



OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

August 13, 2010

The Honorable John D. Rockefeller
Chairman
Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation
United States Senate
254 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Chairman Rockefeller:

Enclosed, please find the second annual Report submitted by the Federal Communications Commission in accordance with Section 101 of the New and Emerging Technologies 911 Improvement Act of 2008 ("NET 911 Act").

Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, which appears to be "J. Genachowski", is written over the typed name. The signature is stylized with a large, sweeping initial "J" and a horizontal line extending to the right.

Julius Genachowski

Enclosure

SECOND ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS
ON STATE COLLECTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF
911 AND ENHANCED 911 FEES AND CHARGES

Submitted Pursuant to
Public Law No. 110-283

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Julius Genachowski, Chairman

AUGUST 13, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Paragraph
I. Introduction	2
II. Background	2
III. Discussion	4
A. State Collection of 911/E911 Fees and Charges	4
B. State Estimates of Collected 911/E911 Funds for 2008	7
C. Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges To Fund Programs Other Than 911/E911 Services.....	10
D. Indian Tribes	12
IV. Conclusion	12
Appendices	

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This report is submitted by the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission (Commission),¹ pursuant to the New and Emerging Technologies 911 Improvement Act of 2008 (NET 911 Act).² This report, which was prepared by Commission staff,³ is the second annual report on the collection and distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 (E911) fees and charges by the states, the District of Columbia, the U.S. territories, and the Indian territories, covering the period from January 1 to December 31, 2009.

II. BACKGROUND

2. Section 101 of the NET 911 Act adds a new section 6(f)(2) to the Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act of 1999 (Wireless 911 Act), which provides:

To 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, the Commission shall submit a report within 1 year after the date of enactment of the New and Emerging Technologies 911 Improvement Act of 2008, and annually thereafter, to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives 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 for any purpose other than the purpose for which any such fees or charges are specified.⁴

3. In order to collect the data necessary to compile the report, the Commission received authorization from the Office of Management Budget (OMB) to implement a data collection program.⁵

¹ See 47 U.S.C. § 155(a) (1996) (stating, *inter alia*, that “[i]t shall be [the Chairman’s] duty . . . to represent the Commission in all matters relating to legislation and legislative reports”).

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

³ See 47 C.F.R. § 0.191(k) (2008) (providing delegated authority to the Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau to develop responses to legislative inquiries).

⁴ NET 911 Act § 101(2); Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act of 1999, Pub. L. No. 106-81, 113 Stat. 1286, § 6(f)(2) (1999) (Wireless 911 Act). The NET 911 Act was signed into law on July 23, 2008.

⁵ See Letter from Kevin F. Neyland, Deputy Administrator, Office of Info. & Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, to Karen Wheelless, Certifying Official, FCC (Jan. 26, 2009) OMB Control No. 200812-3060-008.

On July 22, 2009, the Commission submitted its first Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges.⁶ In that report for the annual period ending December 31, 2008, the Commission found that twenty-four (24) jurisdictions collected 911/E911 fees at the state level, eleven (11) at the local level and nineteen (19) states collected at both the state and local levels.⁷ Estimates of funds collected ranged from a low of \$1,468,363 in Guam to a high of \$190,239,804.99 in Pennsylvania.⁸ The 2009 Report also found that “a majority of respondents: thirty (30) states, Guam, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico” used the funds exclusively for 911/E911 purposes, while twelve (12) states used some portion of their funds to support other programs.⁹ Additionally, seven (7) states were unable to report whether local funds collected in connection to 911/E911 were used exclusively for that program.¹⁰ Other uses of funds ranged from depositing them into the state’s general fund to purchasing public safety radio equipment.¹¹

4. On February 5, 2010, the Commission’s Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau (the Bureau) issued a Public Notice soliciting specific information from state, territory, and tribal authorities regarding the collection and use of 911/E911 funding in their jurisdictions for the annual period ending December 31, 2009.¹² The Public Notice sought the following information:

- A statement as to whether or not the state has established a funding mechanism designated for or imposed for the purposes of 911 or E911 support or implementation (including a citation to the legal authority for such mechanism).
- The amount of the fees or charges imposed for the implementation and support of 911 and E911 services, and the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees or charges, for the annual period ending December 31, 2009.
- A statement describing how the funds collected are made available to localities, and whether the state has established written criteria regarding the allowable uses of the collected funds, including the legal citation to such criteria.
- A statement identifying any entity in the state that has the authority to approve the expenditure of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes, and a description of any oversight procedures established to determine that collected funds have been made available or used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism, or otherwise used to implement or support 911 or E911.
- A statement whether all the funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes have been made available or used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism, or otherwise used for the implementation or support of 911 or E911.

⁶ Federal Communications Commission, Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges (July 22, 2009) (2009 Report).

⁷ *Id.* at ¶¶ 8-10.

⁸ *Id.* at ¶ 12.

⁹ *Id.* at ¶ 13. The Commission continues to receive information. For instance, Indiana reports that during its 2008 annual audit, the Indiana State Board of Accounts found “minor incidents of funds being used in a manner other than the intended designation.” Indiana Response at 4. Indiana reports that “[t]hese infractions were neither fraudulent nor deliberate and very minimal in scope.” *Id.*

¹⁰ *Id.* at ¶ 15.

¹¹ *See id.* at tbl 4.

¹² Information Collection Mandated By the New and Emerging Technologies Improvement Act of 2008, PS Docket No. 09-14, *Public Notice*, 25 FCC Rcd 1317 (PSHSB 2010).

- A statement identifying what amount of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes were made available or used for any purposes other than the ones designated by the funding mechanism or used for purposes otherwise unrelated to 911 or E911 implementation or support, including a statement identifying the unrelated purposes for which the funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes were made available or used.
- Any other comments the respondent may wish to provide regarding the applicable funding mechanism for 911 and E911.

5. On March 5, 2010, the Bureau sent letters to the Office of the Governor of each state and territory and the Regional Directors of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) requesting the information sought in the Public Notice. The Bureau also sent copies of the Public Notice to the Secretary of State, Public Utility Commission Chairman, and 911 Director of each state and equivalent offices in the territories. The Public Notice and letters set a due date for submission of information of March 23, 2009. On April 13, 2010, the Bureau sent Second Notice letters to those states and territories that had not yet replied to the initial request for information. On May 24, 2010, Bureau staff placed telephone calls to states, territories and BIA Offices that had not responded as of that date.

6. The Bureau received responsive information from every state and from the District of Columbia.¹³ As for the U.S. territories, we received responses from Puerto Rico, American Samoa, and the US Virgin Islands; we did not receive responses from the Northern Mariana Islands or Guam.¹⁴ Additionally, we received eight responses from the BIA offices regarding the status of 911/E911 for Indian Tribes. The responses that the Commission received are attached to this report as Appendix B.

III. DISCUSSION

7. Based upon the information gathered from the responding states and territories, this report describes how states and other entities collected 911/E911 funds in 2009, how they oversaw the expenditure of these funds, and how much they collected. The report also describes the extent to which states spent the collected 911/E911 funds on programs other than those that support or implement 911/E911 services.

A. State Collection of 911/E911 Fees and Charges

8. States use a variety of methods to collect and distribute 911/E911 fees. Table 1 provides an overview of whether 911/E911 funds are collected by the state (or equivalent jurisdiction), by local jurisdictions, or through a combination of the two.

Table 1

Type of Collection	Number of States
State Collection	22
Local Authority	11

¹³ While Nevada did not provide a single state-level response, several Nevada counties, representing the major population centers, provided information. The Commission received responses from Clark County, Douglas County, and Washoe County.

¹⁴ American Samoa reported that it does not impose any fees or charges in connection with 911/E911 services, so Puerto Rico and the US Virgin Islands are the only territories discussed in this report.

Hybrid	19
No Response	3 ¹⁵

9. Twenty-two respondents report that statewide E911 fees are collected by the state and then either distributed to counties or administered directly by the state.¹⁶ Maine, for example, reports that it imposes a statewide surcharge on monthly telephone exchange lines, and administers the collection and expenditure of 911 funds within the state.¹⁷ Maine reports that its statute granting the state authority to collect and administer 911 funds created an Emergency Services Communications Bureau within the State Public Utility Commission, which implements and manages the 911/E911 system.¹⁸ This system serves the entire state, including Indian tribes within Maine.¹⁹

10. Eleven states report that they allow counties and other local jurisdictions to establish funding mechanisms, subject to state statutory requirements, for 911 and E911 purposes.²⁰ Colorado is typical of such states. In Colorado, state statutes authorize local governing bodies to charge fees to support 911 services with certain restrictions.²¹ Under the Colorado statutes, local governing bodies impose an emergency telephone charge for emergency telephone services to cover the costs of “equipment, installation, and other directly related costs.”²² This charge may not exceed seventy cents per month per “exchange access facility, per wireless communications access, and per interconnected [VoIP] service in those portions of the governing body’s jurisdiction for which emergency telephone service will be provided.”²³

11. Nineteen states report that they employ a hybrid approach where two or more governing bodies or providers are allowed to collect surcharges from customers.²⁴ For instance, Illinois reports that it allows local governments to establish “Emergency Telephone System Boards” that set and distribute telephone bill surcharges, but also empowers the Illinois Commerce Commission to levy and collect surcharges on wireless subscribers.²⁵ The Illinois Commerce Commission has created two separate funds through its surcharge – one to reimburse wireless carriers for 911 costs and the other to pay for wireless 911 services.²⁶

¹⁵ Louisiana and Mississippi did not respond to the Commission’s information request. American Samoa reported that they do not have an established funding mechanism for 911/E911.

¹⁶ This category includes Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virgin Islands and Virginia.

¹⁷ See Maine Response at 1.

¹⁸ See *Id.* at 1-2.

¹⁹ *Id.* at 2.

²⁰ This category includes Alaska, Colorado, Idaho, Missouri, Nevada, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

²¹ See Colorado Response at 1; Colo. Rev. Stat. § 29-11-102.

²² See Colorado Response at 1; Colo. Rev. Stat. § 29-11-102(1)(a).

²³ Colorado Response at 2; Colo. Rev. Stat. § 29-11-102(2)(a).

²⁴ This category includes Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Nebraska, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, and Washington..

²⁵ Illinois Response at 3-4.

²⁶ *Id.* at 4.

12. Table 2 indicates whether each state controls the expenditures of funds collected from 911/E911 surcharges. States that responded “no” to this question typically cede control of 911/E911 funds to local jurisdictions.

Table 2

State	State Approval of Expenditures?
Alabama	State oversight for wireless. Local control for wireline.
Alaska	No
Arizona	Yes
Arkansas	No
California	Yes
Colorado	No
Connecticut	Yes
Delaware	Yes
District of Columbia	Yes
Florida	Yes
Georgia	Yes
Guam	Did not provide.
Hawaii	Yes
Idaho	No
Illinois	State oversight for wireless. Local control for wireline.
Indiana	Yes
Iowa	Yes
Kansas	Yes
Kentucky	State oversight for wireless. Local control for wireline.
Louisiana	Did not provide.
Maine	Yes
Maryland	Yes
Massachusetts	Yes
Michigan	Yes
Minnesota	Yes
Mississippi	Did not provide.
Missouri	No
Montana	Yes
Nebraska	State oversight for wireless. Local control for wireline.
Nevada	No ²⁷
New Hampshire	Yes
New Jersey	Yes
New Mexico	Yes
New York	State oversight for some wireless charges. Local control for wireline and some

²⁷ While the State of Nevada did not provide information on this subject, Clark County indicated in its response that the Boards of any County in the State are responsible for approving 911/E911 expenditures.

State	State Approval of Expenditures?
	wireless charges.
North Carolina	Yes
North Dakota	Yes
Ohio	No
Oklahoma	No
Oregon	Yes
Pennsylvania	State oversight for wireless. Local control for wireline.
Puerto Rico	Yes
Rhode Island	Yes
South Carolina	Yes
South Dakota	No
Tennessee	Yes
Texas	Yes
Utah	No
Vermont	Yes
Virginia	Yes
Washington	Yes
West Virginia	Yes
Wisconsin	Yes
Wyoming	No

B. State Estimates of Collected 911/E911 Funds for 2009

13. Table 3 shows the reported amount of money collected by various states, territories, and in a few cases, political subdivisions, for the year ending December 31, 2009. The fees range from an estimated low of \$1,400,000 in Hawaii to an estimated high of \$203,547,359.97 in Texas. Some states did not provide an estimate of the amount raised. Some states provided separate figures for wireless and wireline services (and, in one case, for VoIP services as well). Other states provided separate figures for charges collected locally and those collected at the state level. Eleven states did not provide any fee collection information for 2009.

Table 3

State	Funds Collected in 2009
Alabama	Wireless: \$29,857,571.09
	Wireline: Did not provide
Alaska	\$8,199,046.36
Arizona	\$17,460,160.00
Arkansas	Did not provide.
California	\$101,450,093.46
Colorado	\$45,000,000
Connecticut	\$21,397,572.52
Delaware	No less than \$2,259,727.83 per legislative mandate.
District of Columbia	\$12,714,347.00

State	Funds Collected in 2009
Florida	Wireline: \$49,599,186
	Wireless: \$75,932,488
Georgia	\$8,537,319
Guam	Did not provide.
Hawaii	Wireline: \$1,400,000 (approx)
	Wireless: \$8,178,764.44 (approx)
Idaho	\$18,673,808.67
Illinois	Wireline: Did not provide.
	Wireless: \$67,000,000 excluding Chicago
Indiana	Wireline: Respondent provided an estimate of \$37,304,273 for 2008. (No information for 2009)
	Wireless: Respondent provided an estimate of \$26,900,000.00 for 2008. (No information for 2009)
Iowa	Wireline: \$14,992,268
	Wireless: \$16,466,263
Kansas	\$6,705,538.67
Kentucky	Wireline: Did not provide.
	State Wireless: \$22,979,827.96
Louisiana	Did not provide
Maine	\$6,108,985
Maryland	\$55,556,616.37
Massachusetts	\$69,694,702
Michigan	Counties: \$65,881,869.64
	State: \$27,118,262.60
Minnesota	\$51,269,514.00
Mississippi	Did not provide.
Missouri	Did not provide
Montana	\$13,172,462.14
Nebraska	Wireline: \$5,507,239.80
	Wireless: Respondent provided an estimate of \$6,284,559.15 for 2008. (No information for 2009)
Nevada	Did not provide

State	Funds Collected in 2009
New Hampshire	Did not provide
New Jersey	\$128,900,000.00
New Mexico	\$12,073,923.31
New York	Counties: Respondent provided an estimate of over \$23,300,000.00 for 2008. (No information for 2009)
	New York City: Respondent provided an estimate of over \$60,400,000.00 for 2008. (No information for 2009)
North Carolina	\$87,367,015
North Dakota	\$8,369,366
Ohio	Wireline: Did not provide
	Wireless: \$28,164,049.54
Oklahoma	Did not provide
Oregon	\$40,155,054.04
Pennsylvania	Wireline: Did not provide
	Wireless: \$105,357,828
	VoIP: \$11,298,364.90
Puerto Rico	\$21,876,276.72
Rhode Island	\$18,200,000
South Carolina	Wireless: Respondent provided an estimate of over \$22,000,000.00 for 2008. (No information for 2009)
	Wireline: Did not provide
South Dakota	Did not provide
Tennessee	Wireline: Respondent provided an estimate of \$43,900,000 for 2008. (No information for 2009)
	Wireless: \$55,965,000 (does not include Nov and Dec which are not available yet)
Texas	\$203,547,359.97
Utah	\$2,724,374.00
Vermont	\$5,487,046.00
Virgin Islands	\$590,812.00
Virginia	\$52,022,170.24
Washington	County: \$50,481,165.00
	State: \$20,555,553.00

State	Funds Collected in 2009
West Virginia	\$33,760,563.00
Wisconsin	Wireline: Did not provide
	Wireless: \$0 (discontinued in 2008)
Wyoming	Did not provide

C. Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges To Fund Programs Other Than 911/E911 Services

14. The majority of respondents – 32 states, plus the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands – indicate that 911/E911 surcharges are used only for 911/E911 purposes. Thirteen states, however, report that collected funds are or may be used, at least in part, to support programs other than 911 and E911. Two states did not respond, and three states did not provide this information.

15. States that reported that they use 911/E911 funds for other purposes indicated that they use the collected money for a variety of reasons. For instance, Virginia's proposed biennial budget proposes that \$8M be transferred from the Wireless E911 Fund to the Compensation Board in order to support sheriffs' 911 dispatchers.²⁸ Ten states (Arizona, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Nebraska, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Wisconsin) report that they used money collected for 911/E911 to assist in closing the states' general fund, although Wisconsin stated that it only used monies in excess of wireless E911 obligations.²⁹ In last year's Report, the Commission found that five states reported using 911/E911 funds to assist in closing the state's general fund.³⁰

16. Of the states that reported using funds for non-911/E911 purposes in this year's report, six also reported using funds for non-911/E911 purposes in the 2009 Report (Illinois, Nebraska, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin). Seven states reporting using funds for non-911/E911 purposes in 2008, but not in 2009 (Idaho, Maine, Montana, New Jersey, Tennessee, and Utah). Finally, seven states reported using fund for non-911/E911 purposes in 2009, but not in 2008 (Arizona, California, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Virginia and Washington).

17. In short, at the state level, most states used the 911/E911 fees they collected in 2009 solely to fund 911/E911 services. Some of the remaining states use some 911/E911 fees for related expenses, such as to cover the administrative costs of collecting the fees, or for other public safety purposes (such as public safety radio communications). Below, Table 4 summarizes the reported uses of revenue in the states that reported using 911/E911 fees for purposes other than 911/E911.

Table 4

State	Use of 911/E911 Fees/Charges for Other Purposes
Arizona	\$8,655,700 was transferred to the State of Arizona General Fund.

²⁸ Virginia Response at 3.

²⁹ See Table 4.

³⁰ 2009 Report at ¶ 14.

State	Use of 911/E911 Fees/Charges for Other Purposes
California	In fiscal year 2008-2009, CAL FIRE appropriated \$2,393,000 from State Emergency Telephone Number Account to purchase and install new hardware and Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) software. Redundant hardware and CAD systems were purchased for use in training at the Fire Academy. CAL FIRE's use of SETNA did not follow established procedures for 911 related expenditures, but equipment purchased is for use in response to 911 call activity.
Delaware	In April 2009, Delaware's General Assembly enacted legislation transferring \$4 million into the state's General Fund. The allocated funds were a surplus of collections generated from the wireline surcharge.
Georgia	In the annual period ending December 31, 2009, \$8,537,319 was collected in prepaid 911 fees. None of these funds were allocated for 911 or E911 use. These funds remained in the general fund of the state treasury.
Hawaii	\$16,000,000 to General Fund.
Illinois	\$30.5 million will have been transferred from the Wireless Carrier Reimbursement Fund to the State's General Revenue Fund, including \$253,000 chargeback, between July 2003 and April 2010. This is because funds were unclaimed by wireless carriers, and state law has been amended to allow those "excess" funds to be transferred once per year to the State's Wireless Service Emergency Fund.
Nebraska	\$273,889.35 used for administrative expenses (authorized by statute). In December 2009, the Nebraska Legislature transferred approximately \$3.4 million in interest to address state budget shortfalls.
New York	\$10 million from the Local Wireless account was placed in the State's General Fund.
Oregon	As stated in Oregon's March 23, 2009 report, in February 2009, the Oregon Legislature reallocated \$3.6 million from the 911 fund, sub account and Equipment Replacement Account, to the State's general fund. Since last year's report, no funds collected for E911 purposes were made available or used for any purposes other than the ones designated by the funding mechanism. However, as of August 1, 2009 all interest accrued on the 911 accounts is transferred to the State's general fund.
Rhode Island	Approximately \$13,373,068 went to the State's General Fund and was used for purposes other than E911 operation.
Virginia	Current proposed biennial budget proposes that \$8 million be transferred from the Wireless E911 Fund to the Compensation Board in order to support sheriffs' 911 dispatchers. Although the support of the sheriffs' 911 dispatchers is not specifically mentioned in the funding mechanism established in Code, the purposes are directly related to supporting E911.
Washington	The control process that the State E911 Program Office utilizes, along with audit controls provided by the Office of the State Auditor, have uncovered instances of use of E911 Funds for unauthorized purposes, all of which were promptly remedied. During the 2001-2002 fiscal years the Legislature modified the purposes for which the State E911 funds could be utilized to include appropriations of \$6 million to support other activities.

State	Use of 911/E911 Fees/Charges for Other Purposes
Wisconsin	911 Fund collected approximately \$25,000,000 in excess of the actual requests for funds submitted by the 911 grant applicants. A small portion of that collection was applied to the salary expense the Commission incurred to administer the program. The funds collected in excess of the wireless E911 program obligations were transferred to the state's general purpose revenue account on June 30, 2009.

D. Indian Tribes

18. Because many BIA offices do not collect information regarding 911/E911 funding among Indian tribes, the Commission does not have a clear picture of Indian tribe use of 911/E911 funds. The Commission requested information from the twelve regional BIA offices.³¹ Eight offices responded; however, only two BIA offices, the Rocky Mountain Region and the Midwest Region, were able to provide information on 911/E911 funding.

19. The Midwest Region BIA stated that “[n]o agency under the direction of BIA that responded runs a 911 or E911 system. They are usually run by the state or local county.”³² The Rocky Mountain Region BIA provided a response from the Blackfeet Indian Tribe of Montana, which indicates that the Blackfeet Indian Tribe of Montana “receives quarterly dividends through telephone shares from the State of Montana.”³³ As of October 15, 2009, the cash balance of these programs was \$259,615.70.³⁴

IV. CONCLUSION

20. The Commission is pleased to have the opportunity to report on the issue of 911 fee collection and distribution for the annual period ending December 31, 2009. In this report, we have been able to report on the practices of almost every state and territory. The information that the states provided indicates that in 2009, most of the 911/E911 fees collected by the states were in fact used to fund 911/E911 services, while thirteen states reported using, or potentially using, 911 fees to support other services.

³¹ The BIA has twelve regional offices, organized by geographical location: Alaska Region, Eastern Oklahoma Region, Eastern Region, Southern Plains Region, Great Plains Region, Midwest Region, Navajo Region, Northwest Region, Pacific Region, Rocky Mountain Region, Southwest Region, and Western Region.

³² Midwest Region BIA Response at 1.

³³ Rocky Mountain Region BIA Response at 1.

³⁴ *Id.* at 2.

APPENDIX A

Summary of State Responses

State/Territory	Type of Fund Collection	State Approval of Expenditures	Funds Collected	Use of 911/E911 Fees/Charges for Other Purposes
Alabama	Hybrid	State oversight for wireless.	Wireless: \$29,857,571.09	N/A
		Local control for wireline.	Wireline: Did not provide	
Alaska	Local	No	\$8,199,046.36	N/A
Arizona	State	Yes	\$17,460,160	Yes
Arkansas	Hybrid	No	Did not provide.	N/A
California	State	Yes	\$101,450,093.46	Yes
Colorado	Local	No	\$45,000,000	N/A
Connecticut	State	Yes	\$21,397,572.52	N/A
Delaware	State	Yes	No less than \$2,259,727.83 per legislative mandate.	Yes
District of Columbia	State	Yes	\$12,714,347 (based on fiscal year ending September 2009)	N/A
Florida	State	Yes	Wireline: \$49,599,186	N/A
			Wireless: \$75,932,488	
Georgia	Hybrid	Yes	\$8,537,319	Yes
Guam	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR
Hawaii	Hybrid	Yes	Wireline: \$1,400,000 (approx)	Yes

State/Territory	Type of Fund Collection	State Approval of Expenditures	Funds Collected	Use of 911/E911 Fees/Charges for Other Purposes
			Wireless: \$8,178,764.44 (approx)	
Idaho	Local	No	\$18,673,808.67	N/A
Illinois	Hybrid	State oversight for wireless. Local control for wireline.	Wireline: Did not provide.	Yes
			Wireless: \$67,000,000 excluding Chicago	
Indiana	Hybrid	Yes	Wireline: Respondent provided an estimate of \$37,304,273 for 2008. (No information for 2009)	N/A
			Wireless: Respondent provided an estimate of \$26,900,000.00 for 2008. (No information for 2009)	
Iowa	Hybrid	Yes	Wireline: \$14,992,268	N/A
			Wireless: \$16,466,263	
Kansas	Hybrid	Yes	\$6,705,538.67	N/A
Kentucky	Hybrid	State oversight for wireless. Local control for wireline.	Wireline: Did not provide.	N/A
			State Wireless: \$22,979,827.96	
Louisiana	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR

State/Territory	Type of Fund Collection	State Approval of Expenditures	Funds Collected	Use of 911/E911 Fees/Charges for Other Purposes
Maine	State	Yes	\$6,108,985	N/A
Maryland	State	Yes	\$55,556,616.37	N/A
Massachusetts	State	Yes	\$69,694,702.00	N/A
Michigan	Hybrid	Yes	Counties: \$65,881,869.64	N/A
			State: \$27,118,262.60	
Minnesota	State	Yes	\$51,269,514.00	N/A
Mississippi	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR
Missouri	Local	No	Did not provide.	N/A
Montana	State	Yes	\$13,172,462.14	N/A
Nebraska	Hybrid	State oversight for wireless. Local control for wireline.	Wireline: \$5,507,239.80	Yes
			Wireless: Respondent provided an estimate of \$6,284,559.15 for 2008. (No information for 2009)	
Nevada	Local	No	Did not provide.	N/A
New Hampshire	State	Yes	Did not provide.	N/A
New Jersey	State	Yes	\$128,900,000.00	N/A
New Mexico	State	Yes	\$12,073,923.31	N/A
New York	Hybrid	State and local approval.	Counties: Respondent provided an estimate of over \$23,300,000.00 for 2008. (No information for 2009)	Yes

State/Territory	Type of Fund Collection	State Approval of Expenditures	Funds Collected	Use of 911/E911 Fees/Charges for Other Purposes
			New York City: Respondent provided an estimate of over \$60,400,000.00 for 2008. (No information for 2009)	
North Carolina	State	Yes	\$87,367,015	N/A
North Dakota	Local	Yes	\$8,369,366	N/A
Ohio	Hybrid	No	Wireline: Did not provide.	No information available
			Wireless: \$28,164,049.54	
Oklahoma	Local	No	Did not provide.	No information available
Oregon	State	Yes	\$40,155,054.04	Yes
Pennsylvania	Hybrid	State oversight for wireless.	Wireline: Did not provide.	N/A
		Local control for wireline.	Wireless: \$105,357,828.00	
			VoIP: \$11,298,364.90	
Puerto Rico	State	Yes	\$21,876,276.72	N/A
Rhode Island	State	Yes	\$18,200,000	Yes
South Carolina	Hybrid	No	Wireless: Respondent provided an estimate of over \$22,000,000.00 for 2008 (No information for 2009)	N/A
			Wireline: Did not provide.	
South Dakota	Local	Yes	Did not provide.	No information available until late

State/Territory	Type of Fund Collection	State Approval of Expenditures	Funds Collected	Use of 911/E911 Fees/Charges for Other Purposes
				2010.
Tennessee	Hybrid	Yes	Wireline: Respondent provided an estimate of \$43,900,000 for 2008 (No information for 2009)	N/A
			Wireless: \$55,965,000 (does not include Nov and Dec which are not available yet)	
Texas	Hybrid	Yes	\$203,547,359.97	N/A
Utah	Hybrid	No	\$2,724,374.00	N/A
Vermont	State	Yes	\$5,487,046.00	N/A
Virgin Islands	State	Yes	\$590,812.00	N/A
Virginia	State	Yes	\$52,022,170.24	Yes
Washington	Hybrid	Yes	County: \$50,481,165.00	Yes
			State: \$20,555,553.00	
West Virginia	Local	Yes	\$33,760,563.00	N/A
Wisconsin	Local	Yes	Wireline: Did not provide.	Yes
			Wireless: \$0 (discontinued in 2008)	
Wyoming	Local	No	Did not provide.	N/A

APPENDIX B
Copies of Responses