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Dear Secretary Moyer:

I am pleased to provide you with the Annual Report of the Emergency Number Systems Board (ENSB or Board) for Fiscal Year 2015. The Board has convened monthly, and more frequently in sub-committees, to consider a variety of 9-1-1 related issues and projects. The attached report outlines the collective efforts of the Board and the larger 9-1-1 community in making Maryland a safer place for its residents, businesses and visitors.

Maryland continues to benefit from an effective 9-1-1 system. Recent Board statewide efforts include working with Verizon, Maryland PSAP personnel and the Maryland Public Service Commission to review the implementation of policies and standards adopted by the Federal Communications Commission and ENSB to minimize disruptions to 9-1-1 service caused by power outages and network failures. Ongoing Board activities include providing a vigorous 9-1-1 training program throughout the state, working with vendors to improve 9-1-1 service delivery, and continuing research, planning and implementation of “Next Generation” technologies.

The Board remains focused on the enhancement of 9-1-1 and the critical role it plays in public safety. On behalf of the members of the Emergency Number Systems Board and the more than nine hundred call takers around the State, I thank you for your support and the diligent assistance your staff routinely provides.

The attached document and appendices constitute the 2015 Annual Report of the Emergency Number Systems Board as required by the Public Safety Article.

Sincerely,

Anthony Myers, Chairman
Emergency Numbers Systems Board
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Introduction

ENSB Mission Statement

The Emergency Number Systems Board works cooperatively with the counties to provide an effective and efficient Maryland 9-1-1 system through the administration of the 9-1-1 Trust Fund revenues.

The Board achieves its goals through implementation of the following principles:

ENSB Vision Statement

The Emergency Number Systems Board is dedicated to ensuring Maryland’s 9-1-1 system remains robust and responsive to the public-safety needs of our citizens and visitors. The Board is committed to providing fiscally responsive funding to maintain a technologically advanced 9-1-1 system staffed with appropriately trained emergency operators. Through a partnership with the 9-1-1 community, the Board will provide leadership and guidance for Maryland to be recognized nationally for excellence in providing 9-1-1 service.

The Emergency Number Systems Board’s (ENSB or Board) duties are defined by Sections §1-301 through §1-314 of the Public Safety Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland. Further clarity of direction and explicit responsibilities of the Board are provided in the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) Title 12, Subtitle 11, Chapter 03. Those duties include coordinating the enhancement of County 9-1-1 systems and the oversight of the 9-1-1 Trust Fund. This report details the activities of the Board during calendar year 2015 and Trust Fund expenditures of fiscal year 2015 (July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015).

The Public Safety Article requires that the following six topics be included in the annual report:

1. Types of 9-1-1 Systems in Operation Page 16
2. Total State and County Fees Charged Page 24
3. Funding Formula in Effect by County Page 23
4. Statutory or Regulatory Violations by County None Noted
5. Efforts to Establish an Enhanced 911 System Page 16
6. Any Suggested Changes to this Subtitle Page 9
This report goes significantly beyond these six areas in an effort to provide additional understanding into the work of the Emergency Number Systems Board. As the communications industry introduces new technological enhancements, Maryland’s 9-1-1 system continues to evolve to ensure that Maryland’s citizens and visitors are afforded a robust and responsive system when they call 9-1-1.

The current direction of the Board is to evaluate and fund local, regional, and statewide plans for enhancements consistent with the Public Safety Article, Board guidelines, the availability of 9-1-1 Trust Fund dollars, and technological advancements. The Board is examining the following current issues:

- Integrating “Next Generation (NG)” Internet Protocol (IP) based 9-1-1 service delivery of voice, text, data, and video messaging into the 9-1-1 System;
- Examining current local and national policies, standards, and legislation to identify best practices evolving from governance, planning, regulatory, policy, and funding issues arising from a statewide transition to a NG 9-1-1 environment;
- Working with our 9-1-1 System service providers to establish standards, policies and procedures that will enhance the redundancy, resiliency and survivability of 9-1-1 service in Maryland;
- Establishing adequate back-up 9-1-1 facilities and furthering other Homeland Security initiatives;
- Funding emergency dispatch protocol training and software enhancements that promote the standardization of 9-1-1 call processing throughout the state;
- Exploring advancements in geographical information systems (GIS) to enhance 9-1-1 related mapping, caller location, prioritized call answering, and emergency response routing methodologies;
- Implementing remote 9-1-1 workstations at secondary PSAPs to provide enhanced caller information associated with transferred 9-1-1 calls; and
- Examining technological advancements that permit regional sharing of 9-1-1 related equipment for call delivery to primary, back-up, and secondary PSAPs in an IP network environment.

The engagement of local leadership has created a positive and constructive working relationship among Maryland’s PSAP community, its legislative delegations, its first responder community, and the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services to collectively address these issues.

Questions regarding this report and its content should be forwarded to the ENSB Office of the Executive Director at 300 E. Joppa Road – Suite 1000, Towson, Maryland 21286.

The ENSB web site is: www.dpscs.maryland.gov/ensb
Maryland’s Public Safety Article §1-305 defines the membership of the seventeen member Emergency Number Systems Board. Board members are drawn from private and public sectors representing various aspects of public safety and the people they serve. The current membership of the Board includes a diverse group of police, fire, emergency management, regulatory, and communications industry professionals. The members serve a Governor appointed, Senate confirmed four-year term without compensation. While only required to meet quarterly, the ENSB meets at least monthly to examine current trends and funding needs of Maryland’s Public Safety Answering Points (PSAP).

The existing 9-1-1 infrastructure has performed admirably for decades; however, new data rich communications devices and services are driving the existing 9-1-1 infrastructure towards its operational limits. Consumers are increasingly relying on enhanced wireless and IP-based communications technologies, which offer expanded data capabilities such as text, picture and video messaging. Many public-safety related service providers are also seeking to share crash notification data, personal health, family, and other pertinent records with emergency responders utilizing the 9-1-1 system.

The Board continues to monitor and study national standards surrounding the development of Next Generation 9-1-1 system elements that would capture the benefits of expanding mobile and data communications technologies, as well as continuing to provide or enhance existing 9-1-1 functionality.

Some of the more prominent achievements and current activities of the ENSB include:

- Exploring technology and costs associated with the delivery and processing of Next Generation 9-1-1 services (NG 9-1-1) to our primary and secondary PSAPs;
- Working with PSAP personnel, Verizon and other carrier representatives to review circumstances surrounding 9-1-1 service disruptions, augment notification procedures, improve customer service issues, and seek enhancements that will improve Maryland’s 9-1-1 Systems;
- Providing funding to upgrade and refresh 9-1-1 enhanced IP enabled phone systems for five (5) primary PSAPs and three (3) back-up PSAPs;
- Providing back-up power equipment (generator and/or UPS) for one (1) primary PSAP and three (3) back-up PSAPs;
- Requiring and funding “power monitoring systems” for PSAPs, which will provide PSAP personnel with a visual and audible alert when changes occur affecting the PSAP’s current power source (commercial, generator or UPS battery power);
- Providing ongoing training on new 9-1-1 technologies and evolving 9-1-1 service delivery techniques by offering 60 training sessions attended by 1384 students;
- Securing statewide regulatory compliance through annual PSAP inspections;
- Interacting with federal agencies and national organizations to study evolving 9-1-1 issues, develop service standards, understand the impact of social media, and explore funding resources;
- Encouraging counties to secure additional funding resources to augment the 9-1-1 Trust Fund;
- Funding and implementing Network Control Modems to replace legacy remote “make busy” keys for the rerouting of 9-1-1 calls from primary to back-up PSAPs; and
- Assisting Maryland counties to update and maintain the accuracy of their mapping capacity by providing new ortho-photography, which is being renewed on a three year cycle.

To further facilitate the execution of the mission of the ENSB, the Board established several sub-committees comprised of Board members and supporting consultative membership from outside the Board. These subcommittees include:

- **Training and Education** – to provide and enhance entrance level and in-service training opportunities for 9-1-1 call takers;
- **Policy/Standards** – to recommend policy and funding guidance for ENSB membership and PSAP Directors and to make recommendations for Legislative changes; and
- **Technology** – to investigate and educate the Board on current and future technological advancements impacting the delivery of 9-1-1 services.

By statutory requirement, the Board also enjoys membership and actively participates on the following Maryland Board:

- **Statewide Emergency Medical Systems Advisory Council (SEMSAC)** – to assist the SEMSAC Board, comprised of representatives from organizations involved in providing emergency medical care services.

The ENSB remains committed to enhancing Maryland’s 9-1-1 system and taking advantage of proven technological advances in service delivery. Maryland continues to be a national leader in providing enhanced emergency wireline, wireless, and VoIP services. With the advancements made in IP based telephony equipment, Maryland is again poised to embrace a new technology and work towards a smooth transition as Next Generation 9-1-1 system and related service is realized.
The Maryland Public Safety Article (Title-1, Subtitle-3) is the enabling legislation that established the 9-1-1 Trust Fund and the Emergency Number Systems Board. It was originally crafted to create a funding mechanism and oversight Board to provide for the orderly installation, maintenance and operation of 9-1-1 systems in Maryland, and establish the three-digit number, 9-1-1, as the primary emergency telephone number to summon emergency assistance. The Public Safety Article remains responsive to the needs of the Maryland’s citizens.

The legislation established the Maryland 9-1-1 Surcharge, derived from a monthly surcharge levied on each telephone bill, to provide a constant funding source for enhancing and maintaining Maryland’s 9-1-1 system. The 9-1-1 Surcharge was initially comprised of two separate fees designated to offset 9-1-1 related capital and operational costs. The first portion of the Maryland 9-1-1 Surcharge is the “9-1-1 State Fee.” The State Fee is distributed to the Maryland counties at the discretion of the Emergency Number Systems Board in response to county 9-1-1 system enhancement requests. The level of the second portion of the “Additional Charge” is determined by each county through local resolution. The Public Safety Article limits the Additional Charge to a maximum of $0.75. Legislation requires that the amount of the Additional Charge received may not exceed a level necessary to cover the total eligible maintenance and operation costs of the county. The Public Safety Article further defines that maintenance and operation costs may include telephone company charges, equipment costs, equipment lease charges, repairs, utilities, personnel costs, and appropriate carryover costs from previous years. To ensure compliance, the Board provides for an audit of each county's expenditures for the maintenance and operation of the county's 9-1-1 system. All Maryland counties have taken advantage of this legislative authority and have passed local resolutions establishing an Additional Charge.

In 2003, the Public Safety Article was updated to provide the mandate and fiscal support for Maryland’s 9-1-1 call takers to receive callback phone number and location information of wireless callers (defined as “enhanced wireless 9-1-1”). This milestone was achieved in June 2005 when Maryland became only the eighth state in the nation to receive and display enhanced wireless information at all primary Maryland PSAPs when available from a wireless carrier.

The 2003 revisions also expanded the definition of “9-1-1 accessible service” to include “telephone service or another communications service that connects an individual dialing the digits 9-1-1 to an established public safety answering point.” This new definition expanded the communication service providers required to collect and remit the 9-1-1 surcharge to include carriers utilizing Voice over Internet Protocol technology (VoIP) for voice connectivity to 9-1-1 centers.

In 2008, this legislation was revised to increase the membership of the Board from 15 to 17 members. Responding to technological advancements in geographical information
systems (GIS) and the integration of wireless location technology into the 9-1-1 system, this legislation established a new Board position to represent Maryland’s GIS community. Since 2001, the role and capacity of local emergency management services (EMS) and nationwide homeland security efforts have increased significantly. Because 9-1-1 plays a vital role in identifying incidents where emergency management services are to be deployed, the Public Safety Article was amended to increase the emergency management services representation on the Board from one to two positions.

In 2012, this legislation was expanded with the passage of House Bill 1235 to include a definition of Next Generation 9-1-1 services as an Internet Protocol (IP) based system comprised of hardware, software, data, and operational policies and procedures, that:

- provides standardized interfaces from emergency call and message services to support emergency communications;
- processes all types of emergency calls, including voice, text, data, and multimedia information;
- acquires and integrates additional emergency call data useful to call routing and handling;
- delivers the emergency calls, messages, and data to the appropriate public safety answering point and other appropriate emergency entities;
- supports data or video communications needs for coordinated incident response and management; and
- provides broadband service to public safety answering points or other first responder entities.

This legislative change also tasked the Board with establishing planning guidelines for next generation 9–1–1 services system plans and deployment of next generation 9–1–1 services in accordance with this subtitle.

In 2012, Senate Bill 1301 changed how 9-1-1 Trust Fund interest is to be accrued. The new language amended the State Finance and Procurement Article Section §6-226 to include that “net interest on all State money allocated by the State Treasurer under this section to special funds or accounts, and otherwise entitled to receive interest earnings, as accounted for by the Comptroller, shall accrue to the General Fund of the State.”

In 2013, Senate Bill 745 codified a third portion of the fee by extending the collection of the Maryland 9-1-1 Surcharge Fee ($0.60 per transaction) to the sales of pre-paid wireless service to be collected at the point of sale (Maryland Pre-Paid Wireless E9-1-1 Fee). The amounts collected in this manner, minus a processing fee retained by retailers (3%), are deposited to the State’s 9-1-1 Trust Fund. The Maryland Pre-Paid Wireless E9-1-1 Fees collected will be utilized to fund 9-1-1 enhancement projects and offset PSAP recurring operational and maintenance costs in the same fashion as currently collected 9-1-1 fees.

In 2015, Senate Bill 576 (cross-filed with House Bill 1080) required those that own or maintain a multi-line telephone system (MLTS) allow for the direct dialing of 9-1-1 without having to take an additional step to access the public switch telephone network.
(PSTN). On December 1, 2013 Kari Rene Hunt was ambushed and murdered in a Texas hotel room by her estranged husband. When Kari’s nine year old daughter attempted to call 9-1-1 from the hotel room’s telephone, which part of the hotel’s MLTS, she could not reach help because she was not aware of the requirement to dial “9” for an outside line. As a result, she was unable to obtain lifesaving assistance for her mother. According to the National Association of State 9-1-1 Administrators, Maryland is the first state to pass this legislation, which is known nationally as “Kari’s Law.”

The Public Safety Article is sufficient in its current content to be responsive to the needs of Maryland’s 9-1-1 community and no further changes are recommended.
The Code of Maryland Regulations

The Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) Title 12, Subtitle 11, Chapter 03 further codifies the activities of the Board, and describes in detail its essential functions, responsibilities and training standards. Previous recommendations made by the Emergency Number Systems Board’s Policy Subcommittee for updating COMAR were adopted. Significant updates include:

- Redundant wording of items appearing in COMAR that were verbatim to the Public Safety Article were removed and language added to reference the reader back to the appropriate section of the Public Safety Article;
- The Board requires a majority of confirmed members to be present at a meeting to constitute a quorum;
- PSAPs shall provide access to services for individuals who do not speak or understand the English language¹;
- PSAPs shall have sufficient call takers and equipment to consistently answer incoming calls on a daily average of 10 seconds or less²;
- Within six months of hiring a Public Safety Answering Point call taker, a county shall train the new call taker using a curriculum adopted or approved by the Board³;
- A county shall provide a Public Safety Answering Point call taker with yearly in-service training using a curriculum adopted or approved by the Board²; and
- In requesting funding from the Board, the county shall ensure that the county's procurement laws and policies are followed.

COMAR is sufficient in its current content to be responsive to the needs of Maryland’s 9-1-1 community and no further changes are recommended.

¹ All PSAPs provide immediate language assistance to persons who are limited in English proficiency through contractual translation services.
² Through the annual inspection process, all PSAPs were found to be compliant.
History of 9-1-1 in Maryland

1970s and 1980s

- In March 1973, the White House's Office of Telecommunications issued a national policy statement that recognized the benefits of 9-1-1, encouraged the nationwide adoption of 9-1-1, and provided for the establishment of a Federal Information Center to assist units of government in planning and implementation.

- In 1972, Charles County was the first county in Maryland to adopt 9-1-1, followed by Prince George’s County in 1973 and Montgomery County in 1974.

- In 1979, Maryland became the second state in the nation to adopt 9-1-1 as the statewide universal number for emergency services access. The Emergency Number Systems Board was established to coordinate 9-1-1 implementation efforts.

- The emergency communications industry established standards for automatic number information (ANI) and automatic location information (ALI) to be presented with each 9-1-1 call. This automatic ANI/ALI data delivery to 9-1-1 call takers was designed to streamline the information gathering/dispatch processes and allow locating persons who are unable to identify their location or to verbally communicate with the 9-1-1 call taker.

- Maryland established a $0.10 phone bill surcharge to fund 9-1-1 development efforts.

- The statute enabling the ENSB was amended to include the authority for counties to charge an “Additional Fee” assessed on monthly phone bills to offset 9-1-1 operational expenses.

1990s

- By 1995, all Maryland counties had implemented enhanced wireline 9-1-1 service with ANI/ALI displayed for each 9-1-1 call.

- The 9-1-1 Surcharge fee was modified to encompass wireless telecommunication services, and the ENSB was expanded to include a member of the wireless industry.

- The ENSB Training Sub-Committee and the Dundalk Community College developed a standardized 40-hour entrance level training course for 9-1-1 dispatchers.
2000 - 2010

In 2002, Anne Arundel County is selected as the State’s test site for providing enhanced wireless service and becomes Wireless Phase I operational (call back number displayed).

In 2003, the 9-1-1 Surcharge is increased to $0.25 per bill per month and the County “Additional Fee” is increased from a maximum of $0.50 per bill per month to $0.75. Board membership increased to 15 by adding representatives from the Maryland Emergency Number Association (MENA), a large county (population greater than 200,000), and a small county (population less than 200,000), while deleting a public-at-large position.

By 2004, more than 50 percent of all 9-1-1 calls originated from wireless callers in most Maryland counties.

By June 2005, all of Maryland’s primary PSAPs are Wireless Phase II operational (ANI/ALI with all wireless calls), making Maryland the eighth state in the nation to reach this milestone.

In response to Homeland Security Core Goals established by the Governor, the Board established “back-up” PSAP criteria should a primary PSAP not fulfill its role due to power outages, telephone system interruptions, building evacuations, or other natural or manmade disasters. The Board began providing funding for each PSAP to have a viable back-up facility that met Board established standards.

The Board encourages and funds the utilization of Emergency Dispatch Protocol Systems to provide a standardized means to consistently query and process information from 9-1-1 callers. Currently, all Maryland primary PSAPs utilize emergency medical dispatch protocols, while 96% of primary PSAPs use emergency fire and/or police dispatch protocols.

In 2008, Board membership is increased to 17 members, adding a representative from the Geographical Information Systems (GIS) community, and an additional representative from Emergency Management Services.

In 2009, Board established a policy to fund remote workstations at Maryland’s secondary PSAPs, which receive transferred 9-1-1 calls. The Frederick City Police Department completed the first installation utilizing the Frederick County PSAP phone equipment and IP connectivity between the two facilities. Through this effort, the Board intends to advance the dissemination of enhanced 9-1-1 data to secondary PSAPs.

---

3 Source: The National Emergency Number Association (NENA).
In 2009, the Harford County PSAP became the first PSAP in the nation to be recognized by the National Academies of Emergency Dispatch as an accredited “Center of Excellence” in all protocol disciplines (police, fire, and medical).

**2011 - Present**

- In 2012, the enabling legislation was amended to include a definition of Next Generation 9-1-1 services and tasking the Board with developing guidelines for NG 9-1-1 deployment.

- In 2013, the enabling legislation was amended providing for the 9-1-1 Surcharge to be applied to the sale of pre-paid wireless service to be collected at the point of sale (Maryland Pre-Paid Wireless E9-1-1 Fee).

- In 2013, Frederick County participated in a national pilot and offered text-to-9-1-1 services to Verizon Wireless customers located within Frederick County. Texts were sent to the Frederick County PSAP via a web-portal system provided by TeleCommunication Systems (TCS), a Maryland based company.
The membership of the ENSB includes a diverse and technically astute group of professionals from the emergency services, communications and public safety industries, as well as the public-at-large. The members serve a Governor appointed, Senate confirmed four-year term. While only required to meet quarterly, the ENSB has met at least monthly to examine current trends and needs of the twenty-four county managed PSAPs.

The Board enjoys the support of the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services (DPSCS or Department) fiscal offices in providing auditing and accounting support. In recognition of time demands, the ENSB through DPSCS has employed a full time fiscal coordinator and an accountant to support the ENSB’s efforts in administering the 9-1-1 Trust Fund.

The Board recognizes the need for entrance-level and in-service training for 9-1-1 call takers and supervisors. The Department established an administrative assistant position, working directly for the Office of the Executive Director, to advance the training efforts described in COMAR and handling special projects as assigned.

The following page outlines Board membership and the organization each member represents.
## DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY AND CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

**Emergency Number Systems Board**

**Board Member Listings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Represent</th>
<th>Member Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/30/99 - 6/30/16</td>
<td>Public Service Commission</td>
<td>Anthony Myers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/1/08 - 6/30/15</td>
<td>MIEMSS(^4)</td>
<td>Richard Berg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/04 - 6/30/16</td>
<td>Volunteer Fire Service</td>
<td>Brian C. Ebling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/10 - 6/30/17</td>
<td>Career Fire Service</td>
<td>Captain Colleen O’Neill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/07/11 - 6/30/15</td>
<td>Public-At-Large</td>
<td>J. Scott Whitney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/14 - 6/30/18</td>
<td>Emergency Management Systems</td>
<td>Scott Brillman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/14 - 6/30/15</td>
<td>Telephone Utility</td>
<td>E. Colton O'Donoghue, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/08 - 6/30/17</td>
<td>APCO(^5)</td>
<td>Susan E. Greentree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/06 - 6/30/17</td>
<td>Maryland State Police</td>
<td>VACANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/26/11 - 6/30/18</td>
<td>Police Services</td>
<td>Major Peter Lazich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/04 - 6/30/16</td>
<td>Public-At-Large</td>
<td>Roderick W. Hart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/29/03 - 6/30/17</td>
<td>Large County</td>
<td>Andrew M. Johnston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/04 - 6/30/17</td>
<td>Wireless Industry</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10/03 - 6/30/18</td>
<td>Small County</td>
<td>Steve Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/1/08 - 6/30/15</td>
<td>NENA(^6) – Local Chapter</td>
<td>William A. Frazier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/08 - 6/30/16</td>
<td>Emergency Management Systems</td>
<td>John E. Markey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/08 - 6/30/16</td>
<td>Geographical Information Systems</td>
<td>Ken Miller</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^4\) Maryland Institute for Emergency Medical Services Systems  
\(^5\) Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials  
\(^6\) National Emergency Number Association
In the mid-1990s, all Maryland PSAPs achieved “enhanced” capability when each became able to display Automatic Number Information (ANI) and Automatic Location Information (ALI) for wireline 9-1-1 calls. Previously, emergency services were requested through unique local phone exchanges to police and fire service agencies, or by dialing “0” for the telephone company operator. The caller’s phone number and address were not displayed to the call taker.

The advent and proliferation of wireless communications caused the public safety community to demand the same “enhanced” capability provided by their wireline counterparts. The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) required the wireless industry to provide the ANI/ALI data of a wireless caller to the PSAP. Today, the wireless industry is in compliance with the FCC regulations and has been able to provide enhanced wireless service to technologically capable PSAPs. In June 2005, Maryland became only the eighth state in the nation to have all 24 primary PSAPs receive and display the ANI and ALI information from wireless 9-1-1 calls.

During 2015, the Board continued to approve project funding to upgrade various PSAP phone systems and mapping capacity to receive and display enhanced wireless data. The caller location information (ALI) provided through enhanced wireless service is received at the PSAP in measurements of latitude and longitude. Mapping of this information is required to facilitate meaningful application in processing the 9-1-1 call. The Board obtained statewide aerial-photography to assist Maryland counties to update and maintain the accuracy of their mapping capacity. This cooperative effort of providing current statewide aerial-photography to PSAPs is anticipated to be an ongoing project.

In coordination with the Board, Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) and Telematics emergency 9-1-1 services are now being directed through the Verizon selective router to the appropriate PSAP in the same fashion as traditional communication services, with caller related emergency information displayed to the call taker.

**Next Generation 9-1-1**

The Emergency Number Systems Board (Board) is currently exploring the feasibility of migrating to an IP network-based 9-1-1 system for receiving voice, data, text, pictures and video messaging; known as Next Generation 9-1-1 (NG 9-1-1). NG 9-1-1 is a system that includes network, hardware, software, database services, and operational policies and procedures. Each of these parts needs to be fully vetted, established and, most importantly, funds need to be identified to provide for the initial capital expenditures and for the ongoing expenses.

In anticipation of this transition, all of the phone system hardware currently being funded by the Board is IP-enabled and ready for transitioning to an established NG 9-1-1 environment. These NG 9-1-1 phone systems provide the ability to geo-diversely locate
core hardware connected via an IP network to share operational data and functionality with remotely connected workstations that can be located at multiple sites using a common network. These technologically advanced phone systems provide greater resiliency, redundancy and back-up facilities for Maryland’s 9-1-1 System. Within the next few years, all of Maryland’s PSAPs will receive funding to purchase phone systems that utilize this NG 9-1-1 technology.

It is also the goal of the Board that as these new phone systems are locally implemented, secondary PSAPs that receive transferred 9-1-1 calls from a primary PSAP may be eligible to receive funding for the purchase and installation of remote 9-1-1 workstations. These workstations will be connected via an IP network to the local 9-1-1 phone system core and receive all the functionality and data that is available at the primary PSAP. Eventually, this local IP network connectivity from primary PSAPs to their local secondary PSAPs will be incorporated into the overall statewide Emergency Service IP Network (ESInet).

In March 2013, Frederick County was selected as part a national pilot to provide texting-to-9-1-1 services. Frederick County worked with Verizon Wireless, TeleCommunication Systems (TCS) and the Board to become the first jurisdiction in the State of Maryland, and one of the first in the nation, to be able to provide text-to-9-1-1 service to county residents and visitors that subscribe to Verizon Wireless services. The pilot project’s success helps the State of Maryland determine the impact of texting on a 9-1-1 center, identify operational “best practices,” and provide the framework for other wireless carriers to implement text-to-9-1-1 solutions. This pilot has also discovered location accuracy issues surrounding 9-1-1 texting, and the impact of providing 9-1-1 texting services on the deaf community (Frederick County is home to the Maryland School for the Deaf, and has a large speech and hearing impaired population).

By May 2014, the FCC ordered that all major wireless carriers (Verizon, T-Mobile, Sprint and AT&T) be able to provide text-to-9-1-1 services for all of their customers and to provide delivery to those PSAPs requesting to receive text-to-9-1-1 messages. Although text-to-9-1-1 will be offered by the wireless carriers by May 2014, it will take some time for the wireless carriers to implement the service as it will need to be rolled out on a PSAP by PSAP basis to account for PSAP boundaries and the routing of the messages. Working with each of Maryland’s PSAPs, it is the goal of the Board that within the next 12 months to have text-to-9-1-1 service available throughout Maryland. The Board is working with DPSCS and DoIT to develop a request for proposals (RFP) to implement consistent text-to-9-1-1 service in Maryland.

Network infrastructure with the capacity, resiliency and redundancy to transport 9-1-1 calls and related data in a cost effective manner is the greatest challenge to the implementation of NG 9-1-1 services. The current legacy system that delivers 9-1-1 calls has been reliable and sufficient to handle the demands of providing 9-1-1 emergency call delivery. It is critical that before transitioning to a Next Generation environment, the IP network delivery of emergency calls and data provides the same “five-nines” (99.999%) of service reliability, redundancy, and sufficient bandwidth capacity experienced today.
To this end, the Board has been working with Network Maryland (DoIT) and other NG 9-1-1 IP network providers to ensure these elements can be realized in a cost efficient manner.

Efforts by the federal government to create a nationwide ESInet, identified as the FirstNet Project, are also being monitored. The Board has participated in regional FirstNet efforts but it is still to be determined by FirstNet partners if 9-1-1 call delivery to PSAPs will be part of this data transport scheme.

NG 9-1-1 delivery of services will be geographically based and will require a transition from current address based data to new geo-based location technology. The Board and local counties are working with DoIT and its GIS department to coordinate the creation of this required geographic database. This process is on-going.

The Board is discovering that a significant impediment to implementing NG 9-1-1 in Maryland will be the recurring cost associated with securing an IP network with sufficient bandwidth, reliability, and redundancy for transport of 9-1-1 calls and data. Because of its design, NG 9-1-1 will cause a significant shift in one-time up-front (capital) and recurring monthly (expense) costs. Today, the ENSB funds capital projects while the PSAPs fund recurring expenses. At this point, it has not been determined how local government will absorb those increased network related costs.

Nationally, the standards and policies surrounding the transmission and delivery of pictures and video have not yet been established, nor has the FCC directed the carriers to provide that service by any identified date. Once available, PSAPs will need to interface this new data in their computer-aided dispatch (CAD) and recording systems before receiving photos and video. PSAPs will also need to develop policies on handling these ancillary call resources.

Utilizing the current legacy 9-1-1 system, PSAPs are able to receive 9-1-1 related calls, data, and eventually text messaging without having to transition to an IP Network. The capital and recurring costs associated with the current Maryland 9-1-1 System are known and are part of local and state ongoing budgetary projections. The cost associated with providing NG 9-1-1 services must be clearly identified and implemented with fiscal input from county and state entities. For fiscal planning, the Board and PSAP management must demand that a cost-benefit analysis be conducted for all requested and planned changes.

The Board will continue its strategy of adhering to standards adopted and recommended by the National Emergency Number Association (NENA) and the Association of Public Safety Communications Officials, International (APCO). Both organizations represent 9-1-1. It is expected that these organizations will continue their leadership role in defining NG 9-1-1 services. The Board’s strict adherence to national standards will assist in the avoidance of unnecessary expenses that could be associated with the replacement of non-standard software and hardware when transitioning to a NG 9-1-1 environment.
Considering the change in funding resources required in a NG 9-1-1 environment, the Board has begun the process of evaluating Maryland’s current funding structure established by legislation. The current legislation may need to be amended to address fiscal deficiencies once recurring network related costs are identified.

In summary, the Board will continue to plan for NG 9-1-1. Shortly, we will be working with wireless carriers to deliver text-to-9-1-1 services to all Maryland PSAPs. It is anticipated that we will be looking for opportunities to utilize Network Maryland in a test environment to examine its network viability for 9-1-1 purposes. The Board is also looking forward to working with a pilot PSAP to transition to a NG 9-1-1 network in an isolated environment to identify bandwidth requirements and associated costs. Lessons learned and best practices identified through these controlled trials will better prepare Maryland as we move forward to embrace NG 9-1-1 services.
## Maryland 2015 PSAP Statistics

### 9-1-1 Calls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Wireline</th>
<th>Wireless</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allegany</td>
<td>Roger Bennett</td>
<td>11,622</td>
<td>33,538</td>
<td>45,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel</td>
<td>Lt. Sara Schriffer</td>
<td>111,807</td>
<td>293,243</td>
<td>405,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City</td>
<td>Scott Brillman</td>
<td>482,253</td>
<td>892,731</td>
<td>1,374,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>Marie Whisonant</td>
<td>171,649</td>
<td>458,179</td>
<td>629,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert</td>
<td>Yvette Myers</td>
<td>3,442</td>
<td>10,898</td>
<td>14,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>Bryan Ebling</td>
<td>3,925</td>
<td>11,937</td>
<td>15,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>Jack Brown</td>
<td>17,002</td>
<td>39,643</td>
<td>56,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil</td>
<td>Richard Brooks</td>
<td>14,444</td>
<td>44,059</td>
<td>58,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Tony Rose</td>
<td>18,716</td>
<td>60,272</td>
<td>78,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>Kim Browning</td>
<td>3,999</td>
<td>16,223</td>
<td>20,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>John Woelfel</td>
<td>27,209</td>
<td>73,143</td>
<td>100,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>Kenneth Collins</td>
<td>13,399</td>
<td>3,806</td>
<td>17,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford</td>
<td>W. Mitch Vocke</td>
<td>28,606</td>
<td>75,174</td>
<td>103,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Lt. Edward Sprinkle</td>
<td>62,281</td>
<td>107,899</td>
<td>170,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Wayne Darrell</td>
<td>3,135</td>
<td>6,775</td>
<td>9,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>William Ferretti</td>
<td>126,007</td>
<td>386,313</td>
<td>512,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George’s</td>
<td>Charlynn Flaherty</td>
<td>264,383</td>
<td>987,290</td>
<td>1,251,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Anne’s</td>
<td>Scott Haas</td>
<td>4,795</td>
<td>18,638</td>
<td>23,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>Steve Marshall</td>
<td>10,110</td>
<td>20,412</td>
<td>30,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>Robert Kelly</td>
<td>3,442</td>
<td>10,898</td>
<td>14,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot</td>
<td>Clay Stamp</td>
<td>6,842</td>
<td>12,632</td>
<td>19,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Bardona Woods</td>
<td>23,030</td>
<td>76,208</td>
<td>99,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicomico</td>
<td>David Shipley</td>
<td>9,090</td>
<td>57,090</td>
<td>66,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>Fred Webster</td>
<td>8,438</td>
<td>31,696</td>
<td>40,134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maryland Total 9-1-1 Calls** 1,429,626 3,728,697 5,158,323

---

7 As reported by each County’s PSAP Director
In 2015, the Office of the Executive Director inspected each of Maryland’s 24 PSAPs. Inspections are conducted annually to ensure each county’s compliance with COMAR, to determine what areas need to be improved, and to learn about new trends in call handling that may have statewide implications.

Areas reviewed during the inspection process:

- The state of each county’s mapping of wireless 9-1-1 calls;
- A review of each county’s back-up power capabilities (uninterruptable power supply (UPS) and generator), electrical grounding and remote power monitoring/alarming;
- A review of Verizon service issues and concerns;
- A review of each county’s Verizon 9-1-1 System Outage Notification List to ensure that all contacts are up to date;
- A discussion of disaster planning exercises offered by Verizon;
- A discussion of 9-1-1 call delivery issues resulting from other service providers;
- A discussion of ongoing efforts to implement Next Generation 9-1-1 technologies;
- A review of the Frederick County text to 9-1-1 pilot;
- Other sources of funding the counties may have used for communications related projects (radio, CAD, 9-1-1, mapping, etc.);
- A check of PSAP equipment at both the primary and back-up (if applicable) locations to make certain that the equipment at each site meets COMAR requirements;
- A review of 9-1-1 call metrics to see if each county meets the COMAR requirement of answering 9-1-1 calls on a daily average of 10 seconds or less on a consistent basis;
- A discussion of staffing concerns;
- A review of each county’s three-year plan;
- A review of training records to determine if each county meets the COMAR standards for entrance-level and annual in-service training;
- A review of ENSB funded Emergency Telecommunicator Course (ETC) certifications of 9-1-1 operators;
- Any suggestions by the county to improve ENSB processes and training offered.

No deficiencies were noted at any of Maryland’s 24 PSAPs during the inspection process.
The Maryland Public Safety Article (§1-310 & §1-311) initially established two funding streams that support 9-1-1. The first is the State “9-1-1 Fee,” which is $0.25 per subscriber per month. The second is the County “Additional Fee” in an amount determined by each county, through local ordinance, up to maximum of $0.75 per bill per month. All Maryland counties and Baltimore City currently have passed local ordinances establishing the “Additional Fee” at $0.75. Telephone companies, wireless carriers, and other 9-1-1 accessible service providers, collect and remit both portions of the 9-1-1 Surcharge to the State Comptroller, monthly, for deposit into the 9-1-1 Trust Fund. A third funding source was codified, effective July 1, 2013, when the Maryland Public Safety Article was amended extending the collection of the Maryland 9-1-1 Surcharge Fee to the sales of pre-paid wireless service ($0.60 per transaction), collected at the point of sale (Maryland Pre-Paid Wireless E9-1-1 Fee).

Quarterly, the county “Additional Fee” and the county portion of the Maryland Pre-Paid Wireless E9-1-1 Fee remittances are distributed to each county prorated in accordance with the level of fees collected in each jurisdiction (Public Safety Article §1-309 & §1-313). Annually, the Secretary of the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services requests a budget appropriation from the 9-1-1 Trust Fund in an amount sufficient to carry out the purposes of the enabling legislation, pay administrative costs, and reimburse counties for the cost of enhancing their 9-1-1 system (Public Safety Article §1-309). Through this budget appropriation process, the State “9-1-1 Fee” is distributed from the 9-1-1 Trust Fund to the Maryland counties at the discretion of the Emergency Number Systems Board in response to county 9-1-1 enhancement requests.

Maryland has established written criteria identifying the allowable uses of all 9-1-1 related funds collected. Money collected from the State “9-1-1 Fee” and 25% of all collected Maryland Pre-Paid Wireless E9-1-1 Fee may be used to reimburse counties for the cost of enhancing Maryland’s 9-1-1 system through payment to a third party contractor (Public Safety Article §1-308). COMAR (12.11.03.12) further defines equipment qualifying for funding or reimbursement. Money distributed quarterly to the counties from the collection of the county “Additional Fee” and Maryland Pre-Paid Wireless E9-1-1 Fee may be spent on the installation, enhancement, maintenance, and operation of a county or multi-county 9-1-1 system. Maintenance and operation costs may include telephone company charges, equipment costs, equipment lease charges, repairs, utilities, personnel costs, and appropriate carryover costs from previous years (Public Safety Article §1-312).
The following chart indicates the 9-1-1 Surcharge fees associated with each jurisdiction and the date of resolution modifying the county fee (i.e., additional fee).

**Maryland 9-1-1 Surcharge Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>State Fee 8</th>
<th>County Additional Fee 9</th>
<th>Pre-Paid Wireless 10</th>
<th>Effective Date 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allegany</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>October 1, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>July 1, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>June 23, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>April 23, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>June 15, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>November 9, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>June 8, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>October 1, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>January 1, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>October 1, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>July 1, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>October 1, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>May 4, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>July 1, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>January 30, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>October 1, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George’s</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>March 5, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Anne’s</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>October 1, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>February 10, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>July 1, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>May 11, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>October 21, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicomico</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>January 1, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>October 1, 2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 The State fee is deposited to the State 9-1-1 Trust Fund for ENSB approved funding of capital projects
9 The County Additional Fee is disbursed quarterly to Counties to offset operational costs
10 The Maryland Pre-Paid Wireless E9-1-1 Fee (enacted July 1, 2013) is disbursed 25% to the 9-1-1 Trust Fund (similar use as the State Fee) and 75% to be disbursed quarterly in the same proportion as the County Additional Fee to each County
11 Effective date of the County Additional Fee, passed by local ordinance
The chart below reflects the Fiscal Year 2015 distribution of the collected “Additional Charge” fees.

**FY 2015 Additional Fee Payments to the Counties and Baltimore City**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Population 12</th>
<th>Additional Fee Disbursement</th>
<th>Percent of Total 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allegany County</td>
<td>75,087</td>
<td>$376,973.97</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel County</td>
<td>537,656</td>
<td>$4,044,555.24</td>
<td>10.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City</td>
<td>620,961</td>
<td>$3,414,453.64</td>
<td>8.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore County</td>
<td>805,029</td>
<td>$6,078,418.41</td>
<td>15.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert County</td>
<td>88,737</td>
<td>$607,462.69</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline County</td>
<td>33,066</td>
<td>$175,918.98</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll County</td>
<td>167,134</td>
<td>$1,073,250.11</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil County</td>
<td>101,108</td>
<td>$597,089.32</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles County</td>
<td>146,551</td>
<td>$1,070,608.34</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester County</td>
<td>32,618</td>
<td>$181,532.40</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick County</td>
<td>233,385</td>
<td>$1,580,072.12</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett County</td>
<td>30,097</td>
<td>$194,116.30</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford County</td>
<td>244,826</td>
<td>$1,698,728.11</td>
<td>4.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard County</td>
<td>287,085</td>
<td>$2,241,971.14</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>20,197</td>
<td>$131,047.85</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County</td>
<td>971,777</td>
<td>$7,171,870.97</td>
<td>17.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George's County</td>
<td>863,420</td>
<td>$6,290,780.71</td>
<td>15.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Anne's County</td>
<td>47,798</td>
<td>$317,317.93</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset County</td>
<td>26,470</td>
<td>$108,377.35</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary's County</td>
<td>105,151</td>
<td>$617,849.18</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot County</td>
<td>37,782</td>
<td>$275,134.48</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>147,430</td>
<td>$831,496.07</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicomico County</td>
<td>98,733</td>
<td>$539,659.77</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester County</td>
<td>51,454</td>
<td>$422,325.23</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,773,552</strong></td>
<td><strong>$40,041,010.31</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

12 2010 Actual Census (Maryland Manual)
13 Percent of total disbursement - used to calculate disbursement of Wireless Pre-Paid funds
The Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services FY 2015 annual budget appropriation for the Emergency Number Systems Board is approximately $14.4 Million.

The technical nature of 9-1-1 communications has evolved over time to include the advent of computer-aided dispatch, multiple agencies providing emergency response, national standard setting organizations, wireless telephone communications, and most recently, IP based communication and telematics (automatic crash notification) services. These have brought about fundamental changes in the 9-1-1 infrastructure, and added training and equipment challenges.

Historically, the vast majority of funds are allocated to upgrading phone systems, keeping current with technological advances, providing adequate backup facilities, and enhancing mapping capacity. Current phone systems funded by the Board must be IP capable and ready to accept NG 9-1-1 data once national delivery and presentation standards have been established. All Maryland PSAPs now have the capability of mapping the position of 9-1-1 callers, when location information is received by the call taker.

Should circumstances arise that prevent a PSAP from receiving or processing emergency calls, it is critical that back-up 9-1-1 service and relocation strategies are in place and regularly exercised. During 2015, the Board funded several projects for PSAPs to enhance or establish capacity for back-up service and emergency relocation procedures. Referring to the Board’s back-up PSAP guidelines, the Board works with noncompliant 9-1-1 Centers to establish approved back-up facilities with appropriate service functionality.

Utilizing technological advances in 9-1-1 phone systems and IP connectivity, the Board began the process of expanding the 9-1-1 system to encompass secondary PSAPs. Through the use of remote workstations, linked directly to the primary PSAP via IP network connectivity, secondary PSAP call takers experience the same functionality, mapping capacity and data delivery on all transferred 9-1-1 calls.
The chart below reflects FY 2015 Board expenditures

**Other Funding:**

Other funding is comprised of capital expenditures related to 9-1-1 call processing or its enhancement. Some examples of these capital expenditures are listed below:

- 9-1-1 center security;
- Backup power systems;
- Redundant/diverse 9-1-1 call routing;
- Training – entry-level, in-service and supervisory/administrative;
- Lightning/surge protection; and
- Protocol-based call processing systems.
Receiving and processing 9-1-1 calls requires specialized phone system equipment to optimize voice, data and location technologies. These complex phone systems leverage advances in communication equipment to provide responsive 9-1-1 call handling, data management and mapping capacity, while maintaining enhanced 9-1-1 services with legacy systems. The NG 9-1-1 phone systems the Board is currently funding provide the ability to geo-diverse locate core hardware, connect the cores via an IP network to share operational data and functionality, and remotely connect workstations at multiple sites to one system using a common IP network to answer 9-1-1 calls. In response to technological advances in the communication industry, the Board anticipates updating PSAP phone equipment in five to six year cycles. During FY 15, the Board provided funding to upgrade and refresh 9-1-1 enhanced geo-diverse phone systems for five (5) primary PSAPs and three (3) backup PSAPs.

HIGHLIGHTED FISCAL YEAR 2015 PHONE SYSTEM UPGRADES

In fiscal year 2015, the Board funded geo-diverse IP enabled phone systems for Wicomico, Queen Anne’s and Dorchester Counties. In each of these installations, the A-Side of the core system was located at the primary PSAP while the B-Side of the core system was located at their back-up PSAP facilities. Each of these phone system cores (A & B) were connected via an IP network to provide real-time sharing of data and operations. Once linked and sharing data, the A or B Side can independently provide 9-1-1 service should the other core side fail or both sides can work in tandem, thus affording PSAPs with enhanced redundancy and increased capacity. In addition, the Board funded workstations connected to existing phone equipment for the Saint Mary’s and Prince George’s Counties’ primary PSAPs.

Should circumstances arise that prevents a PSAP from receiving or processing emergency calls, it is critical that back-up 9-1-1 service and relocation strategies are in place and regularly exercised. In 2015, the Board funded phone equipment at the designated back-up PSAP facilities in Calvert County. Each is exercised on a regular basis and can augment their primary PSAP to significantly increase call answering capacity during emergency conditions.
The Public Safety Article requires each county to annually report to the Board how the monies received from the State 9-1-1 Trust Fund were spent. The Board is charged with the responsibility of evaluating the expenditures for compliance with applicable laws and regulations. To this end, the Board funds independent audits of county expenditures.

All of the audits for FY 15 were received and auditors compensated. The audits were reviewed and each county found in compliance with the spending limits articulated in the Public Safety Article. Operational expenses typically include 9-1-1 related personnel salaries/benefits, recurring maintenance and service fees, mapping maintenance/updating, network associated fees, and capital expenditures not covered by the Board.

### County Audits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>COUNTY 9-1-1 FEE REVENUES</th>
<th>COUNTY 9-1-1 EXPENSES</th>
<th>% of 9-1-1 FEE OFFSET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allegany County</td>
<td>$420,186.00</td>
<td>$2,260,620.00</td>
<td>18.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel County</td>
<td>$5,000,600.00</td>
<td>$7,179,008.00</td>
<td>69.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City</td>
<td>$4,621,420.28</td>
<td>$6,923,311.71</td>
<td>66.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore County</td>
<td>$6,130,089.00</td>
<td>$9,651,513.00</td>
<td>63.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert County</td>
<td>$643,291.00</td>
<td>$2,601,188.00</td>
<td>24.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline County</td>
<td>$177,981.40</td>
<td>$1,008,141.00</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll County</td>
<td>$1,034,756.00</td>
<td>$2,680,137.08</td>
<td>38.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil County</td>
<td>$585,841.18</td>
<td>$2,153,108.57</td>
<td>27.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles County</td>
<td>$1,040,763.12</td>
<td>$2,374,381.30</td>
<td>43.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester County</td>
<td>$187,889.00</td>
<td>$1,493,239.00</td>
<td>12.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick County</td>
<td>$1,535,558.00</td>
<td>$6,319,845.00</td>
<td>24.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett County</td>
<td>$214,697.00</td>
<td>$935,610.00</td>
<td>22.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford County</td>
<td>$1,638,236.00</td>
<td>$6,088,885.00</td>
<td>26.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard County</td>
<td>$2,690,300.04</td>
<td>$5,991,915.00</td>
<td>44.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>$129,632.00</td>
<td>$976,738.00</td>
<td>13.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County</td>
<td>$8,616,645.00</td>
<td>$8,665,515.00</td>
<td>99.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George’s County</td>
<td>$6,236,879.29</td>
<td>$10,094,942.00</td>
<td>61.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Anne’s County</td>
<td>$307,919.00</td>
<td>$2,177,987.00</td>
<td>14.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Mary’s County</td>
<td>$142,143.00</td>
<td>$1,063,010.00</td>
<td>13.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset County</td>
<td>$608,709.14</td>
<td>$2,751,945.00</td>
<td>22.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot County</td>
<td>$300,928.00</td>
<td>$8,169,041.00</td>
<td>3.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>$862,395.63</td>
<td>$3,988,537.38</td>
<td>21.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicomico County</td>
<td>$535,483.00</td>
<td>$1,207,969.00</td>
<td>44.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester County</td>
<td>$418,905.00</td>
<td>$2,412,798.07</td>
<td>17.36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Operational Cost Offset by 9-1-1 Fee**  
44.45%

---
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Following the June 2012 Derecho Storm, the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG or COG) established a PSAP Directors’ Committee. The initial purpose of the committee was to understand the 9-1-1 network failures that occurred in Northern Virginia as a result of the Derecho, and to craft solutions to prevent a similar reoccurrence. The committee works collaboratively with partners from Virginia, Maryland, the District of Columbia, the federal government and private entities, such as Verizon, to strengthen the reliability and resiliency of the 9-1-1 network in the National Capital Region (NCR).

Due to the Board’s efforts to improve 9-1-1 network reliability and resiliency, and with the hardening Maryland’s PSAPs against catastrophic failures, Maryland did not experience the same level of 9-1-1 related issues following the Derecho.

Chairman Myers and members of the Office of the Executive Director have participated in the committee’s quarterly meetings to discuss what is occurring with 9-1-1 in Maryland, and to share Maryland’s successes in strengthening the state’s 9-1-1 System.
The Emergency Number Systems Board (ENSB) held a Planning Day on November 12, 2015 at the Prince George’s County Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP). The purpose of the day was to network with peers, to promote information sharing, and to discuss developments, direction and options for the delivery of emergency service through the 9-1-1 system. This document reflects the effort of that day and is a process that will need to continue into the future. Additional meetings will be held as deemed appropriate by the Emergency Number Systems Board. Action items were assigned to various individuals and committees with reports due to the Board at various times in the future.

Baltimore City Uprising: Lessons Learned – Tenea Reddick

Spring 2015 saw large protests and disturbances in Baltimore City resulting from the death of Freddie Gray while in police custody. From April 23rd through the first week of May, Baltimore experienced a citywide curfew, a state of emergency, National Guard activation to restore order, and large mutual aid responses from neighboring jurisdictions. Peaceful protests gave way to looting, property damage, and assaults on first responders and members of the public. One of the entities in Baltimore that was affected was the Baltimore City Public Safety Answer Point (PSAP), which is located on the fourth floor of the police headquarters’ building.

On April 27, 2015, the shift working at the time that riots began around Mondawmin Mall was staffed with 14 9-1-1 operators. There were rumors that a large protest was planned to begin at 3:00 P.M., but that information was not shared with the PSAP staff so that additional staffing could have been added. During the initial period of protest, 9-1-1 calls increased from 100 to 1100 calls per hour. PSAP supervisors attempted to have additional staff respond to the PSAP, but were hampered by the following:

- Mass transportation had shut down;
- Lack of parking in and around the police headquarters’ building; and
- The safety of the PSAP staff travelling to and from their homes to the PSAP.

By 8:30 PM on the 27th, staffing had increased to 17 operators, and the use of emergency dispatch protocols (emergency fire dispatch and emergency medical dispatch) had been suspended by the PSAP with the consent of the Baltimore City Fire Department. The queue size on the phone system was also increased so that fewer callers would receive busy signals when calling 9-1-1.

The city found that as the week progressed, supervisors got better with scheduling, handling expenses, transportation and parking, utilizing all staff (including trainees), community relations and working cohesively with outside agencies. Due to the physical
space and number of positions at the PSAP, the PSAP was not able to add staffing from other agencies, such as a Telecommunicator Emergency Response Team (TERT) deployment.

The city PSAP also recognized that improvement was needed in being attentive to unfolding events, training staff to meet expectations, and employee needs such as food and shelter.

The PSAP will take the following actions to prepare for any future incidents of civil unrest:

- Cross training dispatchers and 9-1-1 operators to allow more flexibility in increasing call handling capabilities with short or no notice;
- Adding additional call taking positions;
- Hiring additional 9-1-1 operators;
- Hold regular meetings with other city agencies to discuss:
  - PSAP needs;
  - Best practices and lessons learned; and
  - Intelligence.

Ms. Reddick thanked the other PSAPs that offered assistance, food or other support during the period of unrest.

Chairman Myers stated that it was good to have an operations perspective with these sorts of incidents. Normally, the Board hears about how equipment or networks perform, but not necessarily about the people in the PSAP. Chairman Myers asked if there were any issues with security of the PSAP during the uprising. Ms. Reddick replied that there were none. Chairman Myers also asked if the city has implemented strategies for food, shelter and other needs. Ms. Reddick advised that the city would be hiring a consultant to review the PSAP as a whole, and may make recommendations that may include the consolidation of 9-1-1, police and fire dispatch operations into one agency.

Chairman Myers also asked if the sustained increase in call volume has reduced. Ms. Reddick stated that the calls for service are reducing, but they remain above historical averages. The addition of personnel on the evening shift, which handles approximately one-half of the total 9-1-1 calls, has reduced the answer time on that shift from 12 seconds to 4 or 5 seconds on the busiest of shifts. Ms. Reddick also noted that there were no issues with the telephone equipment, but the new computer aided dispatch (CAD) system that went online the previous month operated slowly.

Mr. Tony Rose recommended that PSAPs should use call-up lists and prearrange hotel rooms for staff in the event of future events such as the uprising.
Mr. de Witte provided an overview of Vesta 9-1-1 release 6. Release 6 is available now, and includes ATIS\textsuperscript{15} compliant SMS\textsuperscript{16} integration. Release 6 was beta tested for longer than most Vesta products to ensure that the engineering and operational workflow were correct. The product was tested heavily with the text control centers (TCC) to force SIP\textsuperscript{17} failures to see how they could occur and how they would be remedied. The interfacing with other Vesta components, such as i3 log, was also tested. Release 6 has the i3 log interface, which is a national Emergency Number Association (NENA) standard that includes SMS transcripts. This has been shared with most CAD vendors. An update to Vesta Analytics release 2.4 service pack 1 is needed for SMS messaging.

Mr. Bill Ferretti asked how transfers of SMS messages in the i3 environment would be handled. Mr. de Witte replied that transfers within a single phone system are not an issue. SMS transfers between TCC’s (TCS and Intrado) and between different phone systems is an issue being worked on with the TCC’s.

Vesta release 7 will include call history, ACD reason codes and readiness controls, queue display, real time operational performance management, an operating system update (Microsoft’s Windows 10 and Server 2008 release 2), and US Department of Defense Joint Interoperation Test Command (JITC) recertification.

Vesta Analytics release 3 will be adding new reports and updating to the latest Microsoft operating system.

Future released of Vesta will include:

- **“Pocket dial” screening**, which will be set up for wireless trunks and will prompt the caller to press “1” on their phone or to speak to be connected to a call taker. If there is no action, the call will be disconnected and the call will be displayed in the abandoned call queue. Charlynn Flaherty asked if an interactive voice response (IVR) will be in Vesta. Mr. de Witte stated that it exists now, and will be enhanced in future releases.

- **Automated abandoned callbacks**, where the phone system will call back the abandoned call queue and present the caller with IVR options that will then connect the caller with a call taker, or record the reason the call was not connected in MIS data.

- **Vesta 9-1-1 Interconnect** to connect Vesta systems without an ESI\textsuperscript{net}.

\textsuperscript{15} Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions
\textsuperscript{16} Short Message Service (text messages)
\textsuperscript{17} Session Initiated Protocol
➢ Emergency Incident Data Document (EIDD), which is a NENA/APCO standard to allow every emergency management system to feed into one standard document to record historical data for phone, CAD and radio for a specific event. This will be in release 8, and will be able to transfer data between PSAPs using Vesta Interconnect.

➢ Instant messaging through the NG911 core.

➢ Partner Integrations:

  o NICE recorders will have full IP recording.
  o Emergency Call Tracking System (ECaTS) to link Vesta MIS data to a standardized reporting solution that works with different vendors.
  o Language Line integration to allow for translation services for text to 9-1-1. This will allow the phone system to push SMS messages to language detection, and to assign translation resources (human and/or automated) and provide a suggested response. The caller and translator will not interact directly with each other.
  o Real-Time Operational Performance Management, which partners with RMG (Symon) to provide an enhanced experience outside of Vesta by using display panels and/or mobile applications to display threshold triggers and alerts on a non-Vesta device.

Chairman Myers asked if Airbus participates in the FCC’s reliability certification where providers are to certify the reliability of their network. Airbus has participated, and Jeff Wittek (Vice President of Strategic Planning) sits on the committee. Chairman Myers further asked how Airbus certifies with partners. Airbus will not certify an interconnection to another vendor’s equipment without testing it in a lab to see if the partner product meets standards and interoperates with the Vesta equipment without reducing performance. If requested by a customer PSAP, Airbus will test third party applications with the Vesta equipment.

Chairman Myers also asked about intended disruptions to the Vesta equipment from cyber-attacks. Airbus has addressed cyber-security with border protection and endpoint protections. Workstations are only able to run allowed applications and approved applications delivered through an IP port. The equipment also identifies unknown processes and performance, and will shut down a device if a problem is detected. This is consistent with the JITC standards.

**Next Generation 9-1-1 Discussion – Technology Subcommittee**

Technology Subcommittee Chairman Rod Hart facilitated a discussion with the assembled group about NG911 migration. Since the 1990’s, the Board has only funded equipment that meets the prevailing standards for 9-1-1. Today’s funding model allows the Board to fund capital costs, but not reoccurring and operational costs. In the future, the costs will shift to subscription services. It is not clear who will request these services
(Board or PSAP), and who will own these services. There may be a need to convince the legislature to change the existing Public Safety Article to adapt to the evolving nature of 9-1-1. It is also not clear about governance, and who will control hardwired and network services.

The Technology Subcommittee is reviewing requests for proposals (RFP) and requests for information (RFI) from other states to see what it is that the Board should look to when issuing its own RFP or RFI for NG911. Currently, the Board cannot delegate its authority to another governing body, and the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG or COG) will need to come before the Board with any changes to 9-1-1 service in Maryland.

Mr. Hart then opened the discussion regarding what the counties’ expectations of the Board are during any migration to NG911.

Bill Ferretti provided some background on the COG 9-1-1 Director’s Committee. This committee was formed after the 2012 Derecho storm, and it evolved into planning for NG911 technologies and conducting an assessment for an ESInet for the region. The next step will be to issue an RFP for a regional ESInet. The goal for the regional ESInet will be for cost efficiencies with shared core services. Mr. Ferretti posed his dilemma that should Montgomery County elect to migrate to NG911, it is not fully understood how the county will be able to transfer calls to its neighbors that have not yet migrated, or have migrated to a different network.

Jack Markey stated that the COG process is important in determining the human aspect of NG911, and how governance can help drive that process. Ken Miller added that a state RFI should include the COG and possibly the State of Delaware for efficiencies and interoperability. Mr. Hart encouraged the COG counties to enter into a dialog with the Board to discuss their needs and requirements.

Tony Rose stated that the Technology Subcommittee should be proactive with NG911 issues. Chairman Myers added that the statute requires a county-centric 9-1-1 system, and that in addition to Board initiated efforts, the counties can bring issues regarding NG911 before the Board. Mr. Ferretti asked who should the counties take direction from: the Board or the COG. Chairman Myers replied that Maryland law sets the Board’s responsibility with respect to 911, however, there will be many entities involved in the discussion, including the Board, the Maryland Public Service Commission, the Federal Communications Commission and the COG. Also included in these discussions will be Maryland’s counties.

Mr. Hart stated that any changes to the statute will need to be pushed by the counties with their respective legislative delegations. Additionally, the COG counties will need to present something before the Board for the Technology Subcommittee to evaluate prior to any Board approval. Mr. Ferretti asked if the Board would be able to review the RFP issued by the COG prior to its release. Mr. Roper replied that any RFP review would
likely include a non-disclosure agreement, which would need to be reviewed by the DPSCS legal counsel.

**GIS Update – Ken Miller**

Ken Miller discussed the two-county pilot conducted by the Maryland Department of Information Technology (DoIT) with Queen Anne’s and Talbot Counties. This pilot was to conduct a gap analysis of county GIS data against NENA standards using Master Street Address Guide (MSAG) data, Automatic Location Information (ALI) data, United States Postal Service address data, voter registration data, and other data sets. The anticipated results would provide a “road map” to fix errors and to replicate this process with GIS data in other counties. The pilot could not be completed due to procurement issues.

The data examined were the county centerline maps and address points. Errors were discovered in road name spelling and suffixes. The outcomes helped to validate the methodology.

Mr. Miller stated that a statewide approach for data gap analysis must maintain county focus and meet with county expectations. There will be a need to integrate data into a statewide database for NG911.

Mr. Miller stated that there are two ways to handle the data gap analysis procurement: county-by-county or with a statewide contract managed by DoIT or DPSCS. The contract will need to be for data analysis only or data analysis and repair. It will also need to be determined if this should be a stand-alone mapping contract, or part of a NG911 implementation.

From a governance perspective, a determination will need to be made as to the ownership of the data (county versus state), and does NG911 fit into the state’s master information technology plan. It will also need to be decided if there will be one statewide dataset, or if it will be series of regional interconnected datasets. Funding options for this study may include the 9-1-1 Trust Fund or grant funding.

Jack Markey suggested that an *a-la-carte* contract would best suit the needs of the counties, where each county can select the services that they require using a standardized methodology. This will keep data consistent across jurisdictional boundaries. Mr. Miller stated that it will be important for county input regarding the specifications so that the outcomes will meet the needs of each county in a standardized manner. Mr. Ferretti asked about the status of the “One Maryland” centerline. Mr. Miller stated that this is a Maryland Department of Transportation/State Highway Administration project, and that the data was still being collected and analyzed.
Training Subcommittee – Roundtable Discussion

Mr. Roper facilitated a discussion on behalf of the Training Subcommittee to determine if the Board and the Training Subcommittee are meeting the expectations of the counties, and to provide the counties with the opportunity to provide input for future classes and topics.

Members of the audience appreciated the NENA Center Manager Certification Program (CMCP) class held in 2014. There needs to be a next step in the process, such as an alumni group to discuss best practices and lessons learned.

Other suggestions for the Training Subcommittee to examine include:

- A writing class for supervisors;
- State mandated certifications;
- A standard for a minimum number of hours for annual in-service training;
- A Telecommunicator Emergency Response Taskforce (TERT) class;
- The APCO Staffing and Retention class; and
- An active assailant class from a different training provider.
Maryland continues to be a national leader in its 9-1-1 training efforts and remains one of the few states to establish legislation mandating 9-1-1 personnel training standards. Telecommunicator training has recently received national media attention and improving 9-1-1 personnel training has become the focus of several organizations and foundations (e.g., The Denise Amber Lee Foundation). At the inception of 9-1-1 in the early 1980s, Maryland understood the importance of training and, through the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR), established mandatory 9-1-1 PSAP training standards for both entry-level and in-service programs under the purview of the Emergency Number Systems Board (ENSB). These mandates continue to be updated to maintain current relevance. Compliance is verified through a yearly inspection process conducted by Board staff. It is evident that the ENSB and the Public Safety Answering Points’ leadership have taken the obligation of providing timely and pertinent training seriously.

In the early 2000’s, to provide a consistent entry-level training program, the ENSB selected a nationally offered Emergency Telecommunicator Course (ETC) developed and maintained current by the International Academies of Emergency Dispatch (IAED). The ETC curriculum and instruction was developed to deliver the information and educational experiences needed to prepare entry-level 9-1-1 call takers to begin their careers in public safety in a standardized and consistent manner. The ENSB funded ETC instructor training to provide each Maryland PSAP with certified ETC instructors. Today, Board funded ETC instructor and entry-level training programs continue to be the foundation for developing competent 9-1-1 call takers.

In response to COMAR, in-service training programs are provided by local jurisdictions and supplemented through training funded by the Board. Training officers develop local agency specific programs, while the Board, at the recommendation of the Training Subcommittee, offers 9-1-1 related training courses on a statewide basis throughout the year (see chart on page 45). These training sessions are open to all Maryland PSAP personnel, and address disciplines designed to enhance the skills and abilities of new or veteran call takers, supervisors and administrators.

Locally developed training programs are reviewed by the ENSB Training Subcommittee for content, relevance and statutory compliance. Also during the annual PSAP inspection process, each local jurisdiction’s training program records are inspected by ENSB staff to validate that all 9-1-1 employees are receiving COMAR compliant training.

Maryland has been recognized nationally for its statewide utilization of police, fire, and medical protocol based call-processing systems. Nationally certified protocol systems provide a systematic methodology to query emergency response information from 9-1-1 callers that follows predetermined questioning guidelines and to provide standardized instructions to the caller prior to the first responder’s arrival. Protocols offer a consistent 9-1-1 call handling process, and a quantifiable quality assurance review methodology.
Embracing the value of continuing education, Maryland remains a national leader in the ongoing training of 9-1-1 personnel through the support of the ENSB. The Board’s emphasis on entry-level training, with the ETC program, and support of utilizing emergency medical, fire, and police protocols has significantly enhanced the delivery 9-1-1 service. The evaluation of 9-1-1 personnel through a disciplined quality assurance process is also required of jurisdictions receiving ENSB funding for protocol programs. The IAED protocol quality assurance process identifies individual, unit, and overall center compliance scores. National standards have been established to recognize centers that achieve superior quality assurance scores. Harford County and Prince George’s County are among the first PSAPs in the world to receive the Tri-ACE (Accredited Center of Excellence) Certification from IAED for superior quality assurance scores attained in all three disciplines (police, fire and medical).
The Policy/Standards Subcommittee is tasked with developing the policy and guidelines to provide guidance to the Board and PSAPs with regard to requesting and encumbering funding from the 9-1-1 Trust Fund. They also craft and respond to recommendations for legislative changes affecting the Public Safety Article and the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) as it relates to 9-1-1 service.

**STRATEGIES**

- Develop written guidelines to be used by the ENSB in its consideration of the pricing, functionality, and quantities proposed for routine 9-1-1 equipment and service purchases.
- Develop procurement standards including equipment replacement cycles, spare/back-up equipment purchase guidelines, and minimum qualifications.
- Review the standards and procurement activities of national associations and efforts of other jurisdictions/states to adopt best practices in Maryland.
- Identify synergistic procurement opportunities in Maryland and foster the competitive bidding process.
- Develop statistical models to capture and reflect information relative to the Board’s procurement activities and pricing trends.
- Work with the other subcommittees as needed to support the overall goals and objectives of the Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy/Standards Subcommittee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chairman</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Scott Whitney - ENSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Myers - ENSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Johnston - ENSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Greentree - ENSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Frazier - ENSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Miller - ENSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Windisch - Baltimore County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wally Campbell – Anne Arundel County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through the efforts of this committee working with the Training Subcommittee, Board standards were established to fund police and fire protocol recertification costs that are required for the 9-1-1 call taker maintain his or her certification.

---

18 Currently the Policy and Standards Subcommittee are acting together to achieve their missions.
During 2015, the Standards Subcommittee reviewed current equipment improvements and associated pricing ranges of items commonly funded by the Board to establish more responsive fiscal guidelines to assist Board efforts. No changes were recommended for funding guidelines.

The Policy Subcommittee also presented Federal Communication Commission (FCC) updates to members concerning expanded efforts to safeguard the reliability and resiliency of 9-1-1 networks, national text to 9-1-1 pilots, and national NG 9-1-1 efforts.
The Technology Subcommittee is responsible for the investigation and research of technology related issues, and the dissemination of technical information to the membership of the ENSB. This subcommittee will be focused on issues that could impact the management, operation and maintenance of E9-1-1 systems serving the residents of the State of Maryland.

The Technology Subcommittee is currently reviewing the feasibility of implementing a Next Generation 9-1-1 System (NG 9-1-1) in Maryland. The Technology Subcommittee is following NG 9-1-1 technological advancements and establishment of industry standards/regulations to better prepare the Board as to NG 9-1-1 implementation options.

During 2015, The Technology Subcommittee conducted meetings with PSAP personnel and vendors to discuss migration to NG 9-1-1. The recurring funding required establishing and maintaining a NG 9-1-1 network was identified as a major element that will require a cost to benefit analysis to be conducted before committing the local funding necessary for this effort to advance.

The Technology Subcommittee coordinated presentations to the Board concerning Maryland FirstNet efforts, text-to-9-1-1, mapping and cyber security.
The Training Subcommittee is comprised of members of the Board and the PSAP community. In order to provide Maryland with a robust training program that will meet the requirements of the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR), the Training Subcommittee reviewed numerous training opportunities, programs and seminars before deciding which programs to offer in 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENSB Training Subcommittee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chairman</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Ebling – ENSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Frazier – ENSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Greentree – ENSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John “Chris” McNamara – Howard County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitch Vocke – Harford County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Johnston – ENSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Swisher – Washington County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Fitzgerald – Montgomery County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alicia Dodson – Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) provides specific guidance on the topical requirements for training, but does not address job relatedness, testing standards, or instructional methodologies for entrance level, in-service or supervisory training. The Board, through the recommendation of the Training Subcommittee, partnered with the International Academies of Emergency Dispatch (IAED) to provide an Emergency Telecommunicator Course (ETC) for Maryland’s newly hired 9-1-1 call takers. This course provides a comprehensive review of the skills and abilities needed for successful handling of 9-1-1 emergency calls, and utilizes a curriculum designed for adult based learning. Trainers from each PSAP attend IAED sponsored classes to earn their ETC Instructor certification. During 2015, 264 9-1-1 call takers successfully completed the ETC entry-level training program. For additional information of the program, the web address for IAED is [http://www.emergencydispatch.org](http://www.emergencydispatch.org/).

As established in COMAR, in-service training is a requirement for all jurisdictions. Training programs can be provided by each local jurisdiction as well as on a statewide basis. Training officers at the local level develop agency specific training programs and evaluate individual training based on the needs for their center and county. A variety of educational resources is utilized by each jurisdiction to ensure local personnel are properly trained and prepared for any emergency requests they may receive. The
Training Subcommittee annually reviews each PSAPs training program to ensure curricula meets established guidelines.

Throughout 2015, the Training Subcommittee reviewed new programs and local training requests to determine appropriateness to enhance 9-1-1 service in Maryland. Upon subcommittee recommendation, various training programs are offered to PSAP personnel and held at locations around the state to ensure accessibility to all jurisdictions. The Training Subcommittee will continue to look for training opportunities to take advantage of technological advances in training media and presentation.

During 2015, programs from nationally recognized training vendors including the National Emergency Number Association (NENA), Association of Public Safety Communications Officials - International, Inc. (APCO), Public Safety Training Consultants, Priority Dispatch and the Public Safety Group were offered. The chart below indicates the number of students trained during Board funded classes.

![2015 Board Funded Class Attendance](chart)

The Training Subcommittee continues to utilize the facilities of the Public Safety Training Center, located in Sykesville, Maryland. This facility, which is centrally located, provides a rich learning environment with state of the art technology and ample classroom space that can accommodate up to 75 students in one room.

The Emergency Number Systems Board supports a variety of training programs and encourages the use of protocol systems throughout Maryland. Over 95 percent of the jurisdictions are currently using either Emergency Fire or Emergency Police Dispatch, in addition to Emergency Medical Dispatch protocols. In support of this effort, various protocol classes and protocol quality assurance training have been presented around the state.

The Training Subcommittee reviewed various training programs recommended by our 9-1-1 Centers. Course selections were made and offered throughout the year to best accommodate employee scheduling. Training programs were typically provided at least...
twice for geographic diversity to allow all counties across the state to attend. **See list of training programs on next page.**
2015 Training Programs

Protocol Classes (30 Sessions) .......................... 515 Attendees
Emergency Telecommunicator (ETC) ....................... 264 Attendees
IAED Emergency Telecommunicator Instructor ............. 14 Attendees
PSTC Active Assailant ........................................ 21 Attendees
PSTC Communications Training Officer ...................... 66 Attendees
PSTC What if it Were Family ............................. 50 Attendees
PSTC Crisis Communications ............................. 83 Attendees
PSTC Dispatcher Toolkit .................................... 160 Attendees
Miltenberger Seminar ....................................... 30 Attendees
Denise Amber Lee Foundation ............................... 187 Attendees
PSTC Crisis Communications ............................... 79 Attendees

2015 TOTAL ATTENDEES ................................. 1384
The Emergency Number Systems Board (ENSB), in cooperation with the Maryland Emergency Number Association (MENA) presented the eleventh annual 9-1-1 Day of Celebration on September 17, 2015. This event is intended to recognize the dedication and professional service provided by Maryland’s Telecommunicators that answer 9-1-1 calls from the residents and visitors of Maryland requesting emergency services. Carroll County hosted the 2015 Day of Celebration at the Sykesville Freedom District Volunteer Fire Department. More than 140 Telecommunicators, supervisors, and other 9-1-1 service related personnel were welcomed to Carroll County by John Woelfel, President of the Maryland Chapter of NENA. Attendees then began the morning session with a training seminar presented by Public Safety Training Consultants (PSTC), a nationwide leader in 9-1-1 Center training.

Telecommunicator of the Year awards were presented to exemplary Telecommunicators selected by their local 9-1-1 center directors for outstanding service and dedication to Public Safety through 9-1-1 communications. Seventeen of Maryland’s twenty-four 9-1-1 centers participated. The honorees were presented with a plaque recognizing their achievement and were acknowledged by their peers. The MENA President John Woelfel made the award presentations to the Telecommunicator of the Year recipients. Assisting in the presentation of these awards were ENSB members Sue Greentree and William Frazier.

Marilyn Farndon “Excellence in Training” Award

Marilyn Farndon was the first Executive Director of the Emergency Number Systems Board. Marilyn played a critical role in establishing many of the Board’s policies and guidelines. She understood the critical need of standardized training and one of her signature achievements was bringing the 9-1-1 community together to develop Maryland’s first certified entry-level training program. In recognition of this, and Marilyn Farndon’s many other accomplishments, the Board has established the Marilyn Farndon Excellence in Training Award to recognize Maryland’s most deserving 9-1-1 Instructor that has demonstrated a superior commitment to training through the development and presentation of relevant training curricula that enhances 9-1-1 service in Maryland. The recipient is selected by the Board’s Training Subcommittee and the presentation of this award is made each year as part of the ENSB/MENA Telecommunicator of the Year awards ceremony at the 9-1-1 Day of Celebration.

The 2015 Marilyn Farndon Excellence in Training Award was presented to Charles “Tom” Brown of Washington County.
**Conclusions and Next Steps**

As evidenced by this report, the Emergency Number Systems Board is continuing to identify, evaluate and develop strategies to embrace new 9-1-1 related technologies and public safety services. The Board also monitors local and national efforts to establish future standards surrounding the delivery, processing, sharing, and storing of 9-1-1 calls and data. To prepare for adopting proven technological advancements in public communications and migrating to a Next Generation 9-1-1 environment, the Board has identified the below listed action items to be addressed in the near future. Each action item has been assigned to one of the Board’s subcommittees for follow up, and recommendations will be presented to the Board for further action.

**BOARD ASSIGNED ACTION ITEMS**

**Maryland Networks:** NG 9-1-1 will require an IP network to transport 9-1-1 calls and data. One option would be to use a local or state owned network. The Board will seek to test the ability and cost effectiveness of Network Maryland and other local IP networks to act as the transport agent for 9-1-1 related calls and data in a controlled environment.

*Assigned to Technology Subcommittee*

- Explore the testing of network capacity, reliability, and identifying bandwidth requirements necessary to link diversely located redundant core components of Airbus DS (formerly Cassidian) 9-1-1 phone equipment in a county using local or Network Maryland connectivity.
- Explore if local or Network Maryland broadband service can provide dedicated network connectivity for 9-1-1 related calls and data.

**Text-to-9-1-1 Interface:** One of the first NG 9-1-1 related services will be the ability to request emergency assistance by texting 9-1-1. The Board will expand on the Frederick County text-to-9-1-1 pilot and seek to test the integration of text-to-9-1-1 services with Airbus DS Communications 9-1-1 phone equipment (Vesta) utilizing IP connectivity.

*Assigned to Standards Subcommittee*

- Frederick County is working with Verizon and TCS to integrate directly with Vesta equipment – testing should occur within the next few months.
- Prior to texting-to-9-1-1 services being offered, the Board will develop an informational guide for PSAPs, which will include text-to-9-1-1 standards, best practices, potential staffing/workload impact, methods of receiving 9-1-1 text messages, and the process to request 9-1-1 texting service from the wireless carriers. It should be noted, that this request will place each county into a nationwide queue to receive 9-1-1 text messages, with the cellular carriers initiating text-to-9-1-1 services to each PSAP in the general order that the requests were received.
Future Funding Requirements: The Board will continue to evaluate the evolving allocation of network, equipment, and services costs to determine whether the current 9-1-1 funding model in Maryland warrants modification. **Assigned to Policy Subcommittee**

- The current funding model for 9-1-1 related capital, maintenance, operational, and call delivery costs will need to be examined in a NG 9-1-1 environment, in which monthly recurring costs could significantly increase.
  - The Board will seek monthly recurring NG 9-1-1 network related cost estimates from local, state, and commercial network providers to determine local 9-1-1 fiscal impact.
  - The Board will explore supporting a possible increase in the additional local fee, which would be directed to offset NG 9-1-1 related expenses.

Location Accuracy: In a NG 9-1-1 environment, the current ANI/ALI database will be replaced. It will be critical to have the mapping capacity to locate callers via latitude and longitude in order to geo-route calls to the appropriate PSAP. The Board will continue to monitor technological and regulatory developments regarding location accuracy to ensure that counties are prepared to utilize advancements in geo-based routing. **Assigned to GIS Board Representative**

- The Board will explore the fiscal and operational impact of developing and maintaining a geo-based database for routing 9-1-1 calls via a NG 9-1-1 network and call routing gateway environment.

NG 9-1-1: The Board will continue to explore NG 9-1-1 software, applications, and managed services with vendors and service providers. NG 9-1-1 standards setting organizations (NENA and APCO), as well as national and local NG 9-1-1 related projects and implementation strategies, will be monitored to advance Maryland’s effort to embrace NG 9-1-1 technologies. **Assigned to Technology Subcommittee**

- The Board will seek regular updates from TCS, Intrado and other national NG 9-1-1 service providers for their current NG 9-1-1 standards for data, gateway technology, call routing, and their related cost estimates.
- The Board will work with Maryland’s 9-1-1 phone system providers to identify current efforts to integrate data reception through their phone premise equipment.
- The Board will monitor and identify local and regional partnership opportunities to secure NG 9-1-1 based network and gateway services.
- The Board will explore and work with the Public Service Commission on tariff issues and related PSAP costs when transitioning from the current selective router system to a NG 9-1-1 network/gateway system for routing 9-1-1 calls to PSAPs.
- The Board will work with County PSAPs to develop a NG 9-1-1 budgetary cost model as Maryland transitions to a NG 9-1-1 system.
9-1-1 System Redundancy and Resiliency: The Board will continue its practice of scheduling Verizon representatives to provide service and sales updates, and to also address unresolved county issues, as part of the monthly public ENSB meeting agenda. Working with Verizon, the PSAP community, and other 9-1-1 related service providers the Board will seek to ensure the reliability, resiliency, and responsiveness of Maryland’s 9-1-1 System. The Board will have Verizon provide monthly service reports and provide follow-up interaction with the 9-1-1 community (as needed)

- The Board will work with each county to take advantage of Verizon’s offer to conduct local table-top disaster exercises. The Board will continue to work with Verizon and the counties to schedule table-top disaster exercises with each PSAP, or joint exercises to be conducted on a regional basis to include multiple PSAPs.
APPENDIX

PUBLIC SAFETY ARTICLE

“9-1-1 Emergency Telephone System”

Title 1 - Section 3

§1–301.

(a) In this subtitle the following words have the meanings indicated.

(b) “Additional charge” means the charge imposed by a county in accordance with § 1–311 of this subtitle.

(c) “Board” means the Emergency Number Systems Board.

(d) “Commercial mobile radio service” or “CMRS” means mobile telecommunications service that is:

(1) provided for profit with the intent of receiving compensation or monetary gain;

(2) an interconnected, two–way voice service; and

(3) available to the public.

(e) “Commercial mobile radio service provider” or “CMRS provider” means a person authorized by the Federal Communications Commission to provide CMRS in the State.

(f) “County plan” means a plan for a 9–1–1 system or enhanced 9–1–1 system, or an amendment to the plan, developed by a county or several counties together under this subtitle.

(g) (1) “Customer” means:

(i) the person that contracts with a home service provider for CMRS; or

(ii) the end user of the CMRS if the end user of the CMRS is not the contracting party.

(2) “Customer” does not include:

(i) a reseller of CMRS; or

(ii) a serving carrier under an arrangement to serve the customer outside the home service provider’s licensed service area.

(h) “Enhanced 9–1–1 system” means a 9–1–1 system that provides:

(1) automatic number identification;

(2) automatic location identification; and

(3) any other technological advancements that the Board requires.

(i) “FCC order” means an order issued by the Federal Communications Commission under proceedings regarding the compatibility of enhanced 9–1–1 systems and delivery of wireless enhanced 9–1–1 service.

(j) “Home service provider” means the facilities–based carrier or reseller that contracts with a customer to provide CMRS.

(k) “Next generation 9–1–1 services” means an Internet Protocol (IP)–based system, comprised of hardware, software, data, and operational policies and procedures, that:

(1) provides standardized interfaces from emergency call and message services to support emergency communications;

(2) processes all types of emergency calls, including voice, text, data, and multimedia information;

(3) acquires and integrates additional emergency call data useful to call routing and handling;

(4) delivers the emergency calls, messages, and data to the appropriate public safety answering point and other appropriate emergency entities;

(5) supports data or video communications needs for coordinated incident response and management; and

(6) provides broadband service to public safety answering points or other first responder entities.

(l) “9–1–1–accessible service” means telephone service or another communications service that connects an individual dialing the digits 9–1–1 to an established public safety answering point.
“9–1–1 fee” means the fee imposed in accordance with § 1–310 of this subtitle.

“9–1–1 service carrier” means a provider of CMRS or other 9–1–1–accessible service.

“9–1–1 service carrier” does not include a telephone company.

“9–1–1 system” means telephone service that:

1. meets the planning guidelines established under this subtitle; and
2. automatically connects an individual dialing the digits 9–1–1 to an established public safety answering point.

“9–1–1 system” includes:

1. equipment for connecting and outswitching 9–1–1 calls within a telephone central office;
2. trunking facilities from a telephone central office to a public safety answering point; and
3. equipment to connect 9–1–1 calls to the appropriate public safety agency.

“9–1–1 Trust Fund” means the fund established under § 1–308 of this subtitle.

“Prepaid wireless E 9–1–1 fee” means the fee that is required to be collected by a seller from a consumer in the amount established under § 1–313 of this subtitle.

“Prepaid wireless telecommunications service” means a commercial mobile radio service that:

1. allows a consumer to dial 9–1–1 to access the 9–1–1 system;
2. must be paid for in advance; and
3. is sold in predetermined units that decline with use in a known amount.

“Public safety agency” means:

1. a functional division of a public agency that provides fire fighting, police, medical, or other emergency services; or
2. a private entity that provides fire fighting, police, medical, or other emergency services on a voluntary basis.

“Public safety answering point” means a communications facility that:

1. is operated on a 24–hour basis;
2. first receives 9–1–1 calls in a 9–1–1 service area; and
3. as appropriate, dispatches public safety services directly, or transfers 9–1–1 calls to appropriate public safety agencies.

“Secretary” means the Secretary of Public Safety and Correctional Services.

“Seller” means a person that sells prepaid wireless telecommunications service to another person.

“Wireless enhanced 9–1–1 service” means enhanced 9–1–1 service under an FCC order.

§1–302.

The General Assembly:

1. recognizes the paramount importance of the safety and well–being of the public;
2. recognizes that timely and appropriate assistance must be provided when the lives or property of the public are in imminent danger;
3. recognizes that emergency assistance usually is summoned by telephone, and that a multiplicity of emergency telephone numbers existed throughout the State and within each county;
4. was concerned that avoidable delays in reaching appropriate emergency assistance were occurring to the jeopardy of life and property;
5. acknowledges that the three digit number, 9–1–1, is a nationally recognized and applied telephone number that may be used to summon emergency assistance and to eliminate delays caused by lack of familiarity with emergency numbers and by confusion in circumstances of crisis; and
6. recognizes that all end user customers of 9–1–1–accessible services, including consumers of prepaid wireless telecommunications service, should contribute in a fair and equitable manner to the 9–1–1 Trust Fund.

The purposes of this subtitle are to:

1. establish the three digit number, 9–1–1, as the primary emergency telephone number for the State; and
provide for the orderly installation, maintenance, and operation of 9–1–1 systems in the State.

§1–303.
(a) (1) This subtitle does not require a public service company to provide any equipment or service other than in accordance with tariffs approved by the Public Service Commission.
(2) The provision of services, the rates, and the extent of liability of a public service company are governed by the tariffs approved by the Public Service Commission.
(b) (1) This subtitle does not require a 9–1–1 service carrier to provide any equipment or service other than the equivalent of the equipment and service required of a telephone company under subsection (a) of this section.
(2) This subtitle does not extend any liability to a 9–1–1 service carrier or seller of prepaid wireless telecommunications service.

§1–304.
(a) Each county shall have in operation an enhanced 9-1-1 system.
(b) If implementation is preceded by cooperative planning, the enhanced 9-1-1 system required under subsection (a) of this section may operate as part of a multicounty system.
(c) (1) Services available through a 9-1-1 system shall include police, fire fighting, and emergency ambulance services.
(2) Other emergency and civil defense services may be incorporated into the 9-1-1 system at the discretion of the county or counties served by the 9-1-1 system.
(d) (1) The digits 9-1-1 are the primary emergency telephone number in the 9-1-1 system.
(2) A public safety agency whose services are available through the 9-1-1 system:
(i) may maintain a separate secondary backup telephone number for emergency calls; and
(ii) shall maintain a separate telephone number for nonemergency calls.
(e) Educational information that relates to emergency services made available by the State or a county:
(1) shall designate the number 9-1-1 as the primary emergency telephone number; and
(2) may include a separate secondary backup telephone number for emergency calls.
(f) (1) Each public safety answering point shall notify the public safety agencies in a county 9-1-1 system of calls for assistance in the county.
(2) Written guidelines shall be developed to govern the referral of calls for assistance to the appropriate public safety agency.
(3) State, county, and local public safety agencies with concurrent jurisdiction shall have written agreements to ensure a clear understanding of which specific calls for assistance will be referred to which public safety agency.
(g) Counties, other units of local government, public safety agencies, and public safety answering points may enter into cooperative agreements for the allocation of maintenance, operational, and capital costs attributable to the 9-1-1 system.

§1–305.
(a) There is an Emergency Number Systems Board in the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services.
(b) (1) The Board consists of 17 members.
(2) Of the 17 members:
(i) one member shall represent a telephone company operating in the State;
(ii) one member shall represent the wireless telephone industry in the State;
(iii) one member shall represent the Maryland Institute for Emergency Medical Services Systems;
(iv) one member shall represent the Department of State Police;
(v) one member shall represent the Public Service Commission;
(vi) one member shall represent the Association of Public–Safety Communications Officials International, Inc.;
(vii) two members shall represent county fire services in the State, with one member representing career fire services and one member representing volunteer fire services;
(viii) one member shall represent police services in the State;
(ix) two members shall represent emergency management services in the State;
(x) one member shall represent a county with a population of 200,000 or more;
(xi) one member shall represent a county with a population of less than 200,000;
(xii) one member shall represent the Maryland chapter of the National Emergency Numbers Association;
(xiii) one member shall represent the geographical information systems in the State; and
(xiv) two members shall represent the public.

(c) (1) The term of a member is 4 years and begins on July 1.
(2) The terms of the members are staggered as required by the terms provided for members of the Board on October 1, 2003.
(3) At the end of a term, a member continues to serve until a successor is appointed and qualifies.
(4) If a vacancy occurs after a term has begun, the Governor shall appoint a successor to represent the organization or group in which the vacancy occurs.
(5) A member who is appointed after a term has begun serves only for the rest of the term and until a successor is appointed and qualifies.
(d) The Governor shall appoint a chairperson from among the Board members.
(e) The Board shall meet as necessary, but at least once each quarter.
(f) A member of the Board:
(1) may not receive compensation as a member of the Board; but
(2) is entitled to reimbursement for expenses under the Standard State Travel Regulations, as provided in the State budget.
(g) The Secretary shall provide staff to the Board, including:
(1) a coordinator who is responsible for the daily operation of the office of the Board; and
(2) staff to handle the increased duties related to wireless enhanced 9–1–1 service.

§1–306.
(a) The Board shall coordinate the enhancement of county 9–1–1 systems.
(b) The Board’s responsibilities include:
(1) establishing planning guidelines for enhanced 9–1–1 system plans and deployment of wireless enhanced 9–1–1 service in accordance with this subtitle;
(2) establishing procedures to review and approve or disapprove county plans and to evaluate requests for variations from the planning guidelines established by the Board;
(3) establishing procedures for the request for reimbursement of the costs of enhancing a 9–1–1 system by a county or counties in which a 9–1–1 system is in operation, and procedures to review and approve or disapprove the request;
(4) transmitting the planning guidelines and procedures established under this section, and any amendments to them, to the governing body of each county;
(5) submitting to the Secretary each year a schedule for implementing the enhancement of county or multicounty 9–1–1 systems, and an estimate of funding requirements based on the approved county plans;
(6) developing, with input from counties, and publishing on or before July 1, 2004, an implementation schedule for deployment of wireless enhanced 9–1–1 service;
(7) reviewing and approving or disapproving requests for reimbursement of the costs of enhancing 9–1–1 systems, and submitting to the Secretary each year a schedule for reimbursement and an estimate of funding requirements;
(8) reviewing the enhancement of 9–1–1 systems;
(9) providing for an audit of county expenditures for the operation and maintenance of 9–1–1 systems;
(10) ensuring inspections of public safety answering points;
(11) reviewing and approving or disapproving requests from counties with operational enhanced 9–1–1 systems to be exempted from the expenditure limitations under § 1–312 of this subtitle;
(12) authorizing expenditures from the 9–1–1 Trust Fund that:
   (i) are for enhancements of 9–1–1 systems that:
      1. are required by the Board;
      2. will be provided to a county by a third party contractor; and
      3. will incur costs that the Board has approved before the formation of a contract between the county and the contractor; and
   (ii) are approved by the Board for payment:
      1. from money collected under § 1–310 of this subtitle; and
      2. directly to a third party contractor on behalf of a county; and
(13) establishing planning guidelines for next generation 9–1–1 services system plans and deployment of next generation 9–1–1 services in accordance with this subtitle.

(c) The guidelines established by the Board under subsection (b)(1) and (13) of this section:
   (1) shall be based on available technology and equipment; and
   (2) may be based on any other factor that the Board determines is appropriate, including population and area served by 9–1–1 systems.

§1–307.

(a) The Board shall submit an annual report to the Governor, the Secretary, and, subject to § 2–1246 of the State Government Article, the Legislative Policy Committee.

(b) The report shall provide the following information for each county:
   (1) the type of 9-1-1 system currently operating in the county;
   (2) the total 9-1-1 fee and additional charge charged;
   (3) the funding formula in effect;
   (4) any statutory or regulatory violation by the county and the response of the Board;
   (5) any efforts to establish an enhanced 9-1-1 system in the county; and
   (6) any suggested changes to this subtitle.

§1–308.

(a) There is a 9–1–1 Trust Fund.

(b) The purposes of the 9–1–1 Trust Fund are to:
   (1) reimburse counties for the cost of enhancing a 9–1–1 system;
   (2) pay contractors in accordance with § 1–306(b)(12) of this subtitle; and
   (3) fund the coordinator position and staff to handle the increased duties related to wireless enhanced 9–1–1 service under § 1–305 of this subtitle, as an administrative cost.

(c) The 9–1–1 Trust Fund consists of:
   (1) money from the 9–1–1 fee collected and remitted to the Comptroller under § 1–310 of this subtitle;
   (2) money from the additional charge collected and remitted to the Comptroller under § 1–311 of this subtitle;
   (3) money from the prepaid wireless E 9–1–1 fee collected and remitted to the Comptroller under § 1–313 of this subtitle; and
   (4) investment earnings of the 9–1–1 Trust Fund.

(d) Money in the 9–1–1 Trust Fund shall be held in the State Treasury.

(e) The Secretary shall administer the 9–1–1 Trust Fund, subject to the guidelines for financial management and budgeting established by the Department of Budget and Management.

(f) The Secretary shall direct the Comptroller to establish separate accounts in the 9–1–1 Trust Fund for the payment of administrative expenses and for each county.

(g) (1) Any investment earnings shall be credited to the 9–1–1 Trust Fund.
    (2) The Comptroller shall allocate the investment income among the accounts in the 9–1–1 Trust Fund, prorated on the basis of the total fees collected in each county.
§1–309.  
(a) On recommendation of the Board, each year the Secretary shall request an appropriation from the 9–1–1 Trust Fund in an amount sufficient to:
   (1) carry out the purposes of this subtitle;
   (2) pay the administrative costs chargeable to the 9–1–1 Trust Fund; and
   (3) reimburse counties for the cost of enhancing a 9–1–1 system.

(b) (1) Subject to the limitations under subsection (e) of this section, the Comptroller shall disburse the money in the 9–1–1 Trust Fund as provided in this subsection.
   (2) Each July 1, the Comptroller shall allocate sufficient money from the 9–1–1 fee to pay the costs of administering the 9–1–1 Trust Fund.
   (3) As directed by the Secretary and in accordance with the State budget, the Comptroller, from the appropriate account, shall:
      (i) reimburse counties for the cost of enhancing a 9–1–1 system; and
      (ii) pay contractors in accordance with § 1–306(b)(12) of this subtitle.

(c) (1) Money accruing to the 9–1–1 Trust Fund may be used as provided in this subsection.
   (2) Money collected from the 9–1–1 fee may be used to:
      (i) reimburse counties for the cost of enhancing a 9–1–1 system; and
      (ii) pay contractors in accordance with § 1–306(b)(12) of this subtitle.
   (3) Money collected from the additional charge may be used by the counties for the maintenance and operation costs of the 9–1–1 system.
   (4) Money collected from the prepaid wireless E 9–1–1 fee may be used as follows:
      (i) 25% for the same purpose as the 9–1–1 fee under paragraph (2) of this subsection; and
      (ii) 75% for the same purpose as the additional charge under paragraph (3) of this subsection, prorated on the basis of the total fees collected in each county.

(d) (1) Reimbursement may be made only to the extent that county money was used to enhance the 9–1–1 system.
   (2) Reimbursement for the enhancement of 9–1–1 systems shall include the installation of equipment for automatic number identification, automatic location identification, and other technological advancements that the Board requires.
   (3) Reimbursement from money collected from the 9–1–1 fee may be used only for 9–1–1 system enhancements approved by the Board.

(e) (1) The Board may direct the Comptroller to withhold from a county money for 9–1–1 system expenditures if the county violates this subtitle or a regulation of the Board.
   (2) (i) The Board shall state publicly in writing its reason for withholding money from a county and shall record its reason in the minutes of the Board.
      (ii) On reaching its decision to withhold money, the Board shall notify the county.
      (iii) The county has 30 days after the date of notification to respond in writing to the Board.
   (3) (i) On notification by the Board, the Comptroller shall hold money for the county in the county’s account in the 9–1–1 Trust Fund.
      (ii) Money held by the Comptroller under subparagraph (i) of this paragraph does not accrue interest for the county.
      (iii) Interest income earned on money held by the Comptroller under subparagraph (i) of this paragraph accrues to the 9–1–1 Trust Fund.
   (4) County money withheld by the Comptroller shall be withheld until the Board directs the Comptroller to release the money.

(f) (1) The Legislative Auditor shall conduct fiscal/compliance audits of the 9–1–1 Trust Fund and of the appropriations and disbursements made for purposes of this subtitle.
The cost of the fiscal portion of the audits shall be paid from the 9–1–1 Trust Fund as an administrative cost.

§1–310.

(a) This section does not apply to prepaid wireless telecommunications service.

(b) Each subscriber to switch local exchange access service or CMRS or other 9–1–1–accessible service shall pay a 9–1–1 fee.

(c) The 9–1–1 fee is 25 cents per month, payable when the bill for the telephone service or CMRS or other 9–1–1–accessible service is due.

(d) (1) The Public Service Commission shall direct each telephone company to add the 9–1–1 fee to all current bills rendered for switched local exchange access service in the State.

(2) Each telephone company:

(i) shall act as a collection agent for the 9–1–1 Trust Fund with respect to the 9–1–1 fees;

(ii) shall remit all money collected to the Comptroller on a monthly basis; and

(iii) is entitled to credit, against the money from the 9–1–1 fees to be remitted to the Comptroller, an amount equal to 0.75% of the 9–1–1 fees to cover the expenses of billing, collecting, and remitting the 9–1–1 fees and any additional charges.

(3) The Comptroller shall deposit the money remitted in the 9–1–1 Trust Fund.

(e) (1) Each 9–1–1 service carrier shall add the 9–1–1 fee to all current bills rendered for CMRS or other 9–1–1–accessible service in the State.

(2) Each 9–1–1 service carrier:

(i) shall act as a collection agent for the 9–1–1 Trust Fund with respect to the 9–1–1 fees;

(ii) shall remit all money collected to the Comptroller on a monthly basis; and

(iii) is entitled to credit, against the money from the 9–1–1 fees to be remitted to the Comptroller, an amount equal to 0.75% of the 9–1–1 fees to cover the expenses of billing, collecting, and remitting the 9–1–1 fees and any additional charges.

(3) The Comptroller shall deposit the money remitted in the 9–1–1 Trust Fund.

(4) The Board shall adopt procedures for auditing surcharge collection and remittance by CMRS providers.

(5) On request of a CMRS provider, and except as otherwise required by law, the information that the CMRS provider reports to the Board shall be confidential, privileged, and proprietary and may not be disclosed to any person other than the CMRS provider.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, the 9–1–1 fee does not apply to an intermediate service line used exclusively to connect a CMRS or other 9–1–1–accessible service, other than a switched local access service, to another telephone system or switching device.

(g) A CMRS provider that pays or collects 9–1–1 fees under this section has the same immunity from liability for transmission failures as that approved by the Public Service Commission for local exchange telephone companies that are subject to regulation by the Commission under the Public Utilities Article.

§1–311.

(a) This section does not apply to prepaid wireless telecommunications service.

(b) In addition to the 9–1–1 fee, the governing body of each county, by ordinance or resolution enacted or adopted after a public hearing, may impose an additional charge to be added to all current bills rendered for switched local exchange access service or CMRS or other 9–1–1–accessible service in the county.

(c) (1) The additional charge imposed by a county may not exceed 75 cents per month per bill.

(2) The amount of the additional charges may not exceed a level necessary to cover the total eligible maintenance and operation costs of the county.

(d) The additional charge continues in effect until repealed or modified by a subsequent county ordinance or resolution.
(e) After imposing, repealing, or modifying an additional charge, the county shall certify the
amount of the additional charge to the Public Service Commission.

(f) The Public Service Commission shall direct each telephone company that provides service in
a county that imposed an additional charge to add, within 60 days, the full amount of the additional charge
to all current bills rendered for switched local exchange access service in the county.

(g) Within 60 days after a county enacts or adopts an ordinance or resolution that imposes,
repeals, or modifies an additional charge, each 9–1–1 service carrier that provides service in the county
shall add the full amount of the additional charge to all current bills rendered for CMRS or other 9–1–1–
accessible service in the county.

(h) (1) Each telephone company and each 9–1–1 service carrier shall:

(i) act as a collection agent for the 9–1–1 Trust Fund with respect to the
additional charge imposed by each county;

(ii) collect the money from the additional charge on a county basis; and

(iii) remit all money collected to the Comptroller on a monthly basis.

(2) The Comptroller shall deposit the money remitted in the 9–1–1 Trust Fund account
maintained for the county that imposed the additional charge.

§1–312.

(a) During each county’s fiscal year, the county may spend the amounts distributed to it from 9-
1-1 fee collections for the installation, enhancement, maintenance, and operation of a county or multicounty
9-1-1 system.

(b) Subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of this section, maintenance and operation costs
may include telephone company charges, equipment costs, equipment lease charges, repairs, utilities,
personnel costs, and appropriate carryover costs from previous years.

(c) During a year in which a county raises its local additional charge under § 1-311 of this
subtitle, the county:

1. may use 9-1-1 trust funds only to supplement levels of spending by the county for 9-1-1
maintenance or operations; and

2. may not use 9-1-1 trust funds to supplant spending by the county for 9-1-1 maintenance
or operations.

(d) The Board shall provide for an audit of each county’s expenditures for the maintenance and
operation of the county’s 9-1-1 system.

(e) (1) For a county without an operational Phase II wireless enhanced 9-1-1 system within the
time frames established by the Board under § 1-306(b)(6) of this subtitle, the Board shall adopt procedures,
to take effect on or after January 1, 2006, to assure that:

(i) the money collected from the additional charge and distributed to the
county are expended during the county’s fiscal year as follows:

1. for a 9-1-1 system in a county or a multicounty area with a
population of 100,000 individuals or less, a maximum of 85% may be spent for personnel costs; and

2. for a 9-1-1 system in a county or multicounty area with a
population of over 100,000 individuals, a maximum of 70% may be spent for personnel costs; and

(ii) the total amount collected from the 9-1-1 fee and the additional charge
shall be expended only for the installation, enhancement, maintenance, and operation of a county or
multicounty system.

(2) The Board may grant an exception to the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection
in extenuating circumstances.

(3) A county with an operational Phase II wireless enhanced 9-1-1 system is exempt from
the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection.

§1–313.

(a) (1) In this section the following words have the meanings indicated.

(2) “Consumer” means a person that purchases prepaid wireless telecommunications
service in a retail transaction.

(3) “Provider” means a person that provides prepaid wireless telecommunications service
under a license issued by the Federal Communications Commission.
(4) “Retail transaction” means the purchase of prepaid wireless telecommunications service from a seller for any purpose other than resale.

(b) There is a prepaid wireless E 9–1–1 fee of 60 cents per retail transaction.

(c) (1) (i) The prepaid wireless E 9–1–1 fee shall be collected by the seller from the consumer for each retail transaction in the State.

(ii) The prepaid wireless E 9–1–1 fee collected by the seller under this section is not subject to the sales and use tax under the Tax – General Article.

(2) A retail transaction occurs in the State if:

(i) the sale or recharge takes place at the seller’s place of business located in the State;

(ii) the consumer’s shipping address is in the State; or

(iii) no item is shipped, but the consumer’s billing address or the location associated with the consumer’s mobile telephone number is in the State.

(d) The amount of the prepaid wireless E 9–1–1 fee shall be disclosed to the consumer at the time of the retail transaction.

(e) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the prepaid wireless E 9–1–1 fee is the liability of the consumer and not of the seller or of any provider.

(2) The seller is liable for remitting all prepaid wireless E 9–1–1 fees that the seller collects from consumers as provided in this section.

(f) (1) Before December 28, 2013, a seller may deduct and retain 50% of prepaid wireless E 9–1–1 fees collected from consumers for direct start-up costs.

(2) On or after December 28, 2013, a seller may deduct and retain 3% of prepaid wireless E 9–1–1 fees collected from consumers.

(g) A seller shall report and remit to the Comptroller all prepaid wireless E 9–1–1 fees collected by the seller in the manner provided for the remitting of the sales and use tax under Titles 11 and 13 of the Tax – General Article.

(h) The Comptroller shall deposit all reported and remitted prepaid wireless E 9–1–1 fees into the 9–1–1 Trust Fund within 30 days of receipt.

(i) A seller may demonstrate that a sale is not a retail transaction in a manner substantially similar to the procedures for demonstrating a resale for exemption from the sales and use tax under Titles 11 and 13 of the Tax – General Article.

(j) For the purpose of this section, the audit and appeal procedures established for the sales and use tax under Titles 11 and 13 of the Tax – General Article apply.

(k) A seller that is not a provider of prepaid wireless telecommunications service is not liable for damages in connection with:

(1) the provision of, or failure of, 9–1–1 or E 9–1–1 service;

(2) identifying, or failing to identify, the telephone number, address, location, or name associated with any person or device that is accessing or attempting to access 9–1–1 or E 9–1–1 service; or

(3) the provision of any lawful assistance to any investigative or law enforcement officer.

(l) Providers and sellers of prepaid wireless telecommunications service have the same immunity from liability for transmission failures as that approved by the Public Service Commission for local exchange telephone companies that are subject to regulation by the Commission under the Public Utilities Article.

(m) A tax, a fee, a surcharge, or any other charge may not be imposed by the State, any political subdivision of the State, or any intergovernmental agency, for E 9–1–1 funding purposes, on any provider, seller, or consumer with respect to the sale, purchase, use, or provision of prepaid wireless telecommunications service.

(n) The Comptroller shall adopt regulations to carry out the provisions of this section.

§ 1-314

(a) "Multiple-line telephone system" defined. -- In this section, "multiple-line telephone system" means a system that:

(1) consists of common control units, telephone sets, control hardware and software, and adjunct systems, including network and premises-based systems; and

(2) is designed to aggregate more than one incoming voice communication channel for use by more than one telephone.
(b) In general.--

(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, on or before December 31, 2017, a person that installs or operates a multiple-line telephone system shall ensure that the system is connected to the public switched telephone network in such a way that when an individual using the system dials 9-1-1, the call connects to the public safety answering point without requiring the user to dial any other number or set of numbers.

(2) A unit of the Executive Branch of State government shall comply with paragraph (1) of this subsection on the date that the multiple-line telephone system of the unit is next upgraded.
.01 Emergency Number Systems Board Authority.

The Emergency Number Systems Board shall coordinate the implementation, enhancement, maintenance, and operation of county or multicounty 9-1-1 systems.

.02 Definitions.

A. In this chapter, the following terms have the meanings indicated.

B. Terms Defined.

(1) "Additional charge" has the meaning stated in Public Safety Article, §1-301, Annotated Code of Maryland.
(2) "Board" means the Emergency Number Systems Board.
(3) "9-1-1 system" means a telephone service or any other communication service that meets the planning guidelines under Public Safety Article, §1-306, Annotated Code of Maryland, and automatically connects an individual dialing the digits 9-1-1 to a public safety answering point.
(4) "Public safety answering point" has the meaning stated in Public Safety Article, §1-301, Annotated Code of Maryland.

.03 The Emergency Number Systems Board.

A. The Emergency Number Systems Board is under the direction of the Secretary of Public Safety and Correctional Services.

B. Board membership shall be according to Public Safety Article, §1-305, Annotated Code of Maryland.

C. The Board shall meet as necessary, but not less than quarterly each calendar year.
D. The Board requires a majority of confirmed members present at a meeting to constitute a quorum.

E. The Board requires a majority vote of members present at a meeting before taking action.

F. The Board shall coordinate enhancement of county or multicounty 9-1-1 systems according to provisions under Public Safety Article, §1-306, Annotated Code of Maryland.

12.11.03.04

.04 Implementation by County or Multicounty Area.

A county or multicounty area shall maintain an enhanced 9-1-1 system that:

A. Uses the digits 9-1-1 as the published emergency telephone number for access to emergency services;

B. Has public safety answering points that provide 24-hour public access and dispatch service;

C. Provides transfer and referrals to related public safety services;

D. Provides for staffing all public safety answering points with personnel trained as required by this chapter;

E. Provides for equipping all public safety answering points with adequate access to TTY equipment to facilitate use by an individual with a speech or hearing disability;

F. Provides access to services for an individual who does not speak or understand the English language;

G. May provide access to local emergency management centers for all public safety answering points;

H. Permits a county to designate a public safety answering point using cooperative arrangements acceptable to the participating agencies;

I. Permits public safety answering points to transfer or relay emergency calls received requiring services outside of the jurisdiction of the system receiving the call;

J. Maintains a current master street address guide and communicates updated information to parties responsible for an automatic number identification (ANI) and automatic location identification (ALI) system;

K. Uses telephone equipment and services that provide:

(1) A visual or audible indication, or both, of an incoming call;
(2) The capability for the call taker to monitor a transferred call to ensure that the call is properly transferred;
(3) Annual telephone company monitoring of service to determine the grade of service and, if appropriate, to make recommendations to ensure that not more than one busy signal in every 100 incoming calls during an average busy hour is maintained; and
(4) Documentation of the date and time a 9-1-1 call is received; and

L. Has a sufficient number of call takers and equipment to consistently answer incoming calls on a daily average of 10 seconds or less.
12.11.03.05

.05 Plans for More Than One Public Safety Answering Point in a County.

A county with a plan for more than one public safety answering point in the county shall submit the plan to the Board for consideration subject to the following:

A. The county administration submitting the plan and not the individual agency within the county shall receive and distribute funding; and

B. The plan shall meet the criteria established under this chapter, unless the Board approves a variation.

12.11.03.06

.06 Minimum Enhanced 9-1-1 System Requirements.

At a minimum, an enhanced 9-1-1 system implemented in Maryland shall include:

A. Sufficient incoming 9-1-1 lines for each telephone central office to ensure that not more than one in 100 call attempts during the average busy hour is blocked;

B. Connections to all public safety agencies covered by the system;

C. 24 hour, 7 day operation of the public safety answering point staffed with personnel trained as required under this chapter;

D. First priority to answering 9-1-1 calls;

E. Electronic recording of all 9-1-1 calls;

F. Playback capability of all 9-1-1 calls;

G. Connection to adjacent public safety answering points by private lines when there is a telephone exchange and jurisdictional boundary not covered by selective routing;

H. Security measures sufficient to minimize intentional disruption of the operation;

I. Standby emergency electrical power to keep the public safety answering point operating when commercial power fails;

J. At least one administrative line for nonemergency calls;

K. Written operational procedures;

L. Automatic location identification (ALI) which displays, at the public safety answering point, the address or location of the calling instrument;

M. Automatic number identification (ANI) which displays, at the public safety answering point, the calling telephone number;
N. Central office identification used to identify dedicated lines or trunks from a central office when a public safety answering point serves more than one central office;

O. A distinct tone, visible signal, or other process for:

(1) Alerting the call taker that an incoming 9-1-1 call was disconnected; and
(2) Receiving and displaying the telephone number with ANI and ALI information for a disconnected 9-1-1 call, when available;

P. Providing access to services for an individual:

(1) With a speech or hearing disability; or
(2) Who does not speak or understand the English language; and

Q. Other technical advances approved by the Board.

12.11.03.07

.07 Minimum Features of a 3-1-1 System.

A. A county or multicounty system may establish a 3-1-1 system to reduce congestion on the 9-1-1 system operation.

B. At a minimum, a 3-1-1 system shall include the following:

(1) Switching or programming to direct a 3-1-1 call to a nonemergency answering position;
(2) A 3-1-1 answering position that shall be capable of:

(a) Immediately transferring an emergency call to a 9-1-1 answering position or an adjoining public safety answering point;

(b) Transferring a nonemergency call to an adjoining jurisdiction or appropriate agency; and

(c) Providing an individual:

(i) With a speech or hearing disability access to TTY services; or

(ii) Who does not speak or understand the English language access to alternative communication services; and

(3) A 3-1-1 call taker trained to handle nonemergency calls and to transfer emergency calls to a 9-1-1 call taker.

12.11.03.08

.08 Operational Plan.

A. A county or multicounty system shall have and maintain a written operational plan for public safety services signed by public safety agencies within the public safety answering point area of responsibility.
B. A public safety agency included in an operational plan under §A of this regulation shall be familiar with the operational procedures of the other public safety agencies included in the same operational plan.

C. An operational plan shall provide for uniform methods and procedures to ensure effective interagency communications.

12.11.03.09

.09 Safeguarding Telephone Circuits by Telephone Companies.

A. A facility housing 9-1-1 telephone equipment shall:

1. Be equipped at all exposed terminations, including central office distributing frames, with protective devices that prevent accidental worker contact; and
2. Include clearly identified protected terminations to distinguish protected terminations from other circuitry.

B. A protected circuit may not be opened, grounded, short-circuited, or manipulated in any way by a telephone company worker without the local telephone company first obtaining approval for circuit release from the appropriate public safety answering point.

C. A telephone company shall ensure that telephone company employees who work in facilities associated with the 9-1-1 service are familiar with procedures for safeguarding 9-1-1 system equipment.

12.11.03.10

.10 Public Safety Answering Point Training.

A. A county shall staff a public safety answering point with personnel who can properly process a call from a machine used by an individual who has a speech or hearing impairment.

B. Within 6 months of hiring a public safety answering point call taker, a county shall train the new call taker using a curriculum adopted or approved by the Board.

C. A county shall provide a public safety answering point call taker with yearly in-service training using a curriculum adopted or approved by the Board.

D. Training shall include:

1. Public safety answering point orientation;
2. Communication skills;
3. Electronic systems;
4. Policies and procedures;
5. Call processing;
6. Documentation;
7. Dispatch procedures;
8. Stress management;
9. Public relations;
10. Administrative duties; and
11. Disaster and major incident training.
.11 9-1-1 Fees.

A. The Board shall ensure that collection, maintenance, dispersal, and auditing of 9-1-1 fees is conducted according to Public Safety Article, §§1-308—1-312, Annotated Code of Maryland.

B. Additional Charges—Local Government.

(1) In addition to the fee charged under Public Safety Article, §1-310, Annotated Code of Maryland, a county with an operational 9-1-1 system under Public Safety Article, §1-304, Annotated Code of Maryland, may, by ordinance or resolution after public hearing, enact or adopt an additional monthly charge not to exceed the limits under Public Safety Article, §1-311, Annotated Code of Maryland, to be applied to current bills, within that county, for:

(a) Switched local exchange access service; and

(b) Wireless telephone service or other 9-1-1 accessible service.

(2) A county authorizing an additional charge under §B of this regulation and maintaining an enhanced 9-1-1 system shall be subject to an annual Board-authorized independent audit of authorized 9-1-1 expenditures pursuant to Public Safety Article, §1-312, Annotated Code of Maryland.

.12 Equipment Which Qualifies for Funding or Reimbursement.

A. Equipment that qualifies for purchase with funds from the 9-1-1 Trust Fund includes:

(1) Equipment for connecting and outswitching 9-1-1 calls within a telephone central office;
(2) Trunking facilities from the central office to a public safety answering point;
(3) Equipment to connect 9-1-1 calls to the appropriate public safety agency; and
(4) Equipment for a 3-1-1 system.

B. Equipment necessary to constitute an enhanced 9-1-1 system shall be used for:

(1) Automatic number identification (ANI);
(2) Automatic location identification (ALI); or
(3) Other technical equipment the Board may require.

C. Computer aided dispatch equipment is not a part of a 9-1-1 system, except when the Board determines that an interface is necessary to properly process 9-1-1 calls.

.13 Submission of 9-1-1 Plan.

A. A county requesting reimbursement from the 9-1-1 Trust Fund for mandated equipment, 9-1-1 enhancements, or technological advancements shall submit the request to the Board for approval.
B. A county shall submit a plan, request, report, or question to the Chairman, Emergency Number Systems Board.

12.11.03.14

.14 Request for Reimbursement from the 9-1-1 Trust Fund.

A. A county shall submit a request for reimbursement from the 9-1-1 Trust Fund to the Board in a format and according to procedures established by the Board.

B. Reimbursement Processing.

(1) A county public safety answering point director or a 9-1-1 administrator shall submit a written or electronic request for reimbursement to the Board so that it is received at least 2 weeks before a Board meeting at which it is to be considered.
(2) The county's public safety answering point director or 9-1-1 administrator, or a designee, shall attend the meeting at which the request is to be considered.
(3) The Board shall review the request and, if approved, encumber funds up to the amount of the request.
(4) The county shall ensure that the county's procurement laws and policies are followed.

12.11.03.15

.15 Variations or Waivers of Regulations.

A. Upon request by a county, the Board may grant a waiver or variance of the regulations contained in this chapter.

B. A county may submit a written or electronic request for waiver or variance to the Board that includes:

(1) Number of persons affected;
(2) Impact of a variance or waiver;
(3) Alternative methods;
(4) Technical difficulties;
(5) Cost.

C. The Board shall consider:

(1) The information for each of the areas cited in §B of this regulation; and
(2) The best interests of the affected parties, the applicant, and the Emergency Number Systems Board.

D. An affected party shall have the right to present, either in writing or through oral testimony, information which may bear on the Board's final decision.

E. Processing a Request for Waiver or Variance.

(1) Upon receipt of a written request for waiver or variance, the Board shall:

(a) Within 10 days of receipt of the request, direct a letter to the applicant, which shall:

(i) Acknowledge receipt; and
(ii) Notify the applicant that additional information may be submitted, within 30 days, for the Board to consider during the review; and

(b) Review the documents or conduct a hearing.

(2) If the Board elects to review the documents, the review shall be conducted at a regular Board meeting within 60 days after the expiration of the 30-day period granted to the applicant to submit additional information.

(3) If the Board elects to conduct a hearing, the Board shall:

(a) Notify the applicant and affected parties of the hearing at least 10 days before the hearing and provide the hearing:

(i) Date;

(ii) Time; and

(iii) Location; and

(b) Conduct the hearing according to State Government Article, Title 10, Subtitle 2, Annotated Code of Maryland.

12.11.03.16

.16 9-1-1 System Violations.

A. The Board may instruct the State Comptroller to withhold funds from a county for 9-1-1 system expenditures for a violation under:

(1) Public Safety Article, §1-312, Annotated Code of Maryland; or

(2) The regulations in this chapter.

B. Withholding Funds.

(1) If the Board decides to withhold funds, the Board shall:

(a) Identify, in writing, the reason or reasons for withholding funds;

(b) Record the reason or reasons in the minutes of the meeting;

(c) Notify the county that the county has 30 days from the date of notification to respond in writing to the Board; and

(d) Notify the State Comptroller to hold funds, in that county's account within the 9-1-1 Trust Fund, until the Board advises the Comptroller that the funds may be released.

(2) Funds held by the Comptroller under this section may not accrue interest for a county.

(3) Interest income earned on funds held by the Comptroller under this regulation shall be diverted to the 9-1-1 Trust Fund.

C. The Board shall notify the Secretary of action taken under §A or B of this regulation.
.17 Decisions of the Board.

After the Board conducts a hearing or a review of a request under this chapter, the Board shall ensure that the Board's decision is:

A. In writing and stated in the record;

B. Accompanied by findings of fact and conclusions; and

C. Provided to the applicant with a copy of the written record containing the information noted under §§A and B of this regulation.