Laws , the surcharge is used for infrastructure, such as new radios, phones or system upgrades, as well as training and related travel. The current surcharge is \$1.00 - \$1.50 (max) for wireless, prepaid, wireline and VoIP (per access line). The organizational structure is local
Ohio	Under House Bill 360 , wireless customers throughout Ohio pay a surcharge to fund enhanced wireless 911 capabilities. The current surcharge is \$0.28 for wireless and property tax and/or fee up to \$0.50 for wireline. There is no surcharge for prepaid or VoIP. The organizational structure for wireline is local and state fee/oversight and local for wireless

State	911 Funding Information
Oklahoma	Under revised Senate Bill 2252 , the surcharge imposed is intended to pay for 911 services. The current surcharge is \$1.50 for wireless and varies up to 15% of tariff rates for wireline. VoIP varies per wireline structure and there is no surcharge for prepaid. The organizational structure is local
Oregon	Under ORS 403.100 – (403.380) , surcharges are used to fund the statewide 911 program. The current surcharge is \$0.75 for wireless, wireline and VoIP (per telephone exchange access lines and channels). There is no surcharge for prepaid. The organizational structure is state fee/oversight and local
Pennsylvania	Act 56 , which further amended Act 78 , allows for the collection of a surcharge per device and is remitted to the State Treasury. Cities and counties must use those funds to develop and maintain an integrated wireless E911 system. The current surcharge is \$1.00 for wireless and VoIP (any number that has outbound calling capability) and \$1.00 - \$1.50 for wireline. The organizational structure is local for wireline and state fee/oversight and local
Rhode Island	Under Section 39-1-62 of the General Laws in Chapter 39-1 entitled "Public 2 Utilities Commission" the surcharge and is intended to be used for operating and maintaining state-of-the-art equipment in public safety agencies. The current surcharge is \$0.47 for wirelines, wireless and VoIP. There is no surcharge for prepaid. The organizational structure is state program
South Carolina	Under South Carolina Bill 4551 , a 911 charge is imposed. The current surcharge is \$0.62 for wireless and prepaid (at point of transaction), and \$0.50 - \$1.00 for wireline and VoIP based on number of access lines per jurisdiction. The organizational structure is local for wireline and state fee/oversight and local for wireless
South Dakota	Under South Dakota Codified Laws, Chapter 34-45 , the Legislature approved an increase in the traditional surcharge from the current \$0.75 per month to \$1.25 per month for wireless and wireline. The surcharge for prepaid is 2% at point of sale. The organizational structure is state fee/oversight and local
Tennessee	Under Tenn. Code Ann. § 7-86-128 , retailers must collect an E911 surcharge from consumers on each retail transaction for the purchase of prepaid wireless telecommunications. The current surcharge is \$0.53 on every prepaid transaction, \$1.00-\$3.00 for wireless and VoIP, while the surcharge for wireline is up to \$1.50 (residential) and up to \$3.00 (business). The organizational structure is local for wireline and state fee/oversight and local for wireless
Texas	Under Texas Health & Safety Code, Section 771.071 , a 911 surcharge is set to fund the provision of 911 emergency telecommunications services. The current surcharge is \$0.50 for wireless, wireline and VoIP (per local exchange service switched access line). The surcharge for prepaid is 2% of sales. The organizational structure is combination
Utah	Under House Bill 36 , a surcharge per month is collected to ensure all areas are served by Enhanced 911 and to implement Phase II wireless service. Enacted in 2011, under HB 303 , the collection of a prepaid wireless 911 service charge from a prepaid wireless customer is now at the point of retail sale. The current surcharge is a \$0.61 local surcharge plus \$.08 cent state for wireless, wireline and VoIP (per access line). The surcharge for prepaid is 1.9% at point of sale. The organizational structure is local for wireline and state fee/oversight and local for wireless

State	911 Funding Information
Vermont	Under Title 30: Public Service Chapter 87: Enhanced 911 Emergency Response System , there is no set surcharge (Universal Service Funding is enforced). The funds cover the purchase of network equipment and software, development of data bases, and provides for training and public education of enhanced 911. The organizational structure is state program
Virginia	Under 56-484.17 , sixty percent of the Wireless E911 Fund is distributed on a monthly basis to PSAPs. The current surcharge is \$0.75 for wireless, wireline and VoIP. The surcharge for prepaid is \$0.50 per retail transaction. The organizational structure for wireline is state and state fee/oversight and local for wireless
Washington	Under Chapter 82.14B of the Revised Code of Washington , the E911 system is funded through a state rate of \$0.25 cents per month, with a local surcharge of \$0.70 for wireless, wireline and VoIP. There is no surcharge for prepaid. The organizational structure is state fee/oversight and local
West Virginia	Under HB 3208 , the bill redistributes 911 funding between West Virginia’s 55 counties, with all counties receiving an equal percent of the funding distribution. The current surcharge is \$3.00 for wireless, varies by county for wireline and VoIP and 6% at point of sale for prepaid. The organizational structure is local
Wisconsin	Under Wis. Stat. § 256.35(3) , the 911 statute permits funding to be disbursed for 911 related telephone network expenses. The current surcharge for wireline varies and there is no surcharge for wireless, VoIP or prepaid. The organizational structure is local
Wyoming	Under section 16-9-103 of the Wyoming Statutes , a monthly 911 emergency surcharge is imposed to pay for the costs of operating a 911 system. The current surcharge is \$0.25 – 0.75 for wireless, wireline and VoIP. There is no surcharge for prepaid. The organizational structure is local