

## Next Generation 9-1-1 Funding

### 9-1-1 Revenue

CURRENT RESULTS	44 Total Responses				
	Do Not Agree	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	2% (1)	11% (5)	7% (3)	45% (20)	34% (15)
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	7% (3)	14% (6)	5% (2)	55% (24)	20% (9)
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	7% (3)	2% (1)	16% (7)	52% (23)	23% (10)
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	2% (1)	5% (2)	5% (2)	36% (16)	52% (23)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	7% (3)	5% (2)	18% (8)	36% (16)	34% (15)

#### REGISTERED (9)

	Do Not Agree	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	11.0% (1)	44.0% (4)	44.0% (4)
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	11.0% (1)	-	22.0% (2)	33.0% (3)	33.0% (3)
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	11.0% (1)	-	11.0% (1)	33.0% (3)	44.0% (4)
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	33.0% (3)	67.0% (6)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	56.0% (5)	44.0% (4)

#### NON-REGISTERED (35)

	Do Not Agree	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	2.9% (1)	14.3% (5)	5.7% (2)	45.7% (16)	31.4% (11)
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	5.7% (2)	17.1% (6)	-	60.0% (21)	17.1% (6)
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	5.7% (2)	2.9% (1)	17.1% (6)	57.1% (20)	17.1% (6)
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	2.9% (1)	5.7% (2)	5.7% (2)	37.1% (13)	48.6% (17)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	8.6% (3)	5.7% (2)	22.9% (8)	31.4% (11)	31.4% (11)

#### ALL RESPONDENTS (44)

	Do Not Agree	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	2% (1)	11% (5)	7% (3)	45% (20)	34% (15)
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	7% (3)	14% (6)	5% (2)	55% (24)	20% (9)
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	7% (3)	2% (1)	16% (7)	52% (23)	23% (10)
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	2% (1)	5% (2)	5% (2)	36% (16)	52% (23)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	7% (3)	5% (2)	18% (8)	36% (16)	34% (15)

#### REGISTERED VOTERS IN VIRGINIA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE (9)

	Do Not	Agree	No	Agree	Strongly
--	--------	-------	----	-------	----------

	Agree	Somewhat	Opinion		Agree
Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	0% (-)	0% (-)	11% (1)	44% (4)	44% (4)
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	11% (1)	0% (-)	22% (2)	33% (3)	33% (3)
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	11% (1)	0% (-)	11% (1)	33% (3)	44% (4)
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	0% (-)	0% (-)	0% (-)	33% (3)	67% (6)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	0% (-)	0% (-)	0% (-)	56% (5)	44% (4)

**LIVE IN VIRGINIA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE (25) - SELF-REPORTED**

	Do Not Agree	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	0% (-)	8% (2)	8% (2)	44% (11)	40% (10)
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	12% (3)	12% (3)	8% (2)	52% (13)	16% (4)
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	12% (3)	0% (-)	12% (3)	52% (13)	24% (6)
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	0% (-)	0% (-)	0% (-)	48% (12)	52% (13)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	4% (1)	4% (1)	8% (2)	48% (12)	36% (9)

**SUBSCRIBERS TO VIRGINIA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE (25)**

	Do Not Agree	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	0% (-)	8% (2)	8% (2)	44% (11)	40% (10)
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	12% (3)	12% (3)	8% (2)	52% (13)	16% (4)
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	12% (3)	0% (-)	12% (3)	52% (13)	24% (6)
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	0% (-)	0% (-)	0% (-)	48% (12)	52% (13)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	4% (1)	4% (1)	8% (2)	48% (12)	36% (9)

**REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (9)**

	Do Not Agree	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	0% (-)	0% (-)	11% (1)	44% (4)	44% (4)
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	11% (1)	0% (-)	22% (2)	33% (3)	33% (3)
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	11% (1)	0% (-)	11% (1)	33% (3)	44% (4)
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	0% (-)	0% (-)	0% (-)	33% (3)	67% (6)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	0% (-)	0% (-)	0% (-)	56% (5)	44% (4)

**AGE RANGE**

9 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Do Not Agree	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
<b>18-29 (1)</b>					
Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	100.0%	-

cards?	-	-	-	(1.0)	-
--------	---	---	---	-------	---

**30-39 (1)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**40-49 (3)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)

**50-59 (3)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)

**80-89 (1)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

**VOTERS GENDER**

9 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Do Not Agree	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	--------------	----------------	------------	-------	----------------

**F (4)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)

**M (5)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)

Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)

**CITY** 9 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Do Not Agree	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	--------------	----------------	------------	-------	----------------

**COVINGTON CITY (EST.) (1)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

**ROANOKE CITY (EST.) (1)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**Unknown (7)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	42.9% (3.0)
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	14.3% (1.0)	-	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	14.3% (1.0)	-	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	42.9% (3.0)	57.1% (4.0)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	57.1% (4.0)	42.9% (3.0)

**COUNTY** 9 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Do Not Agree	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	--------------	----------------	------------	-------	----------------

**COVINGTON CITY (1)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

**LOUDOUN COUNTY (1)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**MECKLENBURG COUNTY (1)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

**MONTGOMERY COUNTY (1)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**PAGE COUNTY (1)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**ROANOKE CITY (1)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**RUSSELL COUNTY (1)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

**WASHINGTON COUNTY (1)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

## YORK COUNTY (1)

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

2011 NEW STATE HOUSE  
DISTRICT

9 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Do Not Agree	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	--------------	----------------	------------	-------	----------------

## 13 (1)

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

## 19.0 (1)

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

## 4 (1)

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

## 49 (1)

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

## 5 (1)

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
---	---	---	---	--------------	---

**7 (1)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**8 (1)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**9 (1)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**93.0 (1)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

**2011 NEW STATE SENATE DISTRICT**

9 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Do Not Agree	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	--------------	----------------	------------	-------	----------------

**13 (1)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**15 (1)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
--	---	---	---	---	--------------

If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

**19 (1)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**21 (1)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**25 (1)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

**26 (1)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**3 (1)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

**38 (1)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)



If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

**40 (1)**

Should the General Assembly (GA) pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 9-1-1 use versus going into local general funds?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Should the GA remove exemption (§58.1-648) for Communication Sales & Use Tax prepaid devices and cards?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

## Wireless E-911 Fund Distribution

CURRENT RESULTS					44 Total Responses
	Do Not Agree	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	9% (4)	16% (7)	20% (9)	43% (19)	11% (5)
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	7% (3)	18% (8)	18% (8)	50% (22)	7% (3)
<b>REGISTERED (9)</b>					
	Do Not Agree	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	11.0% (1)	22.0% (2)	-	56.0% (5)	11.0% (1)
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	11.0% (1)	22.0% (2)	11.0% (1)	44.0% (4)	11.0% (1)
<b>NON-REGISTERED (35)</b>					
	Do Not Agree	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	8.6% (3)	14.3% (5)	25.7% (9)	40.0% (14)	11.4% (4)
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	5.7% (2)	17.1% (6)	20.0% (7)	51.4% (18)	5.7% (2)
<b>ALL RESPONDENTS (44)</b>					
	Do Not Agree	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	9% (4)	16% (7)	20% (9)	43% (19)	11% (5)
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	7% (3)	18% (8)	18% (8)	50% (22)	7% (3)
<b>REGISTERED VOTERS IN VIRGINIA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE (9)</b>					
	Do Not Agree	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	11% (1)	22% (2)	0% (-)	56% (5)	11% (1)
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	11% (1)	22% (2)	11% (1)	44% (4)	11% (1)
<b>LIVE IN VIRGINIA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE (25) - SELF-REPORTED</b>					
	Do Not Agree	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	4% (1)	20% (5)	16% (4)	52% (13)	8% (2)
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	4% (1)	24% (6)	12% (3)	56% (14)	4% (1)
<b>SUBSCRIBERS TO VIRGINIA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE (25)</b>					
	Do Not Agree	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	4% (1)	20% (5)	16% (4)	52% (13)	8% (2)
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	4% (1)	24% (6)	12% (3)	56% (14)	4% (1)
<b>REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (9)</b>					
	Do Not Agree	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	11% (1)	22% (2)	0% (-)	56% (5)	11% (1)
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	11% (1)	22% (2)	11% (1)	44% (4)	11% (1)
<b>AGE RANGE</b>					
	Do Not Agree	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
<b>18-29 (1)</b>					
Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
<b>30-39 (1)</b>					

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

**40-49 (3)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-

**50-59 (3)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)

**80-89 (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**VOTERS GENDER**

9 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Do Not Agree	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	--------------	----------------	------------	-------	----------------

**F (4)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	75.0% (3.0)	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	50.0% (2.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	-

**M (5)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)

**CITY**

9 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Do Not Agree	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	--------------	----------------	------------	-------	----------------

**COVINGTON CITY (EST.) (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

**ROANOKE CITY (EST.) (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

**Unknown (7)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	-	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	-	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)

**COUNTY**

9 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Do Not Agree	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	--------------	----------------	------------	-------	----------------

**COVINGTON CITY (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

**LOUDOUN COUNTY (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

**MECKLENBURG COUNTY (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

**MONTGOMERY COUNTY (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**PAGE COUNTY (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**ROANOKE CITY (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

**RUSSELL COUNTY (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

**WASHINGTON COUNTY (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**YORK COUNTY (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**2011 NEW STATE HOUSE DISTRICT**

9 REGISTERED VOTERS

Do Not Agree    Agree Somewhat    No Opinion    Agree    Strongly Agree

**13 (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**19.0 (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

**4 (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

**49 (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

**5 (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**7 (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**8 (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

**9 (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

**93.0 (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**2011 NEW STATE SENATE DISTRICT**

9 REGISTERED VOTERS

Do Not Agree    Agree Somewhat    No Opinion    Agree    Strongly Agree

**13 (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

**15 (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

**19 (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**21 (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

**25 (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

**26 (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**3 (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
















**38 (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

**40 (1)**

Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**If you responded "Do Not Agree" or "Agree Somewhat" to the above questions, please provide suggestions in the section below.**

- 
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
Blah
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
rural areas are negatively impacted by this methodology. There is a base amount every locality must have simply to install and maintain equipment that has nothing to do with population and call volume.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
I agree somewhat with the current 60/40 split, but with increasing costs for NG911, and the need to maintain 911 Centers that are prepared and up to date with the latest technologies, I do think we should consider increasing the percentage a bit towards the grant funds to make more funds available for such projects.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
Including the personnel cost into the equation may benefit the PSAP
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
Small localities struggle to meet the financial needs.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
As PSAP operational expenses increase the 60/40 is becoming inadequate, the suggested value should be 80/20.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
Agree
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
While we certainly understand the need for grant funding my personal opinion would be that there be a separate allocation for the grant monies. PSAP's struggle as is with the limited funding they receive and since grants are conditional and hard to come by I think the best allocation of the 911 fund distribution would be to give to the localities directly.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
For rural counties with smaller populations, neither of these methodologies/split provides enough funding.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
We would like to see what is left at the end of the year for the grant program. What is done with the money not used? We would like to see this distributed back to the agencies.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
Question # 4 is flawed. We believe that it does not give the opportunity to increase operational funding therefore it should allow for a N/A answer. Recommend increase in operational funding, decrease in grant funding. Operational funding would provide a more stable revenue stream and can be reserved for specific capital and other expenses for 911 operations.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
It would be more equitable to reduce the amount of grant funding given out conditionally and move those funds to a formula based distribution.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
Hanover has a comment with the calculation of Call Volume being limited to wireline and wireless 9-1-1 inbound calls. Inbound 9-1-1 calls are easy to calculate, however, this center receives a significant number of emergency calls over non emergency lines and also receives emergency transfer calls into the center from other locality 911 centers. Those calls are not factored into the overall call volume percentages.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
Ashland receives PSAP services from Hanover County and Hanover has a concern with the calculation of Call Volume being limited to wireline and wireless 9-1-1 inbound calls. Inbound 9-1-1 calls are easy to calculate, however, this center receives a significant number of emergency calls over non emergency lines and also receives emergency transfer calls into the center from other locality 911 centers. Those calls are not factored into the overall call volume percentages.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
As the state roles out mandates to the PSAP, the state should include additional funding for these mandates thus not having to use wireless funds nor grants to cover the expense(s) associated with the mandate.

**Grant Funding for 9-1-1 Systems: If you believe more funding is needed for grants, what is your preferred breakdown of Grant funding to PSAP Operational funding? (Note - Increasing the percentage of PSAP grant funding will result in less funding for PSAP operations. ESInet Connectivity is estimated to be 36% of the total amount of wireless funding available to PSAPs.)**

CURRENT RESULTS			44 Total Responses
<b>A</b>	45% grant / 55% PSAP (25)		57% (25)
<b>B</b>	50% grant / 50% PSAP (9)		20% (9)
<b>C</b>	55% grant / 45% PSAP (2)		5% (2)
<b>D</b>	60% grant / 40% PSAP (8)		18% (8)

REGISTERED VS NON-REGISTERED				
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
Registered Voters (9)	44.4% (4)	11.1% (1)	11.1% (1)	33.3% (3)
Non-Registered Voters (35)	60.0% (21)	22.9% (8)	2.9% (1)	14.3% (5)

ALL RESPONDENTS				
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
All respondents (44)	57.0% (25)	20.0% (9)	5.0% (2)	18.0% (8)
Registered Voters in Virginia Municipal League (9)	44.4% (4)	11.1% (1)	11.1% (1)	33.3% (3)
Live in Virginia Municipal League (25) - Self-reported	72.0% (18)	12.0% (3)	4.0% (1)	12.0% (3)
Subscribers to Virginia Municipal League (25)	72.0% (18)	12.0% (3)	4.0% (1)	12.0% (3)
Register respondents from anywhere (9)	44.0% (4)	11.0% (1)	11.0% (1)	33.0% (3)

AGE RANGE					9 REGISTERED VOTERS
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	
18-29 (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	
30-39 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	
40-49 (3)	66.7% (2)	-	-	33.3% (1)	
50-59 (3)	-	33.3% (1)	-	66.7% (2)	
80-89 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	

VOTERS GENDER					9 REGISTERED VOTERS
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	
F (4)	75.0% (3)	-	-	25.0% (1)	
M (5)	20.0% (1)	20.0% (1)	20.0% (1)	40.0% (2)	

CITY					9 REGISTERED VOTERS
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	
COVINGTON CITY (EST.) (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	
ROANOKE CITY (EST.) (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	
Unknown (7)	28.6% (2)	14.3% (1)	14.3% (1)	42.9% (3)	

COUNTY					9 REGISTERED VOTERS
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	
COVINGTON CITY (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	
LOUDOUN COUNTY (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	
MECKLENBURG COUNTY (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	
MONTGOMERY COUNTY (1)	-	100.0% (1)	-	-	
PAGE COUNTY (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	
ROANOKE CITY (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	
RUSSELL COUNTY (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	

WASHINGTON COUNTY (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
YORK COUNTY (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-

**2011 NEW STATE HOUSE  
DISTRICT**

9 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B	C	D
13 (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
19.0 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-
4 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
49 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
5 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
7 (1)	-	100.0% (1)	-	-
8 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-
9 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-
93.0 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-

**2011 NEW STATE SENATE  
DISTRICT**

9 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B	C	D
13 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-
15 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
19 (1)	-	100.0% (1)	-	-
21 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-
25 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-
26 (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
3 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-
38 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
40 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)



**PSAP Operational Funding: If you believe more funding is needed for PSAP operations, what is your preferred breakdown of PSAP Operational funding to Grant funding? (Note - Increasing the percentage of PSAP operations funding will result in less funding for PSAP grants. ESInet Connectivity is estimated to be 36% of the total amount of wireless funding available to PSAPs.)**

CURRENT RESULTS			44 Total Responses
<b>A</b>	65% PSAP / 35% grant (22)		50% (22)
<b>B</b>	70% PSAP / 30% grant (10)		23% (10)
<b>C</b>	75% PSAP / 25% grant (4)		9% (4)
<b>D</b>	80% PSAP / 20% grant (8)		18% (8)

REGISTERED VS NON-REGISTERED				
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
Registered Voters (9)	33.3% (3)	22.2% (2)	11.1% (1)	33.3% (3)
Non-Registered Voters (35)	54.3% (19)	22.9% (8)	8.6% (3)	14.3% (5)

ALL RESPONDENTS				
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
All respondents (44)	50.0% (22)	23.0% (10)	9.0% (4)	18.0% (8)
Registered Voters in Virginia Municipal League (9)	33.3% (3)	22.2% (2)	11.1% (1)	33.3% (3)
Live in Virginia Municipal League (25) - Self-reported	44.0% (11)	28.0% (7)	8.0% (2)	20.0% (5)
Subscribers to Virginia Municipal League (25)	44.0% (11)	28.0% (7)	8.0% (2)	20.0% (5)
Register respondents from anywhere (9)	33.0% (3)	22.0% (2)	11.0% (1)	33.0% (3)

AGE RANGE					9 REGISTERED VOTERS
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	
18-29 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	
30-39 (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	
40-49 (3)	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	-	33.3% (1)	
50-59 (3)	-	33.3% (1)	-	66.7% (2)	
80-89 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	

VOTERS GENDER					9 REGISTERED VOTERS
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	
F (4)	50.0% (2)	25.0% (1)	25.0% (1)	-	
M (5)	20.0% (1)	20.0% (1)	-	60.0% (3)	

CITY					9 REGISTERED VOTERS
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	
COVINGTON CITY (EST.) (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	
ROANOKE CITY (EST.) (1)	-	100.0% (1)	-	-	
Unknown (7)	42.9% (3)	14.3% (1)	14.3% (1)	28.6% (2)	

COUNTY					9 REGISTERED VOTERS
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	
COVINGTON CITY (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	
LOUDOUN COUNTY (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	
MECKLENBURG COUNTY (1)	-	100.0% (1)	-	-	
MONTGOMERY COUNTY (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	
PAGE COUNTY (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	
ROANOKE CITY (1)	-	100.0% (1)	-	-	
RUSSELL COUNTY (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	

WASHINGTON COUNTY (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-
YORK COUNTY (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-

**2011 NEW STATE HOUSE  
DISTRICT**

9 REGISTERED VOTERS

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
13 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-
19.0 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
4 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
49 (1)	-	100.0% (1)	-	-
5 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-
7 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
8 (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
9 (1)	-	100.0% (1)	-	-
93.0 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-

**2011 NEW STATE SENATE  
DISTRICT**

9 REGISTERED VOTERS

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
13 (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
15 (1)	-	100.0% (1)	-	-
19 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
21 (1)	-	100.0% (1)	-	-
25 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
26 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-
3 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-
38 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
40 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-

**Maintenance for Grant Funded Projects: Are maintenance costs paid on these 9-1-1 systems when grant funds are insufficient to cover and/or past the 5-year allowance period?**

CURRENT RESULTS		44 Total Responses	
	Yes	No	
9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	89% (39)	11% (5)	
Mapping	84% (37)	16% (7)	
CAD	86% (38)	14% (6)	
Recorder	89% (39)	11% (5)	
Other GIS Equipment	82% (36)	18% (8)	

REGISTERED (9)		Yes	No
9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (9)	-	
Mapping	89.0% (8)	11.0% (1)	
CAD	100.0% (9)	-	
Recorder	100.0% (9)	-	
Other GIS Equipment	89.0% (8)	11.0% (1)	

NON-REGISTERED (35)		Yes	No
9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	85.7% (30)	14.3% (5)	
Mapping	82.9% (29)	17.1% (6)	
CAD	82.9% (29)	17.1% (6)	
Recorder	85.7% (30)	14.3% (5)	
Other GIS Equipment	80.0% (28)	20.0% (7)	

ALL RESPONDENTS (44)		Yes	No
9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	89% (39)	11% (5)	
Mapping	84% (37)	16% (7)	
CAD	86% (38)	14% (6)	
Recorder	89% (39)	11% (5)	
Other GIS Equipment	82% (36)	18% (8)	

REGISTERED VOTERS IN VIRGINIA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE (9)		Yes	No
9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100% (9)	0% (-)	
Mapping	89% (8)	11% (1)	
CAD	100% (9)	0% (-)	
Recorder	100% (9)	0% (-)	
Other GIS Equipment	89% (8)	11% (1)	

LIVE IN VIRGINIA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE (25) - SELF-REPORTED		Yes	No
9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	92% (23)	8% (2)	
Mapping	84% (21)	16% (4)	
CAD	88% (22)	12% (3)	
Recorder	92% (23)	8% (2)	
Other GIS Equipment	80% (20)	20% (5)	

SUBSCRIBERS TO VIRGINIA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE

(25)

	Yes	No
9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	92% (23)	8% (2)
Mapping	84% (21)	16% (4)
CAD	88% (22)	12% (3)
Recorder	92% (23)	8% (2)
Other GIS Equipment	80% (20)	20% (5)

**REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (9)**

	Yes	No
9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100% (9)	0% (-)
Mapping	89% (8)	11% (1)
CAD	100% (9)	0% (-)
Recorder	100% (9)	0% (-)
Other GIS Equipment	89% (8)	11% (1)

**AGE RANGE**

9 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Yes	No
--	-----	----

**18-29 (1)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	-	100.0% (1.0)
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	-	100.0% (1.0)

**30-39 (1)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-

**40-49 (3)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (3.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (3.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (3.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (3.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (3.0)	-

**50-59 (3)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (3.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (3.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (3.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (3.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (3.0)	-

**80-89 (1)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-

**VOTERS GENDER**

9 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Yes	No
--	-----	----

**F (4)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (4.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (4.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (4.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (4.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (4.0)	-

**M (5)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (5.0)	-
Mapping	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)
CAD	100.0% (5.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (5.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)

**CITY**

9 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Yes	No
--	-----	----

**COVINGTON CITY (EST.) (1)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-

**ROANOKE CITY (EST.) (1)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-

**Unknown (7)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (7.0)	-
Mapping	85.7% (6.0)	14.3% (1.0)
CAD	100.0% (7.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (7.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	85.7% (6.0)	14.3% (1.0)

**COUNTY**

9 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Yes	No
--	-----	----

**COVINGTON CITY (1)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-

**LOUDOUN COUNTY (1)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-

**MECKLENBURG COUNTY (1)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-

**MONTGOMERY COUNTY (1)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-

**PAGE COUNTY (1)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	-	100.0% (1.0)
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	-	100.0% (1.0)

**ROANOKE CITY (1)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-

**RUSSELL COUNTY (1)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-

**WASHINGTON COUNTY (1)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-

**YORK COUNTY (1)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-

**2011 NEW STATE HOUSE DISTRICT**

9 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Yes	No
--	-----	----

**13 (1)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	-	100.0% (1.0)
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-

Other GIS Equipment	-	100.0% (1.0)
---------------------	---	--------------

**19.0 (1)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-

**4 (1)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-

**49 (1)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-

**5 (1)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-

**7 (1)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-

**8 (1)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-

**9 (1)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-

**93.0 (1)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-

2011 NEW STATE SENATE  
DISTRICT

9 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Yes	No
<b>13 (1)</b>		
9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
<b>15 (1)</b>		
9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
<b>19 (1)</b>		
9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
<b>21 (1)</b>		
9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
<b>25 (1)</b>		
9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
<b>26 (1)</b>		
9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	-	100.0% (1.0)
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	-	100.0% (1.0)
<b>3 (1)</b>		
9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
<b>38 (1)</b>		
9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-



CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-

**40 (1)**

9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD	100.0% (1.0)	-
Recorder	100.0% (1.0)	-
Other GIS Equipment	100.0% (1.0)	-

## How satisfied are you with ECATS for call accounting?

CURRENT RESULTS			44 Total Responses
<b>A</b>	Not Satisfied (4)		9% (4)
<b>B</b>	Somewhat Satisfied (3)		7% (3)
<b>C</b>	Neutral (12)		27% (12)
<b>D</b>	Satisfied (19)		43% (19)
<b>E</b>	Very Satisfied (6)		14% (6)

REGISTERED VS NON-REGISTERED					
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>
Registered Voters (9)	-	-	22.2% (2)	77.8% (7)	-
Non-Registered Voters (35)	11.4% (4)	8.6% (3)	28.6% (10)	34.3% (12)	17.1% (6)

ALL RESPONDENTS						
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	
All respondents (44)		9.0% (4)	7.0% (3)	27.0% (12)	43.0% (19)	14.0% (6)
Registered Voters in Virginia Municipal League (9)		-	-	22.2% (2)	77.8% (7)	-
Live in Virginia Municipal League (25) - Self-reported		8.0% (2)	-	16.0% (4)	56.0% (14)	20.0% (5)
Subscribers to Virginia Municipal League (25)		8.0% (2)	-	16.0% (4)	56.0% (14)	20.0% (5)
Register respondents from anywhere (9)		-	-	22.0% (2)	78.0% (7)	-

AGE RANGE						9 REGISTERED VOTERS
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	
18-29 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	
30-39 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	
40-49 (3)	-	-	33.3% (1)	66.7% (2)	-	
50-59 (3)	-	-	33.3% (1)	66.7% (2)	-	
80-89 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	

VOTERS GENDER						9 REGISTERED VOTERS
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	
F (4)	-	-	-	100.0% (4)	-	
M (5)	-	-	40.0% (2)	60.0% (3)	-	

CITY						9 REGISTERED VOTERS
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	
COVINGTON CITY (EST.) (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-	
ROANOKE CITY (EST.) (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	
Unknown (7)	-	-	14.3% (1)	85.7% (6)	-	

COUNTY						9 REGISTERED VOTERS
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	
COVINGTON CITY (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-	
LOUDOUN COUNTY (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	
MECKLENBURG COUNTY (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	
MONTGOMERY COUNTY (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	
PAGE COUNTY (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	
ROANOKE CITY (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	
RUSSELL COUNTY (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-	
WASHINGTON COUNTY (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	

**2011 NEW STATE HOUSE DISTRICT**

9 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B	C	D	E
13 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
19.0 (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-
4 (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-
49 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
5 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
7 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
8 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
9 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
93.0 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-

**2011 NEW STATE SENATE DISTRICT**

9 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B	C	D	E
13 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
15 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
19 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
21 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
25 (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-
26 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
3 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
38 (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-
40 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-

**If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, would you be willing to participate in a statewide funded solution for the following:**

CURRENT RESULTS						44 Total Responses
	Not Interested	Somewhat Interested	Neutral	Interested	Very Interested	
EISNET	5% (2)	2% (1)	14% (6)	55% (24)	25% (11)	
Call Handling Equipment / Service	9% (4)	9% (4)	14% (6)	43% (19)	25% (11)	
Mapping	14% (6)	7% (3)	20% (9)	36% (16)	23% (10)	
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	16% (7)	2% (1)	27% (12)	34% (15)	20% (9)	
RECORDER	11% (5)	7% (3)	16% (7)	39% (17)	27% (12)	
RADIO	11% (5)	7% (3)	20% (9)	36% (16)	25% (11)	
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	5% (2)	16% (7)	9% (4)	41% (18)	30% (13)	
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	18% (8)	5% (2)	27% (12)	32% (14)	18% (8)	
<b>REGISTERED (9)</b>						
	Not Interested	Somewhat Interested	Neutral	Interested	Very Interested	
EISNET	-	-	-	56.0% (5)	44.0% (4)	
Call Handling Equipment / Service	11.0% (1)	11.0% (1)	11.0% (1)	33.0% (3)	33.0% (3)	
Mapping	22.0% (2)	11.0% (1)	22.0% (2)	11.0% (1)	33.0% (3)	
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	22.0% (2)	-	22.0% (2)	33.0% (3)	22.0% (2)	
RECORDER	11.0% (1)	11.0% (1)	22.0% (2)	33.0% (3)	22.0% (2)	
RADIO	22.0% (2)	-	22.0% (2)	33.0% (3)	22.0% (2)	
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	11.0% (1)	11.0% (1)	-	44.0% (4)	33.0% (3)	
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	22.0% (2)	11.0% (1)	22.0% (2)	22.0% (2)	22.0% (2)	
<b>NON-REGISTERED (35)</b>						
	Not Interested	Somewhat Interested	Neutral	Interested	Very Interested	
EISNET	5.7% (2)	2.9% (1)	17.1% (6)	54.3% (19)	20.0% (7)	
Call Handling Equipment / Service	8.6% (3)	8.6% (3)	14.3% (5)	45.7% (16)	22.9% (8)	
Mapping	11.4% (4)	5.7% (2)	20.0% (7)	42.9% (15)	20.0% (7)	
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	14.3% (5)	2.9% (1)	28.6% (10)	34.3% (12)	20.0% (7)	
RECORDER	11.4% (4)	5.7% (2)	14.3% (5)	40.0% (14)	28.6% (10)	
RADIO	8.6% (3)	8.6% (3)	20.0% (7)	37.1% (13)	25.7% (9)	
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	2.9% (1)	17.1% (6)	11.4% (4)	40.0% (14)	28.6% (10)	
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	17.1% (6)	2.9% (1)	28.6% (10)	34.3% (12)	17.1% (6)	
<b>ALL RESPONDENTS (44)</b>						
	Not Interested	Somewhat Interested	Neutral	Interested	Very Interested	
EISNET	5% (2)	2% (1)	14% (6)	55% (24)	25% (11)	

Call Handling Equipment / Service	9% (4)	9% (4)	14% (6)	43% (19)	25% (11)
Mapping	14% (6)	7% (3)	20% (9)	36% (16)	23% (10)
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	16% (7)	2% (1)	27% (12)	34% (15)	20% (9)
RECORDER	11% (5)	7% (3)	16% (7)	39% (17)	27% (12)
RADIO	11% (5)	7% (3)	20% (9)	36% (16)	25% (11)
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	5% (2)	16% (7)	9% (4)	41% (18)	30% (13)
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	18% (8)	5% (2)	27% (12)	32% (14)	18% (8)

**REGISTERED VOTERS IN VIRGINIA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE (9)**

	Not Interested	Somewhat Interested	Neutral	Interested	Very Interested
EISNET	0% (-)	0% (-)	0% (-)	56% (5)	44% (4)
Call Handling Equipment / Service	11% (1)	11% (1)	11% (1)	33% (3)	33% (3)
Mapping	22% (2)	11% (1)	22% (2)	11% (1)	33% (3)
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	22% (2)	0% (-)	22% (2)	33% (3)	22% (2)
RECORDER	11% (1)	11% (1)	22% (2)	33% (3)	22% (2)
RADIO	22% (2)	0% (-)	22% (2)	33% (3)	22% (2)
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	11% (1)	11% (1)	0% (-)	44% (4)	33% (3)
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	22% (2)	11% (1)	22% (2)	22% (2)	22% (2)

**LIVE IN VIRGINIA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE (25) - SELF-REPORTED**

	Not Interested	Somewhat Interested	Neutral	Interested	Very Interested
EISNET	0% (-)	4% (1)	12% (3)	56% (14)	28% (7)
Call Handling Equipment / Service	8% (2)	8% (2)	16% (4)	44% (11)	24% (6)
Mapping	12% (3)	8% (2)	24% (6)	32% (8)	24% (6)
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	16% (4)	4% (1)	32% (8)	28% (7)	20% (5)
RECORDER	8% (2)	8% (2)	20% (5)	44% (11)	20% (5)
RADIO	12% (3)	4% (1)	28% (7)	36% (9)	20% (5)
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	4% (1)	12% (3)	12% (3)	40% (10)	32% (8)
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	20% (5)	8% (2)	24% (6)	28% (7)	20% (5)

**SUBSCRIBERS TO VIRGINIA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE (25)**

	Not Interested	Somewhat Interested	Neutral	Interested	Very Interested
EISNET	0% (-)	4% (1)	12% (3)	56% (14)	28% (7)
Call Handling Equipment / Service	8% (2)	8% (2)	16% (4)	44% (11)	24% (6)
Mapping	12% (3)	8% (2)	24% (6)	32% (8)	24% (6)
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	16% (4)	4% (1)	32% (8)	28% (7)	20% (5)
RECORDER	8% (2)	8% (2)	20% (5)	44% (11)	20% (5)
RADIO	12% (3)	4% (1)	28% (7)	36% (9)	20% (5)
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	4% (1)	12% (3)	12% (3)	40% (10)	32% (8)

If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	20% (5)	8% (2)	24% (6)	28% (7)	20% (5)
---	---------	--------	---------	---------	---------

**REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (9)**

	Not Interested	Somewhat Interested	Neutral	Interested	Very Interested
EISNET	0% (-)	0% (-)	0% (-)	56% (5)	44% (4)
Call Handling Equipment / Service	11% (1)	11% (1)	11% (1)	33% (3)	33% (3)
Mapping	22% (2)	11% (1)	22% (2)	11% (1)	33% (3)
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	22% (2)	0% (-)	22% (2)	33% (3)	22% (2)
RECORDER	11% (1)	11% (1)	22% (2)	33% (3)	22% (2)
RADIO	22% (2)	0% (-)	22% (2)	33% (3)	22% (2)
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	11% (1)	11% (1)	0% (-)	44% (4)	33% (3)
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	22% (2)	11% (1)	22% (2)	22% (2)	22% (2)

**AGE RANGE**

9 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Not Interested	Somewhat Interested	Neutral	Interested	Very Interested
--	----------------	---------------------	---------	------------	-----------------

**18-29 (1)**

EISNET	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
RECORDER	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
RADIO	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

**30-39 (1)**

EISNET	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
RECORDER	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
RADIO	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

**40-49 (3)**

EISNET	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Mapping	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
RECORDER	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)

RADIO	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
<b>50-59 (3)</b>					
EISNET	-	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)
Call Handling Equipment / Service	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)
Mapping	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
RECORDER	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
RADIO	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)

**80-89 (1)**

EISNET	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
RECORDER	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
RADIO	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**VOTERS GENDER**

9 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Not Interested	Somewhat Interested	Neutral	Interested	Very Interested
--	----------------	---------------------	---------	------------	-----------------

**F (4)**

EISNET	-	-	-	100.0% (4.0)	-
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Mapping	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
RECORDER	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
RADIO	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	75.0% (3.0)	-
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-

**M (5)**

EISNET	-	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)
Call Handling Equipment / Service	20.0% (1.0)	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)

Mapping	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	-	60.0% (3.0)
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	20.0% (1.0)	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
RECORDER	20.0% (1.0)	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
RADIO	20.0% (1.0)	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	20.0% (1.0)	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)

**CITY**

9 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Not Interested	Somewhat Interested	Neutral	Interested	Very Interested
--	----------------	---------------------	---------	------------	-----------------

**COVINGTON CITY (EST.) (1)**

EISNET	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Mapping	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
RECORDER	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
RADIO	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

**ROANOKE CITY (EST.) (1)**

EISNET	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
RECORDER	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
RADIO	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

**Unknown (7)**

EISNET	-	-	-	57.1% (4.0)	42.9% (3.0)
Call Handling Equipment / Service	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)
Mapping	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	28.6% (2.0)	-	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)
RECORDER	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)
RADIO	28.6% (2.0)	-	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	-	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)



COUNTY	9 REGISTERED VOTERS				
	Not Interested	Somewhat Interested	Neutral	Interested	Very Interested
<b>COVINGTON CITY (1)</b>					
EISNET	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Mapping	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
RECORDER	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
RADIO	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
<b>LOUDOUN COUNTY (1)</b>					
EISNET	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
RECORDER	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
RADIO	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
<b>MECKLENBURG COUNTY (1)</b>					
EISNET	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Call Handling Equipment / Service	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
RECORDER	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
RADIO	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
<b>MONTGOMERY COUNTY (1)</b>					
EISNET	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Mapping	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
RECORDER	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
RADIO	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
---	---	---	---	---	--------------

**PAGE COUNTY (1)**

EISNET	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
RECORDER	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
RADIO	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

**ROANOKE CITY (1)**

EISNET	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
RECORDER	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
RADIO	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

**RUSSELL COUNTY (1)**

EISNET	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Mapping	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
RECORDER	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
RADIO	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

**WASHINGTON COUNTY (1)**

EISNET	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Mapping	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
RECORDER	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
RADIO	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
---	---	---	--------------	---	---

**YORK COUNTY (1)**

EISNET	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
RECORDER	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
RADIO	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**2011 NEW STATE HOUSE DISTRICT**

9 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Not Interested	Somewhat Interested	Neutral	Interested	Very Interested
--	----------------	---------------------	---------	------------	-----------------

**13 (1)**

EISNET	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
RECORDER	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
RADIO	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

**19.0 (1)**

EISNET	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Mapping	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
RECORDER	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
RADIO	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

**4 (1)**

EISNET	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Mapping	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

RECORDER	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
RADIO	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
<b>49 (1)</b>					
EISNET	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Call Handling Equipment / Service	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
RECORDER	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
RADIO	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
<b>5 (1)</b>					
EISNET	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Mapping	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
RECORDER	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
RADIO	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
<b>7 (1)</b>					
EISNET	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Mapping	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
RECORDER	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
RADIO	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
<b>8 (1)</b>					
EISNET	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

RECORDER	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
RADIO	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

**9 (1)**

EISNET	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
RECORDER	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
RADIO	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

**93.0 (1)**

EISNET	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
RECORDER	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
RADIO	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**2011 NEW STATE SENATE DISTRICT**

9 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Not Interested	Somewhat Interested	Neutral	Interested	Very Interested
--	----------------	---------------------	---------	------------	-----------------

**13 (1)**

EISNET	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
RECORDER	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
RADIO	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

**15 (1)**

EISNET	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Call Handling Equipment / Service	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Mapping	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
RECORDER	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
RADIO	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

**19 (1)**

EISNET	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Mapping	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
RECORDER	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
RADIO	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

**21 (1)**

EISNET	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
RECORDER	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
RADIO	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

**25 (1)**

EISNET	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Mapping	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
RECORDER	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
RADIO	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

**26 (1)**

EISNET	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
RECORDER	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
RADIO	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

**3 (1)**

EISNET	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Mapping	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
RECORDER	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
RADIO	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-











**38 (1)**

EISNET	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Mapping	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
RECORDER	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
RADIO	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

**40 (1)**

EISNET	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Call Handling Equipment / Service	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Mapping	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
RECORDER	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
RADIO	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, how interested would you be willing to participate in a physical or technological consolidation?	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

**Please describe any consolidation opportunities or experiences relevant to your PSAP and include both the incentives for and challenges to success?**

-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
N/A
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
We proposed consolidating with Manassas Park, but that initiative didn't work out. It may have save both communities in salaries and benefits with fewer positions. Manassas Park had their own plan.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
We are a member of an authority with the County and another town as well as a major university and the question of appropriate funding methods has always been a concern. We get cost savings with the authority but the costs seem to continually go up with technological advances - which are beneficial, but often costly.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
We are already a consolidated PSAP covering 3 localities. I cannot see how a further consolidation would benefit our citizens.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
We are currently researching a potential shared CHE project with two of our neighboring jurisdictions. We have found the grant funds would cover the cost of the CHE equipment and some of the maintenance on the entire shared system. However, the connectivity costs between the three localities is making the overall 5 year cost of the project above what it would cost each locality to stay on their own and purchase their own individual CHE. Network connectivity is too expensive for these shared projects.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
January 25, 2019 the Farmville PSAP began dispatching for the Longwood University PD. Collectively this has been beneficial to our community. We have noticed that the duration from call received to call dispatched has significantly improved, improving response times for the Officer. Some challenges were learning Longwood applications such as monitoring door and fire alarms. Also, learning the terminology that is used by the University (Title IV, etc.). Because Longwood was already in our PSAP boundary, mapping was never and issue nor was radio communications.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
Currently our PSAP only supports one locality. If consolation was possible with our county, cost to run and equipment cost to both municipality's would significantly be reduced. The challenge for this would be the initial cost, for a location that could combined the two PSAP. There would be a significant cost to combine a new CAD system to allow both localities to work off of.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
We consolidated with the Town of Vinton in 2010. There was a survey conducted with Roanoke County and Roanoke City in 2012 to consider consolidation, it revealed there would be no suitable back up center if the two localities joined.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
County/City or regional PSAP
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
Regional PSAP's for high population areas (i.e. Northern Virginia & Hampton Roads) providing operational and grant cost-savings.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
We are currently working with a neighbor to upgrade our radio system. The incentives are redundancy and costs savings and the challenges are the logistics of controlling and maintaining that system with two local governments involved. I believe it can be done but I think it will come down to localities knowing that they can control maintenance and have the ability to get back in service when things bring down.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
n/a
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
While we have not experienced consolidation opportunities or experiences we have experienced shared services. We shared CAD/RMS services with 3 other PSAP's which greatly enhanced our ability to track offenders and cases.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
Consolidation with adjoining like-size counties that are combined with incentives might be enticing.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
We have not participated in any recent consolidated projects, however, we did have a grant project where we signed an MOU with Orange County to be our designated backup center. This process was overwhelming because of the multiple parties involved and all of the paperwork we had to complete. At the time, we had limited knowledge of the grant process and no one to help navigate us through it. The grant process is cumbersome and often the recurring expense is too much which is a deterrent to localities. I recommend offering agencies the incentive of absorbing all or a moderate percentage of the recurring costs for the life of the project. I feel if the financial burden is eliminated or minimized, PSAPs will be more likely to participate, especially smaller agencies that have limited budgets.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
N/A
- Anonymous user's Opinion**





Challenges may include political challenges instead of the logistical challenges. We are sized with the capacity to be a regional hub.



**Anonymous user's Opinion**

We have reviewed the option of consolidating with another PSAP, however it resulted in a 911 Center to large to ensure an adequate back up site was available in the region.



**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Culpeper County Public Safety Radio System is a shared system with Fauquier & Rappahannock County. Currently upgrading the Public Safety Radio System with a shared solution with Fauquier-Culpeper-Rappahannock. In the future would like to see a shared solution for CAD to CAD interface with Fauquier & Culpeper. We are currently the back up PSAP for both agencies



**Anonymous user's Opinion**

One of the biggest challenge we faced when we tried to consolidate, local officials failed to agree on location of PSAP, deployment of resources, and building cost.



**Anonymous user's Opinion**

None noted. Hanover County serves as the primary PSAP/9-1-1 center along with radio system services to the Town of Ashland. Hanover County provides shared radio system services to King William County and tower space on 2 towers to Caroline County for their LMR Public Safety Radio system and shares microwave system backhaul.



**Anonymous user's Opinion**

None noted. Hanover County serves as the primary PSAP/9-1-1 center along with radio system services to the Town of Ashland. Hanover County provides shared radio system services to King William County and tower space on 2 towers to Caroline County for their LMR Public Safety Radio system and shares microwave system backhaul.



**Anonymous user's Opinion**

We are in the process of completing a joint CPE project with an adjoining county. The state has provided additional grant money for a joint system. The procurement process has been the most problematic thus far. The benefits far outweigh the negatives of using joint systems.



**Anonymous user's Opinion**

We are a consolidated center and have considered additional consolidation where there are shared services and cost savings.





















**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Our agency has had multiple experiences related to physical consolidation and shared technology. Currently, our Regional PSAP is physically consolidated with three localities. Our PSAP has multiple shared technologies and virtual technologies with neighboring PSAP's. Our PSAP shares CHE, logging recorder, CAD to CAD and radio consoles with one neighboring PSAP. We also share radio consoles and logging recorder with a separate neighboring PSAP. Incentives for physical consolidation are: minimal 9-1-1 and non-emergency transfer to/from localities, callers receive the law enforcement, fire and/or EMS responses needed and any necessary EMD instructions as a result of a single interview by the PSAP call taker. Additionally, there is ability to better coordinate multi-jurisdictional responses and manage regional resources. There is potential for cost efficiencies when purchasing technology for one PSAP rather than multiple. The value of having PSAP staff in the same room means time is saved and safety is increased. Challenges to success: perceived loss of operational control, political disagreements, and incorrect information.

## Do you have other cost saving ideas?

---

-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
No
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
N/A
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
I think the idea of a standard state-wide system is worth considering as it would increase the purchasing power if done at a state level.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
Re-direct funding that is being provided to the state police for radio services back to local PSAPs as it was intended.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
Since AT&T is providing the ESINet where redundant connections are going to each PSAP, discuss with AT&T their ability to allow the ESINet to be used for shared CHE projects, and similar projects. We have met with AT&T on our potential shared CHE project and they have informed us they are discussing this potential to use the ESINet for shared CHE projects and are supposed to be providing us costs to use the ESINet for this. We have been waiting for 8 weeks now for a response.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
Continue offering grant opportunities to assist with PSAP growth and education. Investing in the Telecommunicators that operate the equipment is priority. If we work on ways to offer incentives that improve retention of the employee cost savings will occur.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
More state contracts for equipment
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
As wireless dependency increases the revenue from wireline has decreased, the revenue from wireline should equate to wireless services as additional revenue.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
The ESINET will have a significant increase from what most localities are paying for 911 connectivity today. I believe the only way to offset this is to raise the 911 surcharge. This has not moved a great deal over the years and with NG coming into the picture I think that charge has to move with it.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
not at this time
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
It has always been our PSAP Managers opinion to have the towns within a county dispatch environment contribute to the PSAP's costs. Rather than have or require 911 fee for services have the local towns and police departments join in providing funding to the county dispatch.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
If everyone used state bid recorders, ENS, etc.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
No, not at this time.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
None at this moment.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
Hard to identify cost saving ideas until the system is up and running.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
Not at this time
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
None noted
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**  
None noted



**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Cloud based CAD and other solutions.



**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Not at this time



**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Localities to receive more revenue to offset the cost of new technology and maintenance fees. The future of 9-1-1 is technological, this is seen with NG9-1-1. These costs are expensive with the purchase of new technologies and the upkeep/maintenance to keep the systems current. Technology is changing everyday and it is becoming a burden on localities to keep up with the trends. By increasing 9-1-1 revenue and the way it is funded can help offset those burdens.



# **Sustainable Funding Committee Meeting**

## **December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2019 2:00PM**

### **Committee Members in Attendance**

Jolena Young      Eddie Reyes      Joe Lerch      Sheriff Heiatt  
J.R. Powell      Terry Hall      Christian Collier

### **Staff in Attendance**

Dorothy Spears-Dean      Steve Marzolf      Lewis Cassada

#### **1) Call Meeting to Order**

The meeting of the Sustainable Funding Committee was called to order by Ms. Young at 2:00PM.

#### **2) Approval of the September 10<sup>th</sup> Minutes**

Ms. Young called for a motion to approve the minutes from the September 10<sup>th</sup> meeting. Mr. Reyes made the motion, and it was seconded by Mr. Powell. The motion passed without opposition.

#### **3) Local Government Survey Results**

Ms. Spears-Dean updated the Committee on the results of the local government survey. There were 44 anonymous submissions. The results analyzed came from the "All Results" category. It would be difficult to attribute responses to any locality or region. Ms. Spears-Dean presented the results of the survey regarding 9-1-1 Revenue, Wireless E9-1-1 Fund Distribution, Grant Funding for 9-1-1 Systems, PSAP Operations Funding, Maintenance, ECaTS, and Statewide Funded Solutions.

#### **4) Next Steps**

Ms. Spears-Dean discussed three options that the Committee has considered. 1) Increasing the surcharge, 2) Wait until FY22 and monitor, 3) Remove the pre-paid wireless exemption. Mr. Lerch said that the VACO

legislative package recommended modernizing the CSUT. Mr. Hall stated that VML is monitoring the situation. Ms. Young discussed the results of the survey and future challenges in 9-1-1, and recommended increasing revenue to the localities. Mr. Hall discussed the knowns and unknowns of NG9-1-1 deployment. Ms. Spears-Dean commented on the Committee's assignment of exploring ways to mitigate the effect of rising recurring costs. There was committee discussion. Staff will prepare a recommendation report sometime in mid-January for the Committee to review. The recommendations would be presented at the March Board meeting. The consensus of the Committee was to recommend the increase of the wireless surcharge and removal of the pre-paid surcharge exemption, and for the Board to engage VML/VACO to evaluate the decision. Mr. Marzolf cautioned that a request for additional funding would require specific reasons for the increase.

#### **5) Conclusion**

Ms. Spears-Dean asked if there were any other items for discussion. Ms. Young mentioned the overall State budget surplus, and asked if the funds allocated for Sheriffs Dispatchers and to the State Police could be taken out of the General fund instead of the 9-1-1 fund. Ms. Spears-Dean asked for any additional comments. There were none. The meeting of the Sustainable funding committee ended at 3:00PM.