

**SENATE COMMITTEE
ON
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON
STATE 9-1-1 EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS**

**INTERIM REPORT TO THE
77TH TEXAS LEGISLATURE**

**SENATE COMMITTEE
ON
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON
STATE 9-1-1 EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS**

**Senator Frank Madla
Chairman**

**Senator John Whitmire
Member**

**Senator Troy Fraser
Member**

**Rosemary Brown
Committee Clerk**

**Harold Oliver
Legislative Assistant**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
Background	3
Committee Findings	
Issue # 1 What is the 9-1-1 fee on the telephone bill used for?	5
Recommendations	7
Issue #2 Is the State prepared to meet future 9-1-1 needs?	8
Recommendations	10
Issue #3 Should participants of the state 9-1-1 program be allowed to opt out of the state system?	11
Recommendations	12
Appendix “A” Chapter 772 Emergency Communication District Service Fee Rates	
Appendix “B” Home-Rule Service Fee Rates	
Appendix “C” Wireless Service Fee Fund	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

9-1-1 is a telecommunications and technology based public service. Calls are delivered to Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) over telephone company networks. The calls, and data relating to the calls, are then processed with the help of sophisticated, computerized equipment utilized by call takers located at the PSAPs. Changes in the telecommunications industry and technology impact service changes which the public safety community must accommodate.

The size and diversity of Texas compound the impact that advances in technology have on 9-1-1 systems and complicates the delivery of emergency services. Historically these complexities have forced the Texas 9-1-1 community to aggressively address 9-1-1 issues in all venues. The Texas system has been largely successful and has provided direction and leadership for the rest of the country.

During the interim of the 76th Legislative Session, Lt. Governor Rick Perry issued four charges to the Senate Committee on Economic Development. One of those charges was to: ***“Study any needed changes to create a more efficient, cost effective and reliable 9-1-1 emergency communications system, including the development and implementation of wireless 9-1-1.”*** Senator David Sibley, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Economic Development, named a subcommittee to address this specific charge. The subcommittee identified three specific topics for review: 1) What is the 9-1-1 fee on the telephone bill used for?; 2) Is the State prepared to meet future 9-1-1 needs?; and, 3) Should participants in the state 9-1-1 program be allowed to opt out of the state system? Three hearings were held and each addressed the preceding topics. The following recommendations were derived from the hearings.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

ISSUE #1 - What is the 9-1-1 fee on the telephone bill used for?

1. Revisit the statutory definition of 9-1-1 in the Health and Safety Code to allow for expanded use of the 9-1-1 fees collected by the Councils of Government (COGs), and Emergency Communication Districts (ECDs). Create a comparable 9-1-1 service by applying the same definition to COGs, ECDs and Home-Rule Cities.
2. Reduce the administrative involvement of the COGs via state catalogue purchasing of products and services for: addressing, training, and enhancing 9-1-1 systems to include database, network and equipment. The impact of this action would be a reduction in administrative costs within the COGs and completion of addressing projects. Completion of these projects would enable the 9-1-1 systems to locate citizens calling 9-1-1 for emergency help.

ISSUE # 2 - Is the State prepared to meet future 9-1-1 needs?

1. Recognize that 9-1-1 is a telecommunications service. Because telecommunications continue to evolve, 9-1-1 is directly impacted. Therefore, compel the Commission on State Emergency Communications (Commission) to update the network, database and equipment

used in 9-1-1 service. The current 9-1-1 infrastructure contains technology that was developed in the 1960's and 1980's.

2. Create Regional 9-1-1 Call Centers. Currently, the Texas Poison Control Network is implemented this way. Poison Centers are fully redundant to one another and seamless to the caller for help. The current 9-1-1 infrastructure (network) does not support a regional approach. 9-1-1 networks will need to evolve in order to create regional call centers and to enable wireless, Internet, and personal management devices (i.e. Palm Pilots) to access 9-1-1 systems.
3. Create incentives to fully implement wireless Phase II - Automatic Location Identification (ALI) - in urban areas of the state.
4. Fully implement an Emergency Call Box Program in rural Texas as a cost efficient means to fulfill the requirements of ALI and to meet the desires of Texas motorists.

ISSUE #3 - Should participants of the state 9-1-1 program be allowed to opt out of the state system?

1. Clarify statute to prohibit cities from opting out of a regional approach for the delivery of 9-1-1 services. Simultaneously, revisit the statutory ceiling placed on the amount of fees assessed and their appropriate uses.
2. Require Home-Rule Cities to either form an ECD or join the state program. This change will establish a more consistent approach to the funding and implementation of 9-1-1. Currently, Home-Rule Cities may fund items outside the statutory definition of 9-1-1 service pertaining to ECDs (Health and Safety Code, Chapter 772) and the state program (Health and Safety Code, Chapter 771).

BACKGROUND

In 1967, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice suggested that there be one nationwide number for citizens to use to report emergencies. In 1968, 9-1-1 was launched as the emergency response number for the nation.

By the early 1970's, several Texas cities had initiated their own 9-1-1 programs. By 1980, at least 20 cities had implemented independent emergency response programs. As cities grew during the early 1980's, coordinating emergency communication where city limits ended and rural areas began became complicated. These challenges prompted larger cities to explore regional cooperative solutions. Harris County was the first metropolitan area to implement a regional plan. Pursuant to enabling legislation in 1983, Harris County created the Greater Harris County 9-1-1 Emergency Network. Since 1983, 24 Emergency Communication Districts (ECDs) have been established and are currently operating throughout the State.

During the 69th Legislative Session in 1985, Texas legislators recognized the need for a statewide emergency communications system and thus, created the Advisory Commission on State Emergency Communications (Commission) through the passage of HB 1655. HB 1655 directed the Commission to study the implications of a statewide 9-1-1 system. The study lasted almost 16 months.

The Commission was assigned the goal of creating and implementing a statewide emergency communication system. Other goals included the elimination of gaps in coverage throughout the State and subsidization of areas that did not have a sufficient population base to generate the revenue needed for 9-1-1 service. The designation of the number 9-1-1 achieved part of the solution by having one abbreviated telephone number to call in case of an emergency. The ensuing system determined the caller's need and dispatched the appropriate local service.

The 70th Legislature passed HB 911 in 1987. Codified in Chapter 771, Subtitle B of the Texas Health and Safety Code, HB 911 directed the Commission to oversee the establishment of the 9-1-1 emergency communication system throughout the State. In order to meet the requirements of HB 911, the Commission partnered with the 24 Councils of Government (COGs) to implement statewide emergency communication in areas not served by the Home-Rule Cities or ECDs. The Commission currently collects and utilizes \$38 million in 9-1-1 revenue for the operation and maintenance of 9-1-1.

The mission of the Commission as determined by HB 911 was to cultivate and maintain public health and safety. An important strategy of that mission was the development of wire-line Automatic Number Identification (ANI). By 1997, the Commission had fully implemented ANI for wire-line service throughout the state. Texas is currently working to provide Automatic Location Identification (ALI) service for all forms of telecommunications.

By definition, 9-1-1 is a telecommunications and technology based public service. Calls are delivered to Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) over telephone company networks. The calls, and data relating to the calls, are then processed with the help of sophisticated, computerized equipment utilized by call takers. Changes in the telecommunications industry and technology

impact services which the public safety community must accommodate.

The size and diversity of Texas compound the impact the above mentioned changes have on 9-1-1 systems and further complicate the delivery of emergency services. Historically these complexities have forced the Texas 9-1-1 community to aggressively address 9-1-1 issues in all venues. The Texas system has been largely successful and has provided direction and leadership for the rest of the country.

During the interim of the 76th Legislative Session, Lt. Governor Rick Perry issued four charges to the Senate Committee on Economic Development. One of those charges was to: ***“Study any needed changes to create a more efficient, cost effective and reliable 9-1-1 emergency communications system, including the development and implementation of wireless 9-1-1.”*** Senator David Sibley, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Economic Development, named a subcommittee to address this specific charge. The subcommittee identified three specific topics for review: 1) What is the 9-1-1 fee on the telephone bill used for?; 2) Is the State prepared to meet future 9-1-1 needs? ; and, 3) Should participants in the state 9-1-1 program be allowed to opt out of the state system? Three hearings were held and each addressed the preceding topics. The following recommendations were derived from the hearings.

COMMITTEE FINDINGS

ISSUE #1 - WHAT IS THE 9-1-1 FEE ON THE TELEPHONE BILL USED FOR?

Emergency service is currently administered by three separate and distinct entities: the Councils of Government (COGs), which administer 9-1-1 on behalf of the State; Emergency Communication Districts (ECDs); and Home-Rule Cities. The state program via the COGs, and the ECDs are governed by Health and Safety Code, Chapters 771 and 772, respectively. Home-Rule Cities are not governed by statute and subsequently, are not required to adhere to fee limitations or statutory uses for fees collected.

The Legislature, when it created the statewide 9-1-1 program, authorized the collection of Emergency Service Fees in Chapters 771 and 772 of the Health and Safety Code. The Health and Safety Code provides for emergency communication services to be funded in three ways: 1) 9-1-1 Service Fees, 2) 9-1-1 Equalization Surcharges, and 3) Wireless Communications Fees. Because the State defines 9-1-1 service as *a telecommunication service that provides the user of a public telephone system the ability to reach a public safety answering point by dialing the digits 9-1-1*, fees and surcharges are assessed on the telephone bills of customers throughout Texas. The fees are collected by telecommunication service providers and remitted to the Commission on State Emergency Communications (Commission).

The amounts charged via 9-1-1 Service Fees and Wireless Service Fees have been limited statutorily to \$0.50 per line per month (up to \$0.50 for land-line, a set fee of \$0.50 for wireless). The 9-1-1 Equalization Surcharge Fee is set by the Commission based on a percentage of the toll on intrastate long distance calls (may not exceed 0.5 percent of that toll). The Commission is then responsible for distribution of the fee revenues to COGs and to the various ECDs which are statutorily limited in the use of revenue. All three revenue streams are part of the State Treasury and subject to the appropriation process. Historically, these revenue streams have generated more funds than their resulting appropriations.

By statute, eligible expenditures for COGs and ECDs are limited to those activities associated with the delivery of a 9-1-1 call. Historically, the Commission has interpreted this provision to apply to the following types of costs: 1) network costs over which 9-1-1 calls are delivered; 2) database costs by either a telephone company or a third-party database provider; 3) customer premise equipment that a 9-1-1 call-taker uses to process the call including ancillary equipment like recorders and language lines; and, 4) addressing and mapping costs. The State does not fund personnel or facility costs for Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs), dispatch, response of emergency service personnel, equipment or vehicles. This is because the Commission has taken the position that each governmental entity already had personnel and facilities in place to meet these needs prior to the state program.

The Commission does allow by rule for the COGs to be reimbursed for salaries associated with the administration of 9-1-1 service. Consequently, the Commission funds 121 9-1-1 related FTEs. Because a requirement to have 9-1-1 services implemented by COGs without some form of reimbursement would be considered an unfunded mandate, the Commission currently projects to appropriate \$8.9 million in fiscal year 2000, for COG administrative costs. A recent State Auditor's

report on the statewide 9-1-1 system identified an estimated \$29.2 million in potential savings through the consolidation of certain services.

Home-Rule Cities, which operate their own 9-1-1 service, act independently from the statutes which govern COGs and ECDs. This enables them to have more flexibility in how much they can charge their local telephone customers and how the fees may be utilized. On average, the ECDs charge the lowest fee, whereas the Home-Rule Cities charge the highest fee. At the first subcommittee hearing, an inquiry about the disparity was raised by one of the members. Tables illustrating the variations in collections and expenditures can be found in Appendices A and B.

In Home-Rule Cities, the city council establishes fees through municipal ordinance. Typically, the fees collected are deposited into the city's general revenue fund and are then allocated to pay expenditures the city council defines as 9-1-1 service. Because these municipalities are not bound by statutory definitions, the municipality may use revenue collected to pay for such issues as equipment, salaries, and facilities not included in the state definition. Inequity is inherent in this method of delivering 9-1-1 service because the COGs and ECDs do not have the same opportunity to spend 9-1-1 funds as the Home-Rule Cities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ISSUE #1

1. Revisit the statutory definition of 9-1-1 in the Health and Safety Code to allow for expanded use of the 9-1-1 fees collected by the Councils of Government (COGs), and Emergency Communication Districts (ECDs). Create a comparable 9-1-1 service by applying the same definition to COGs, ECDs and Home-Rule Cities.
2. Reduce the administrative involvement of the COGs via state catalogue purchasing of products and services for: addressing, training and enhancing 9-1-1 systems to include database, network and equipment. The impact of this action would be a reduction in administrative costs within the COGs and completion of addressing projects. Completion of these projects would enable the 9-1-1 systems to locate citizens calling 9-1-1 for emergency help.

ISSUE # 2 - IS THE STATE PREPARED TO MEET FUTURE 9-1-1 NEEDS?

Using telecommunications equipment with technology from the 1960's would mean an extremely short lifespan to any private business. However, that is what the state 9-1-1 system is facing. It can be asserted with some confidence that Texas citizens would rather not put their trust in 40-year old emergency response technology. Yet, that is what we are asking tax payers to do by continuing to invest in the current 9-1-1 network. Despite the technological advances in recent years the Commission on State Emergency Communications (Commission) has had some outside resistance to modernizing the state 9-1-1 network. Telecommunications technology has recently evolved from analog, to digital, and now to Internet-based services. We have seen cellular phones evolve from the size of a small lunch box to the size of a large match-box. Rolodexes have transformed to Palm Pilots and now into a simple accessory to your match-box-sized phone. Vehicle manufactures are now equipping vehicles with Automatic Crash Notification (ACN) equipment that will instantaneously notify a Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) that an accident has occurred. The technology being used in Texas for 9-1-1 is not equipped to receive that information.

Emerging technologies will undoubtedly change the way people call 9-1-1. Emergency calls will no longer be limited to traditional telephony. Emergency calls will be placed using IP telephony, wireless and a legion of new and emerging communication devices. These new technologies will require the Commission to address nontraditional means of access to emergency services. Advancements in 9-1-1 technology now require states to accommodate digital networking and switching for voice paths, access for Personal Management Devices (i.e., Palm Pilots), location for wireless callers (Wireless Phase II), ACN, and statewide call volume collection. Finally, access to 9-1-1 must be consistent with all forms of telecommunications.

An immediate concern with the current network utilized by the state 9-1-1 program is the possibility of receiving a busy signal when calling 9-1-1. There are nearly 600 PSAPs across the state serving more than 1400 units of local government. Shockingly, there is no mechanism to allow a rollover of emergency calls to the nearest PSAP if the original location is busy. The 9-1-1 network system stands in contrast to the Texas Poison Control Network.

Poison Control is fully redundant and seamless to the caller for help. When a caller dials Poison Control, they will never receive a busy signal because the call will automatically route to the next available center. However, if 9-1-1 is busy the caller will receive a busy signal because the network does not have the same network technology as Poison Control.

Another statewide concern is the limited ability of PSAPs to locate wireless callers dialing 9-1-1. Despite the numerous advantages and conveniences of wireless phones, their wired counterparts still maintain an edge in location identification. Yet, with more than 30 percent of the 9-1-1 calls originating from wireless phones, Phase II or Automatic Location Identification (ALI), has not been implemented at the rate expected. This is due to a lack of deployment of technology and is not only a concern to the PSAP operator but also to the medical industry.

According to Dr. Jerry Potts, Ph.D., American Heart Association, many PSAP operators will indicate that a large percentage of people making emergency calls on cellular phones do not know their general location. An even higher percentage do not know their exact location. Dr. Potts testified

that “minutes count in heart and stroke emergencies, and precious minutes are lost while dispatchers and responders search for a wireless caller’s location.” The completion of Phase II should be thought of as more than a fulfillment of a contractual obligation. It should be considered a matter of public safety.

Determining the location of a citizen whose cellular phone does not have coverage in rural Texas is also problematic. In urban Texas, the development of location identification technology is more cost beneficial than a similar application in rural Texas. Representatives of the wireless telephone industry admit that the quickest, most cost effective way to locate a motorist in rural Texas is by means of an “Emergency Call Box.” Emergency Call Boxes or Motorist Aid Devices have been a part of the highway system in 22 other states. Since the early 1990’s, Texans have benefitted from a call box pilot program, and despite an increase in the number of cellular phones, call boxes have experienced steady usage.

A recent survey conducted by the Texas Transportation Institute at Texas A&M was presented to the Texas House Transportation Committee. The survey found that Texans support the construction of roadside emergency call boxes and are willing to pay extra for the increased safety. Dr. Gerald Ullman, Ph.D., of the Texas Transportation Institute at Texas A&M University, testified before this Committee. Dr. Ullman explained that although there has been an increase in cellular customers (25 percent of Texans are cellular subscribers) more than 95 percent of those surveyed thought the Emergency Call Box Program should be expanded. Most respondents said they would be willing to pay an additional \$1.46 on their annual motor vehicle registration in order to fund the expansion.

The Texas Transportation Institute identified tangential uses for “smart call boxes.” These uses include the alerting of authorities about low visibility on roadways, icy pavements, high wind and water conditions, and lighting failures. Dr. Ullman also testified that the use of such “smart call boxes” will undoubtedly prepare the State to meet the demands being placed on highways since the passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement as well as the demands placed on highways by an ever growing mobile population.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ISSUE #2

1. Recognize that 9-1-1 is a telecommunications service. Because telecommunication continues to evolve, 9-1-1 is directly impacted. Therefore, compel the Commission on State Emergency Communications (Commission) to update the network, database and equipment used in 9-1-1 service. The current 9-1-1 infrastructure contains technology that was developed in the 1960's and 1980's.
2. Create Regional 9-1-1 Call Centers. Currently, the Texas Poison Control Network is implemented this way. Poison Centers are fully redundant to one another and seamless to the caller for help. The current 9-1-1 infrastructure (network) does not support a regional approach. 9-1-1 networks will need to evolve in order to create regional call centers and to enable wireless, Internet, and personal management devices (i.e. Palm Pilots) to access 9-1-1 systems.
3. Create incentives to fully implement wireless Phase II - Automatic Location Identification (ALI) - in urban areas of the State.
4. Fully implement an Emergency Call Box program in rural Texas as a cost efficient means to fulfill the requirements of ALI and to meet the desires of Texas motorists.

ISSUE #3 - SHOULD PARTICIPANTS OF THE STATE 9-1-1 PROGRAM BE ALLOWED TO OPT OUT OF THE STATE SYSTEM?

Currently, 27 cities and 24 county-wide Emergency Communication Districts (ECDs) do not participate in the state 9-1-1 system. During the 75th Legislative Session, the cities of Corpus Christi and Austin attempted to join the ranks of those entities not participating in the state 9-1-1 system. The argument given for opting out was that at the inception of the Texas 9-1-1 system, cities with established emergency service systems could operate either as a Home-Rule City or participate in an ECD or a Council of Government (COG). However, once a city chose its method of operation, there were no provisions to change that method of delivering 9-1-1 service. In the instance of the City of Corpus Christi and the City of Austin, both municipalities chose to participate in a COG delivery of service. Under a COG delivery of service, all fees generated in the COG region are collected by the Commission on State Emergency Communications and then remitted to the region. The monies remitted to the COG are applied across the region on an “as needed” basis. Consequently, fees remitted to a certain area of a region may not equal the fees collected in that region. Admittedly, the urban areas in a region subsidize the 9-1-1 system for rural areas. However, with today’s mobile community, the regional approach is favored over the Home-Rule City approach. As citizen mobility increases, assurances of 9-1-1 service are expected to be available in both rural and urban areas.

If the City of Corpus Christi is allowed to opt out of the state system, the fiscal impact to the State would be \$1,027,108 in order to equalize 9-1-1 service throughout the rural area of the Coastal Bend COG. If the City of Austin is allowed to opt out of the state system, the fiscal impact to the Capitol Area COG would be \$3,694,965. In order to offset these losses, the rural areas will be faced with either a reduction in 9-1-1 services or a fee increase to maintain the current level of service, without an increase in appropriation request from the State Equalization Surcharge Fund. Finally, allowing for the creation of another entity for the delivery of 9-1-1 service requires the entity to set new fees. Given that 9-1-1 fees for Home-Rule Cities are currently not capped nor limited in use by statute, citizens could experience an increase in their 9-1-1 fee as a result of a new entity providing service. Further diversifying and complicating the delivery of 9-1-1 in Texas is not logical and runs counter to the recommendations of the State Auditor’s Office.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR ISSUE #3

1. Clarify statute to prohibit cities from opting out of regional approaches for the delivery of 9-1-1 services. Simultaneously, revisit the statutory ceiling placed on the amount of fees assessed and their appropriate uses.
2. Require Home-Rule Cities to either form an Emergency Communication District (ECD) or join the state program. This change will establish a more consistent approach to the funding and implementation of 9-1-1. Currently, Home-Rule Cities may fund items outside the statutory definition of 9-1-1 service pertaining to ECDs (Health and Safety Code, Chapter 772) and the state program (Health and Safety Code, Chapter 771).

NOTE - A recent judicial decision held that cities do not have unilateral authority to withdraw from the statewide 9-1-1 program. (*See* Cause No. 99-02304; *The City of Corpus Christi, Texas v. Advisory Commission on State Emergency Communications, et al.*; In the 201st Judicial District Court of Travis County, Texas)

Appendices

APPENDIX "A"

Chapter 772 (Districts) Service Fee Rates

<i>Agency</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>T</i>
9-1-1 Network of East Texas	0.46	1.07	1.68
Abilene/Taylor County District	0.41	0.93	1.41
Austin County Emergency Communications District	**		
Bexar Metro 9-1-1 Network District	0.22	0.51	0.77
Brazos County Emergency Communications District	0.54	1.21	2.26
Calhoun County 9-1-1 Emergency Communications District	0.53	1.37	2.19
Cameron County Emergency Communications District	0.50	0.50	0.50
Dallas County (Balance of County)*			
Denco Area 9-1-1 District	0.27	0.71	1.13
Ector County 9-1-1 District	0.42	0.99	1.48
El Paso County 9-1-1 District	0.20	0.50	0.80
Galveston County Emergency Communications District	0.55	1.28	1.93
Greater Harris County 9-1-1 Emergency Network	0.33	0.75	0.87
Henderson County 9-1-1 Communications District	**		
Howard County 9-1-1 Communications District	0.50	1.17	1.86
Kerr County Emergency 9-1-1 Network	0.41	1.05	1.77
Lubbock Emergency Communication District	0.55	1.28	1.93
McLennan County Emergency Assistance District	0.32	0.75	1.13
Medina County 9-1-1 District	0.49	1.15	1.81
Midland Emergency Communications District	0.46	1.07	1.68
Montgomery County Emergency Communications District	0.55	1.28	1.93
Nortex 9-1-1 Communications District	0.46	1.07	1.61
Potter-Randall County Emergency Communications District	0.41	0.96	1.45
Tarrant County 9-1-1 District	0.20	0.46	0.74
Texas Eastern 9-1-1 Network	0.26	0.62	0.98

Service Fee Rates for Emergency Communication Districts (in dollars)

R=Residential; B=Business; and, T=Trunk rates

** Operates like a home-rule city under Subchapter E, Chapter 772*

*** Within statutory limit of six percent (6%) of base rate.*

Source: CSEC Survey and follow-up

APPENDIX "B"

Home-Rule City Service Fee Rates

<i>Municipality</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>T</i>
Addison (Police Department)	0.62	1.52	2.40
Aransas Pass	1.00	1.00	1.00
Cedar Hill (Police Department)	**		
Coppell (Police Department)	0.75	0.75	1.25
Dallas (Emergency Communications Department)	0.62	1.52	2.40
Denison (Fire Department)	0.50	0.75	0.75
DeSoto (Police Department)	0.57	1.00	1.50
Duncanville (Central Comm. PSAP Office)	0.75	0.75	1.50
Ennis (Police Department)	0.49	1.15	1.82
Farmers Branch (Police Department)	0.28	0.75	0.75
Garland (Police Department)	0.75	1.25	2.00
Glenn Heights (Police Department)	**		
Longview (PSAP)	**		
Highland Park (Department of Public Safety)	***		
Hutchins (Police Department)	1.00	1.50	1.50
Kilgore (Police Department)	0.87	0.87	0.87
Lancaster (Fire/Police Department)	0.62	1.52	2.50
Mesquite (Police Department)	0.62	0.50	0.62
Plano	0.75	0.75	
Portland (Police Department)	1.30	1.30	1.30
Richardson (Police Department)	0.75	1.25	2.00
Rowlett (Police & Fire Communications Center)	0.88	0.88	0.88
Sherman (Police Department)	0.32	0.32	
Sunnyvale*			
University Park (Police Department)	**		
Wylie	1.22	2.93	4.47

Service Fee Rates for Home-Rule City Programs (in dollars)

R=Residential; B=Business; and, T=Trunk rates

**Services provided under contract with Dallas County*

***Six percent (6%) of base rate*

****Eight percent (8%) of base rate*

Source: CSEC Survey and follow-up

APPENDIX "C"

WIRELESS SERVICE FEE FUND

<u>9-1-1 Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Collections from Sept 97 thru June 00</u>
49 City of Addison	\$ 42,936.21
50 City of Aransas Pass Police Department	\$ 29,902.05
51 City of Cedar Hill Police Department	\$ 101,666.67
52 City of Dallas	\$ 4,003,494.97
53 City of Longview Communications Center	\$ 281,402.38
54 City of Plano/9-1 -1 Coordinator	\$ 719,604.99
55 City of Wylie	\$ 43,055.50
56 City of Coppell Police Department	\$ 101,428.42
57 Dallas County Sheriffs Office	\$ 32,884.38
58 Denison Fire Department	\$ 83,127.56
59 City of DeSoto Police Department	\$ 132,723.86
60 City of Duncanville	\$ 134,826.77
61 City of Ennis	\$ 58,012.19
62 City of Farmers Branch Police Department	\$ 100,634.55
63 City of Garland	\$ 713,668.81
64 City of Glenn Heights	\$ 21,502.90
65 City of Highland Park	\$ 34,543.01
66 City of Hutchins	\$ 12,339.17
67 City of Kilgore Police Department	\$ 44,486.15
68 City of Lancaster	\$ 100,529.12
69 City of Mesquite Police Department	\$ 423,103.36
70 City of Portland Police Department	\$ 54,974.14
71 City of Richardson Police Department	\$ 332,944.50
72 Rowlett Police and Fire Communications	\$ 138,584.15
73 Sherman Police Department	\$ 125,707.83
74 <u>City of University Park Police Department</u>	<u>\$ 83,908.36</u>
Home Rule Total	\$ 7,951,992.01
State Total	\$ 72,402,767.10

WIRELESS SERVICE FEE FUND

<u>9-1-1 Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Collections from Sept 97 thru June 00</u>
1 Alamo Area Council of Governments	\$ 555,651.85
2 Ark-Tex Council of Governments	\$ 967,306.44
3 Brazos Valley Council of Governments	\$ 404,502.56
4 Capital Area Planning Council	\$ 4,301,058.88
5 Central Texas Council of Governments	\$ 1,345,307.05
6 Coastal Bend Council of Governments	\$ 1,927,517.04
7 Concho Valley Council of Governments	\$ 560,984.68
8 Deep East Texas Council of Governments	\$ 1,275,640.93
9 East Texas Council of Governments	\$ 1,053,439.23
10 Golden Crescent Regional Planning Commission	\$ 602,775.02
11 Heart of Texas Council of Governments	\$ 386,801.11
12 Houston-Galveston Area Council	\$ 2,364,323.11
13 Lower Rio Grande Valley Development Council	\$ 1,972,752.37
14 Middle Rio Grande Development Council	\$ 562,598.95
15 Nortex Regional Planning Commission	\$ 283,718.97
16 North Central Texas Council of Governments	\$ 2,848,348.75
17 Permian Basin Regional Planning Commission	\$ 423,018.41
18 Panhandle Regional Planning Commission	\$ 709,707.69
19 Rio Grande Council of Governments	\$ 94,256.55
20 South East Texas Regional Planning Commission	\$ 1,409,634.08
21 South Plains Association of Governments	\$ 429,328.57
22 Southlexas Development Council	\$ 937,461.02
23 Texoma Council of Governments	\$ 401,144.35
24 <u>West Central Texas Council of Governments</u>	<u>\$ 745,499.36</u>
COG Total	\$ 26,562,776.99
25 9-1-1 Network of East Texas	\$ 617,851.29
26 Abilene/Taylor County PSAP Office	\$ 475,309.41
27 Austin County Emergency Communications District	\$ 85,670.90
28 Bexar Metro 9-1-1 Network District	\$ 5,514,748.53
29 Brazos County Emergency Communications District	\$ 520,774.65
30 Calhoun County 9-1-1 Emergency Communications District	\$ 76,947.49
31 Cameron County Emergency Communications District	\$ 1,173,800.43
32 Denco Area 9-1-1 District	\$ 1,548,417.07
33 El Paso County 9-1-1 District	\$ 2,542,300.47
34 Emergency Communications District of Ector County	\$ 462,010.33
35 Galveston County Emergency Communications District	\$ 635,682.17
36 Greater Harris County 9-1-1 Emergency Network	\$ 12,703,223.01
37 Henderson County 9-1-1 Communications District	\$ 249,931.37
38 Howard County 9-1-1 Communications District	\$ 123,100.69
39 Kerr Emergency 9-1-1 Network	\$ 159,285.59
40 Lubbock County Emergency Communications District	\$ 959,339.40
41 McLennan County Emergency Assistance District	\$ 757,672.25
42 Medina County 9-1-1 District	\$ 128,893.17
43 Midland Emergency Communications District	\$ 440,208.12
44 Montgomery County Emergency Communications District	\$ 951,690.95
45 Nortex 9-1-1 Communications District	\$ 541,633.35
46 Potter-Randall County Emergency Communications	\$ 782,791.74
47 Tarrant County 9-1-1 District	\$ 6,034,009.71
48 <u>Texas Eastern 9-1-1 Network</u>	<u>\$ 402,706.01</u>
District Total	\$ 37,887,998.10