



# Report to the Indiana General Assembly

## 911/E911 Services

**Indiana Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations**  
334 North Senate Avenue  
Indianapolis, IN 46204-1708



**Center for Urban Policy and the Environment**  
Indiana University School of Public and Environmental Affairs



November 2012

# Indiana Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

## REPRESENTING THE INDIANA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

**Chair**  
**Representative Michael Karickhoff (R)**  
Kokomo  
**Senator Richard Young (D)**  
Milltown  
**Senator Lonnie Randolph (D)**  
East Chicago  
**Senator Randy Head (R)**  
Logansport

**Vice-Chair**  
**Senator James Smith (R)**  
Charlestown  
**Representative Sheila J. Klinker (D)**  
Lafayette  
**Representative Tom Saunders (R)**  
Lewisville  
**Representative Terri Austin (D)**  
Anderson

## REPRESENTING MUNICIPAL, COUNTY, TOWNSHIP, AND REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

**Terry Seitz**  
Mayor, City of Jasper  
**Nicholas Jarrett**  
Clerk-Treasurer, Town of Hagerstown  
**Ken Paust**  
Commissioner, Wayne County.  
**Meredith Carter**  
Council Member, Hamilton County  
**Fred Barkes**  
Trustee, Columbus Township (Bartholomew Co.)  
**Susan A. Craig**  
Director, Southeast Regional Planning Commission

**Norm Yoder**  
Mayor, City of Auburn  
**Jon Craig**  
Mayor, City of Petersburg  
**Larry Hesson**  
Council Member, Hendricks County  
**Therese Brown**  
Commissioner, Allen County  
**Jean Lushin**  
Trustee, Center Township (Howard Co.)

## REPRESENTING CITIZENS/INTERGOVERNMENTAL EXPERTISE

**Mark Lawrance**  
Indianapolis

**G. Michael Schopmeyer**  
Evansville

## STATE OFFICIALS

**Governor Mitchell E. Daniels, Jr.**  
State of Indiana

**Lieut. Governor Rebecca S. Skillman**  
State of Indiana

**Adam Horst**  
Director, Indiana State Budget Agency

## ALTERNATES

**Cristopher Johnston**  
Alternate for Governor

**Danielle Chrysler**  
Alternate for Lt. Governor

**Ann Kaiser**  
Alternate for State Budget Agency

## STAFF

**John L. Krauss**  
Director

**Jamie L. Palmer**  
Associate Director

IACIR is staffed by Indiana University Center for Urban Policy and the Environment, a part of the  
Indiana University Public Policy Institute

**John L. Krauss, Director**  
Indiana Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations  
334 North Senate Avenue  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-1708  
317-261-3006 or [jkrauss@iupui.edu](mailto:jkrauss@iupui.edu)  
[www.iacir.spea.iupui.edu/](http://www.iacir.spea.iupui.edu/)

# Report to the Indiana General Assembly

## 911/E911 Services

November 2012

**Director,  
Indiana Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations**

John L. Krauss

The Indiana Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations would like to acknowledge the support and research assistance in developing this commission study provided by:

**The Center for Urban Policy and the Environment**

**Research Team**

Jamie Palmer

Zachary Mulholland

Debbie Wyeth

Markie Rexroat

# Report to the Indiana General Assembly: 911/E911 Services

November 2012

12-C43

---

Introduction .....	1
Public Testimony .....	1
Research and Analysis .....	2
Policy Recommendations .....	2
Appendix A 2012 PSAP Operations Survey Results to Date .....	5
Appendix B PSAP Questionnaire .....	13

Indiana Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations  
c/o Center for Urban Policy and the Environment, Indiana University ~ School of Public and Environmental Affairs  
334 North Senate Avenue, 3rd Floor, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204  
(phone) 317.261.3000 (fax) 317.261.3050  
[www.iacir.spea.iupui.edu](http://www.iacir.spea.iupui.edu)

# Introduction

In the 2012 legislative session, the Indiana General Assembly considered the system for funding public safety answering points (PSAPs). The resulting legislation was 2012 SEA 345. One of the issues that was not fully resolved, in the policy discussions that led to 2012 SEA 345, was the establishment of formal responsibilities among state and local governments currently providing 911. 2012 SEA 345 assigned the Indiana Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (IACIR) to “*study the appropriate roles and responsibilities of the state, counties, municipalities, townships, and other political subdivisions in providing 911 and enhanced 911 services in Indiana.*”

While the assignment from the General Assembly includes only the study of responsibilities (and by inference the distribution of funding based on those responsibilities), the IACIR study also included taking input on the new funding system established in SEA 345 and on the progress that has been made to date on the consolidation required by PL 137-2008 (2008 HEA 1204).

## Public Testimony

The IACIR took testimony and conducted its deliberations on 911 and enhanced 911 (E911) services at meetings held on September 19, 2012, October 9, 2012, and October 25, 2012. The following individuals provided presentations or testimony to the commission during this process:

- Barry Ritter, Executive Director, Statewide 911 Board
- Rhonda Cook, Director of Government Affairs and Legislative Counsel, Indiana Association of Cities and Towns
- Andrew Berger, Director of Government Affairs and General Counsel, Association of Indiana Counties
- Stephanie Yager, Executive Director, Indiana Association of County Commissioners
- John Koppin, President, Indiana Telecommunications Association
- Lester Miller, Principal, IYP Solutions
- Howard County
  - Sheriff Steve Rogers, Howard County
  - Nick Capazolli, 911 Director, Howard County
  - Commissioner Paul Wyman, Howard County
  - Commissioner Tyler Moore, Howard County
  - Mayor Greg Goodnight, city of Kokomo
  - Randy Morris, Controller, city of Kokomo
- Lake County
  - Rick Cockrum, Capitol Assets, LLC
  - Michael Repay, Lake County Council
  - Larry Blanchard, Financial Advisor
  - Chief Brian Miller, Police Department, Hammond
- Ed Reuter, Executive Director, Bartholomew County Emergency Operations 911 Center
- Timothy Lee, Executive Director, Consolidated Communications Partnership of Fort Wayne and Allen County

- Hendricks County
  - Mindy Westrick, Faegre Baker Daniels
  - Robin Brandgard, Town Council President, town of Plainfield; President, Hendricks County Communications Governing Board
- Mayor Richard Fledderman, city of Batesville
- Scott Fadness, Town Manager, town of Fishers
- Mayor Bryan Conklin, city of Union City
- Mark Grady, President, Indigital Telecom

The minutes of the individual meetings and copies of any formal materials presented to the commission are available on the IACIR website ([www.iacir.spea.iupui.edu](http://www.iacir.spea.iupui.edu)).

## Research and Analysis

To support the commission’s deliberations, the IACIR staff conducted a literature review and a survey of PSAPs. The survey was administered to all PSAPs in the state starting on September 20, 2012 and will continue into mid-November 2012. IACIR staff presented survey results to date at both October commission meetings. Brief descriptions of the survey methodology and results to date are provided in Appendix A. The PSAP questionnaire is provided in Appendix B. The final results will be published under separate cover in early December.

## Policy Recommendations

A number of specific recommendations emerged from the discussions at the three meetings devoted to 911 and E911 services.

### **Responsibilities for 911 and E911 services**

1. Establish clearly in statute that counties are responsible for 911 and Enhanced 911 (E911) services and the related public safety dispatch, and will receive the statewide 911 fees that are distributed by the Statewide 911 Board.
2. Establish that counties may delegate their responsibility for 911 and E911 services and related public safety dispatch to a municipality within the county or to another county by interlocal agreement. If delegated, the statewide 911 fees are transferred to units that are delegated authority for 911 and E911 services and the related public safety dispatch.
3. Clarify that municipalities that currently have dispatch that is fully funded by the municipality may continue to exist.

### **Funding of 911 and E911 Services**

4. Establish a sustainable, stable, and equitable system of funding that will support high quality local 911, E911, and related public safety dispatch services. The system of funding should be robust enough to allow the implementation of new technologies over time and address any current technological disparities.

5. Make a distinction between (a) the bundle of services that includes 911, e911, and the related public safety dispatch and (b) additional public safety duties and accepting calls and dispatching for non-public safety services and agencies. The statewide 911 fees should fund 911, E911, and related public safety dispatch. Additional dispatch and other services should be funded with local government resources.
6. Explore additional state funding options (e.g., raising the statewide 911 fees) and local funding options (e.g., higher statewide 911 fees, a public safety LOIT that is uncoupled from property tax relief, a dedicated dispatch LOIT, or a service territory with fee) to supplement current statewide 911 fees. Adopt if necessary.
7. 2012 SEA 345 requires local governments to track costs for 911, E911, and various types of dispatch services across funding sources. They are required to begin submitting data to the Statewide 911 Board beginning in January 2013. Our work has made clear that good data is critical to good decisionmaking for 911, E911, and related public safety dispatch services.
8. Establish authority to audit telecommunications providers to ensure that all statewide 911 fees are being remitted.
9. Establish a statutory formula for the fees on trunk lines. Currently, each telecommunications company is allowed to establish their own formula (e.g., pay three (3) single line fees on each trunk line).
10. Enable local governments within counties to transfer levy capacity to county government to allow counties to fund 911, E911 and related public safety dispatch more fully and equitably with property taxes.

### **Consolidation of PSAPs (2008 HEA 1204)**

11. Clarify that the intent of 2008 HEA 1204 was that there should be only one primary public safety answering points (PSAPs) per county. A second system was intended to be a backup system.
12. Provide incentives for local government units to consolidate to no more than one PSAP/public safety dispatch center per county and to consolidate across county lines. One option would be to allow the new agency or the sending local governments to keep all savings (for a period of time) that accrue from consolidation. Savings are a natural incentive for units to consolidate operations. Currently, local governments are only allowed to keep part of their savings. As additional consolidations occur, particularly across county lines, encourage local governments to establish management structures that allow consolidating entities to participate in setting management policies.

### **Operations/Management**

13. Task the Statewide 911 Board, in collaboration with the Indiana Chapters of the National Emergency Number Association (NENA) and the Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials (APCO) to develop best practices resources about consolidation, staffing, etc. that are available and accessible to PSAP/dispatch centers across the state.
14. Encourage PSAPs/dispatch centers to review and adopt best practices.
15. Establish a pilot grant program that encourages local governments to develop and implement innovative programs to further consolidate dispatch centers or technology, to develop new funding options, and/or to gain significant efficiencies through the adoption of best practices. Give the Statewide 911 Board the authority to distribute a portion of the statewide 911 fees for this purpose.



## **Operations/Management (continued)**

16. Assign the Statewide 911 Board the completion of a feasibility study of Indiana's readiness for Next Generation 911 (NG 911) technology implementation. Adopt state level funding to cover the increased cost of bandwidth associated with NG 911.

# Appendix A

## 2012 PSAP Operations Survey Results to Date

# Appendix A: 2012 PSAP Operations Survey Results to Date

The 2012 PSAP Operations Survey was designed to collect data about the range of circumstances that exist among public safety answering points (PSAPs) throughout the state with regard to their emergency dispatch operations, responsibilities, and budget. The administration of the survey began on September 20, 2012 and is ongoing. Information on the survey methodology and a brief summary of results are provided below as context for the IACIR study of 911/E911 services.

## **Survey Methodology**

The survey process involved four steps: developing the questionnaire, obtaining contact information for each public safety answer points (PSAPs), administering the survey, and coding and analyzing the results.

### *Survey Development*

The questionnaire included six questions with several subquestions for each. The questions were designed to collect information about the following: 1) basic identifying information, 2) management and decision making structure; 3) agencies served and services provided; 4) number of yearly computer-aided dispatch (CAD) events; 5) yearly call volume by type and source; 6) operations expenses by category; and 7) operations revenue by source. The draft questionnaire was reviewed by practitioners to ensure that it would be understandable and elicit the desired data. A copy of the questionnaire is provided in Appendix B.

### *Respondent Contact Information*

Contact persons and addresses for PSAPs were obtained from a directory of state PSAPs provided by the Statewide 911 Board. This list contains 156 counties, municipalities, airports, universities, and hospitals that provide 911 and E911 services within Indiana.

### *Survey Administration*

IACIR staff administered the survey by mail and electronically. Each PSAP was mailed an individualized cover letter, questionnaire, and business reply envelopes on September 20, 2012. For PSAPs with available emails, an email was sent that included an explanation of the effort and an electronic copy of the questionnaire on September 24, 2012. Between September 20, 2012 and October 25, 2012, the Indiana State Board of Accounts, Indiana Statewide 911 Board, commission members, and other interested parties sent reminders and made direct contact in some cases to encourage PSAPs to complete the questionnaire. Respondents were given the option of returning their completed questionnaires either by mail or electronically.

### *Coding and Analysis*

Completed questionnaires were sent to the IU Public Policy Institute and entered by staff into an electronic database. Questionnaires completed by October 29, 2012 are included in this analysis. Basic computations and analysis were conducted using Excel. Some surveys responses were adjusted based on follow-ups by staff. In some cases, population figures provided by the PSAPs were adjusted based on current U.S. Census Bureau population data.

## **Response Rate**

The survey was mailed to 156 PSAPs in Indiana, including those serving counties, municipalities, airports, universities, and hospitals. However, completed surveys received from PSAPs serving airports, universities,

and hospitals are not included in this analysis. In total, the survey was sent to 146 county and municipal PSAPs. Fifty-seven (57) surveys were returned.

The effective aggregated response rate for county and municipal PSAPs was 39 percent (57 out of 146) (Table 1). Among survey respondents 46 were from county PSAPs and 11 were municipal PSAPs. Table 2 shows the respondent agencies that have completed surveys to date.

**Table 1: Response rates**

Governmental Unit	Sent	Received	Response Rate
Municipality	55	11	20%
County	91*	46	51%
Total	146	57	39%

\*Fountain and Warren Counties have a consolidated PSAP. Marion County is counted among the counties and not as a municipality.

**Table 2: Respondents by County**

County	PSAP Name
Adams	Adams County Sheriff Department
Allen	Consolidated Communications Partnership of Fort Wayne/Allen County
Bartholomew	Bartholomew County Emergency 911 Center
Benton	Benton County Sheriff Department
Boone	Boone County Communication Center
Brown	Brown County Communications
Cass	Cass County Central Dispatch
Clark	Charlestown Police Department Clark County 911
Clinton	Clinton County Central Dispatch
Daviess	Washington Police Department
Dearborn	Dearborn County Communications
Decatur	Decatur County Sheriff's Department Greensburg Police Department
DeKalb	DeKalb County Central Communications
Dubois	Dubois County Communications Center
Elkhart	Elkhart City Communications Elkhart County 911
Franklin	Franklin County 911
Gibson	Gibson County Sheriff's Office
Grant	Grant County Sheriff's Department
Greene	Linton Police Department Greene County Sheriff's Department
Hamilton	Hamilton County Public Safety
Hancock	Hancock County Emergency Operations Center
Hendricks	Hendricks County Communications Center
Howard	Howard County (Kokomo) Communications
Jackson	Jackson County Sheriff Department
Jay	Jay County Sheriff's Office
Jefferson	Madison Police Department (Communications & 911) Jefferson County 911

**Table 2: Respondents by County (continued)**

<b>County</b>	<b>PSAP Name</b>
Johnson	Edinburgh Police Department
Knox	Knox County Central Dispatch
LaPorte	La Porte County E-911
Lake	St. John Police Department
	Dyer Police Department
Marion	Marion County Sheriff's 911 Communications
Marshall	Marshall County Sheriff's Department
Miami	Miami County RDC
Monroe	Monroe County Central Emergency Central Dispatch Center
Newton	Newton County Sheriff's Department
Noble	Noble County Communications
Ohio	Ohio County Communications
Porter	Porter County Central Communications
Putnam	Putnam County 911
Ripley	Ripley County 911 Communications Center
Shelby	Shelby County Criminal Justice Center
Tipton	Tipton County Communications
Union	Union County 911
Vigo	Vigo County Central Dispatch
Wabash	North Manchester Police Department
	Wabash County 9-1-1 Central Dispatch Center
Wayne	Wayne County Emergency Communications
Wells	Bluffton Dispatch (Bluffton PD)
White	White County Communications/E911
Whitley	Columbia City Communications
	Whitley County Sheriff Department

## Results

A summary of preliminary results from the responses received to date is provided below. Complete results will be available in early December 2012.

### *PSAP Size (Q1)*

Respondents were asked to report both the population served by the PSAP as well as the number of staff. Both of these measures were used to group the respondent governments. PSAPs were classified by population size as either small (< 19,000), medium (19,000-99,999), large (100,000 -149,999), or extra-large (150,000+) (Table 3). PSAPs also were classified by staff size as small (less than 15), medium (16 to 75), or large (76+) (Table 4). It is important to note that the survey responses reflect total PSAP staff and do not distinguish between administrative, managerial, and dispatch staff or full-time from part-time employees.

**Table 3: PSAP size by population served (Q1, N=57)**

	N	Low	Average	High
Small (<19,000)	15	4,543	10,335	16,376
Medium (19,001 – 99,999)	32	20,526	40,705	82,752
Large (100,00 – 149,999)	6	107,848	124,264	145,448
X-Large (150,000+)	4	197,559	432,713	903,393

**Table 4: PSAP size by staff (Q1, N=56)**

	N	Low	Average	High
Small (0-15)	32	6	10.7	15
Medium (16-75)	22	16	28.6	56
Large (76+)	2	80	n/a	162

***Provision of Service (Q3)***

Respondents were asked to list each agency for which they provided dispatch services as well as any additional services (Tables 5 and 6). IACIR staff also analyzed survey responses and divided agencies by “core” and “non-core” functions. “Core” functions include dispatching for police, fire, EMS, EMT, and any agency determined to be within the scope of emergency services. “Non-core” functions included all other functions. These varied greatly, but generally involved after-hours and administrative calls for municipal agencies (Table 7 and 8).

**Table 5: Agencies served by population size (Q3, N=57)**

	Low	Average	High
Small (n=15)	1	7	21
Medium (n=32)	1	18	34
Large (n=6)	13	22	36
X-Large (n=4)	3	18	28

**Table 6: Agencies served by staff size (Q3, N=56)**

	Low	Average	High
Small (n=32)	1	14	30
Medium (n=22)	1	19	36
Large (n=2)	*3	–	21

\*Marion County is a unique case as a result of its status as a merged city-county body. Most large counties with a single consolidated PSAP serve a greater number of agencies as the sole 911 provider in the county.

**Table 7: Agency function by population size (Q3, N=56)**

	Core			Non-core		
	Low	Average	High	Low	Average	High
Small (n=14)*	1	5	13	0	2	15
Medium (n=32)	1	16	31	0	2	12
Large (n=6)	13	21	33	0	2	4
X-Large (n=4)	3	17	27	0	1	3

\*One PSAP requires clarification regarding agency identification.

**Table 8: Agency function by staff size (Q3, N=55)**

	Core			Non-core		
	Low	Average	High	Low	Average	High
Small (n=31)*	1	12	25	0	3	15
Medium (n=22)	1	17	33	0	2	9
Large (n=2)	3	11	18	0	2	3

\* One PSAP requires clarification regarding agency identification.

### *Emergency Dispatch (Q3 and Q4)*

Respondents were asked to provide the volume of calls received by the PSAP (Q4) and total number of computer-aided-dispatch (CAD) events/reports per year by agency (Q3). In Question 4, respondents reported total calls, 911 calls, and administrative calls. For the sake of consistent data comparisons in this preliminary summary, only 911 calls for 2011 are tabulated and compared below. While totals calls might ideally be more indicative of the volume of calls handled by dispatch, there are significant technological and definitional limitations to the reliability of this data. Many PSAP computer systems do not permit call total to be determined in a consistent manner and the composition of the total call data varies by PSAP and computer system. Some totals include both incoming and outgoing calls, as well as disconnects and transfers. Using 911 calls provides a reliable dataset that is consistently defined and utilized among PSAPs (Tables 9 and 10).

**Table 9: 911 calls by population size (Q4, N=40)**

	Low	Average	High
Small (n=7)	772	3307	7084
Medium (n=25)	1685	17,441	60,677
Large (n=5)	60,916	71,510	92,863
X-Large (n=3)	47,409	395,972	938,366

**Table 10: 911 Calls by staff size (Q4, N=40)**

	Low	Average	High
Small (n=22)	772	7,818	23,669
Medium (n=16)	11,429	43,259	92,863
Large (n=2)	202,140	n/a	938,366

Using CAD events, in addition to 911 calls, provides an alternative method of analyzing the volume of emergency calls and events. Although not every PSAP utilizes a CAD system, for those that do, it provides data on emergencies that are handled and dispatched through the PSAP. However, unlike 911 call data, CAD systems generally combine calls from a unique event (i.e. automobile accident) so that multiple calls related to the same emergency are only counted as a single contact. Further, CAD systems allow for more efficient management and tracking of calls through the system by reducing the administrative burden on dispatcher handling calls (Tables 11 and 12).

**Table 11: CAD events by population size (Q3, N=42)**

	Low	Average	High
Small (n=10)	3,742	10,912	18,740
Medium (n=24)	8,089	40,328	108,385
Large (n=5)	37,692	118,767	167,950
X-Large (n=3)	177,423	218,426	298,679

**Table 12: CAD events by staff size (Q3, N=42)**

	Low	Average	High
Small (n=20)	3,742	17,108	39,162
Medium (n=21)	9,813	80,251	179,178
Large (n=1)*	298,679	n/a	n/a

\*Consolidated Allen County/Fort Wayne

### *Revenue and Expenses*

Respondents were asked to provide financial information regarding PSAP operations, including expense (Q5) and revenue data (Q6). This was the section of the survey most often left incomplete and, even when completed, remained difficult to analyze due to the unique financial circumstances that exist among PSAPs. Among the factors complicating data analyses were cyclical expenditures on technology and co-location with other units of government. Many PSAPs lack independent budgets, and many survey respondents reported that they did not have access to the financial data for their PSAP or that they did not know the amount and source of revenues. Tables 13 and 14 provide a brief summary of aggregated expense data. )

**Table 13: Expenses by population size (Q5; n=42)**

	Low	Average	High
Small (n=10)	\$178,131	\$317,482	\$650,000
Medium (n=25)	\$237,436	\$766,925	\$1,926,962
Large (n=6)	\$602,990	\$1,823,344	\$3,986,197
X-Large (n=1)*	\$2,194,926.58	--	--

\*Data for Allen County/Fort Wayne Consolidated only.



**Table 14: Expenses by staff size (Q5; n=42)**

	<b>Low</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>High</b>
Small (n=23)	\$178,131	\$438,496	\$933,821
Medium (n=18)	\$269,650	\$1,385,024	\$3,986,197
Large (n=1)*	\$2,194,926.58	-	-

\*Data for Allen County/Fort Wayne Consolidated only.

# Appendix B

## PSAP Questionnaire

## 2012 PSAP Operations Survey

This survey is conducted on behalf of the Indiana Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (IACIR) and will provide crucial data on public safety answering points (PSAP) operations statewide. Following the passage of Senate Bill 345 by the Indiana General Assembly, the IACIR has been assigned the task of reviewing the operations and responsibilities of Indiana PSAPs.

Completion of the survey is voluntary. However, responses are important to ensure that the data collected represents the varied circumstances among PSAPs. Respondents have the option to write or type in responses. Respondents may return the survey in the business reply envelopes that accompanied the survey in the mail or return by email at [jlpalmer@iupui.edu](mailto:jlpalmer@iupui.edu).

1. Please provide the following information regarding name, location, contact information, etc., for your PSAP.

<b>PSAP Name:</b>	
<b>County:</b>	
<b>Website:</b>	
<b>Email:</b>	
<b>Phone number:</b>	
<b>Director's Name:</b>	
<b>Respondent (if other than director):</b>	
<b>Population Served (#):</b>	
<b>CAD System (if applicable):</b>	
<b>Total Staff:</b>	

2. What official or entity makes decisions regarding the operation of the PSAP? Please use the space below to describe the management of the PSAP. For example, the PSAP may be managed by the Sheriff, Chief of Police, or by a board.

3. Please list the local unit(s) of government served by the PSAP. In table a, please include services in addition to emergency 911 dispatch services that are provided by the PSAP. In table b, list the number of yearly CAD events or CAD reports by agency.

Agency(ies) Served by PSAP	a. <u>Services provided in addition to 911</u>
Agency 1	
Agency 2	
Agency 3	
Agency 4	
Agency 5	
Agency 6	
Agency 7	
Agency 8	
Agency 9	
Agency 10	
Agency 11	
Agency 12	
Agency 13	
Agency 14	
Agency 15	

Please use the space below if more than 15 units of local government are served by the PSAP.

Agency(s) Served by PSAP	a. <u>Services provided in addition to 911</u>
Agency 16	
Agency 17	
Agency 18	
Agency 19	
Agency 20	
Agency 21	
Agency 22	
Agency 23	
Agency 24	
Agency 25	
Agency 26	
Agency 27	
Agency 28	
Agency 29	
Agency 30	

Please list the number of yearly CAD events by agency or unit of local government.

Agency(s) Served by PSAP	b. <u>CAD Events / Computer Aided Dispatch Reports</u>			
	<u>2012</u> <u>(Jan. 1 – June 30)</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2009</u>
Agency 1				
Agency 2				
Agency 3				
Agency 4				
Agency 5				
Agency 6				
Agency 7				
Agency 8				
Agency 9				
Agency 10				
Agency 11				
Agency 12				
Agency 13				
Agency 14				
Agency 15				

Please use the space below if more than 15 units of local government are served by the PSAP.

Agency(s) Served by PSAP	b. <u>CAD Events / Computer Aided Dispatch Reports</u>			
	<u>2012</u> <u>(Jan. 1 – June 30)</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2009</u>
Agency 16				
Agency 17				
Agency 18				
Agency 19				
Agency 20				
Agency 21				
Agency 22				
Agency 23				
Agency 24				
Agency 25				
Agency 26				
Agency 27				
Agency 28				
Agency 29				
Agency 30				

4. Please provide aggregated call data for the PSAP for Jan 1 – Jun 30, 2012, CY 2011, CY 2010, and CY 2009.

<b>a. Dispatch Calls</b> <b>(2009, 2010 , 2011 , 2012 (Jan. 1 – June 30))</b>						
	<b><u>Total Calls</u></b>	<b><u>911</u></b>	<b><u>Administrative</u></b>	<b><u>Wireline</u></b>	<b><u>Wireless</u></b>	<b><u>Abandoned</u></b>
PSAP Totals for 2012 (Jan. 1 – June 30)						
PSAP Totals for 2011						
PSAP Totals for 2010						
PSAP Totals for 2009						

- b. Please use this space for comments or related additional information that would be helpful in understanding Dispatch Call data provided above. For example, if some call data is not included for a specific year or if the PSAP increased the number of agencies served for a given period, please explain these occurrences here.



5. Please complete the table below describing PSAP expenditures. If budget items do not conform to the categories available below, please list the nonconforming items as *Other* and use the space below the table to provide additional information to explain these expenses. If there are expenses related to PSAP operations that are paid by the host government (or other source), please include them in the space provided.

a. Expenses				
	2012 (Jan 1 – June 30)	2011	2010	2009
<b>Total Expenses:</b>				
Salary/Benefits:				
Communications Equipment Total (hardware and software):				
a. 9-1-1 Answering Equipment:				
b. Radio Equipment:				
Facility Costs (rent, lease, bond, etc.):				
Related Operations Costs (utilities, maintenance, etc.):				
Other (please identify _____):				
Other (please identify _____):				

c. Are there any expenses that are paid by the host government that do not appear above? For example, the electric bill for the dispatch center is paid from the budget of another department.

d. Use the space below to provide additional information for understanding operation expenses.

6. Please complete the table below describing PSAP revenue. If a revenue source requires further explanation, please use the space below the table to provide additional information to explain these sources. Please indicate the source of the revenues.

a. Revenue (with Source)				
	2012 (Jan 1 – June 30)	2011	2010	2009
<b>Total Revenue:</b>				
Landline surcharges:				
Wireless surcharges:				
Contributions from host local government:				
Contributions from participating local government (Please identify _____):				
Contributions from participating local government (Please identify _____):				
Contributions from participating local government (Please identify _____):				
Contributions from participating local government (Please identify _____):				
Contributions from participating local government (Please identify _____):				
Contributions from participating local government (Please identify _____):				
Contributions from participating local government (Please identify _____):				
Contributions from participating local government (Please identify _____):				
Other (please identify _____):				
Other (please identify _____):				

b. Use the space below to provide additional information for understanding operations revenue.

**Please return the survey by email to the address below or return using the enclosed postage paid envelope.**

**Your participation in this survey is greatly appreciated.**

**If you have any questions or comments, please contact:**

**Jamie Palmer, Associate Director**

**Indiana Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Affairs**

334 N. Senate Avenue, Suite 300

Indianapolis, IN 46204-1708

317/261-3046

317/261-3050

[jlpalmer@iupui.edu](mailto:jlpalmer@iupui.edu)



Indiana Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations  
334 North Senate Avenue  
Indianapolis, IN 46204-1708  
ph. 317/261-3000  
fax 317/261-3050  
[iacir.spea.iupui.edu](http://iacir.spea.iupui.edu)  
Email: [iacir@iupui.edu](mailto:iacir@iupui.edu)