August 1, 2014

Sue Cichos
Legislative Research Council
Capitol Building, 3rd Floor
500 East Capitol Avenue
Pierre, SD 57501

Dear Director Cichos,

I am submitting for your review the 2014 Annual Report of the South Dakota 9-1-1 Coordination Board. This report is submitted under SDCL 34-45-20 and it summarizes the operations and findings of the board during state fiscal year 2014.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions you may have regarding the Board’s activities over the past year.

Respectfully yours,

Shawnie Rechtenbaugh
State 9-1-1 Coordinator

Enclosure

cc: Secretary Trevor Jones, DPS
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SUMMARY OF BOARD ACTIVITIES

The State 9-1-1 Coordination Board (board) met eight times during state fiscal year 2014 (July 18, 2013, August 13, 2013, October 24, 2013, December 12, 2013, January 2, 2014, February 6, 2014, and June 26, 2014) to continue work on its’ legislative mandate. Three of the 11 board members’ three-year-terms expired on June 30, 2014: Dennis Falken-SD Association of County Commissioners, Marlene Haines-SD Chapter APCO, and Steve Harding-SD Municipal League. All were interested in serving another term and were reappointed by Governor Daugaard. One other member retired during this fiscal year leaving an opening on the board for a service provider. At the time of this report that appointment had not yet been made.

The annual meeting of the board is held in October each year. At the October 2013 meeting Ted Rufledt, Jr. was re-elected to a sixth term as board chair. Kelly Serr was elected Vice Chair replacing Marlene Haines who served five terms but indicated a desire for someone else to serve in that role.
The primary focus of the board this past year has been the Next Generation 9-1-1 project (NG9-1-1). The board continued its work with consultant, L.R. Kimball and was able to release two requests for proposals (RFPs) for the NG9-1-1 system. The board is currently in contract negotiations with two vendors and expects to have contracts in place by the end of August 2014. See section 34-45-20 for more details about the NG9-1-1 project.
REVIEW OF ACTIONS REQUIRED BY STATUTE

SDCL 34-45-8.4
Distribution of Surcharge Revenue

On July 1, 2012, SB174 took effect centralizing the collection of 9-1-1 surcharge at the Department of Revenue (DOR). After the $1.25 surcharge is collected, the surcharge is transferred to the Department of Public Safety (DPS) which disburses 70 percent of the revenue to the public agency which has adopted an ordinance authorizing a 9-1-1 emergency reporting system (back to the county/municipality where the funds were collected). Surcharge is currently disbursed to 63 of the 66 counties in the state. Dewey, Shannon and Ziebach do not receive a disbursement because no surcharge is remitted from those counties (Exhibit A – Surcharge Collections Report). The remaining 30 percent of the $1.25 surcharge is deposited in the public safety 9-1-1 emergency fund. Disbursement of these funds is explained in the next section.

SB174 also established a 2 percent surcharge on the sale of prepaid wireless service collected at the retail point of sale. This surcharge is remitted to DOR by the retailers and then transferred to DPS. All proceeds are kept in the 9-1-1 Coordination Fund and used by the board for the NG9-1-1 project, annual expenses of the board, and other costs as approved by the board (See Figure 1 – 9-1-1 Surcharge Flowchart, next page).
9-1-1 Surcharge Flowchart

**providers remit surcharges to dor**

**dor transfers revenues to dps**

- 70% of revenue goes back to the county
- 30% of revenue goes to public safety 911 emergency fund
- 26% of 30% goes to qualifying psaps*
- 74% of 30% goes to the state 911 coordination fund

*PSAP serves a population of more than 30,000 or covers an area of three or more counties and is in compliance with Administrative Rules (ARSD 50:02:04).

Figure 1.
SDCL 34-45-8.5
Public Safety 9-1-1 Emergency Fund

As mentioned earlier in this report, 30 percent of the $1.25 surcharge collected is deposited into the public safety 9-1-1 emergency fund. The funds are then continuously appropriated for distribution with 26 percent distributed to eligible Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) and 74 percent deposited in the 9-1-1 Coordination Fund.

The 26 percent share generated $958,489 for eligible PSAPs in FY14. Eligible PSAPs must serve a minimum of three counties or a population of at least 30,000 and undergo an on-site review to determine if they are compliant with the 9-1-1 Administrative Rules (ARSD 50:02:04 inclusive). In FY14 there were 11 PSAPs eligible to receive a distribution from the fund, commonly referred to as incentive funds. The 11 eligible PSAPs are located in Aberdeen, Brookings, Canton, Huron, Mitchell, Mobridge, Pierre, Rapid City, Sioux Falls, Watertown, and Winner.

Collectively, these 11 PSAPs serve 40 of the 66 counties in South Dakota. The Incentive Fund Distribution Reports can be found at


The 74 percent share generated $2.7 million deposited in the 9-1-1 Coordination Fund and earmarked for the NG9-1-1 Project. During FY14 the
board expended $286,901 for services provided by NG9-1-1 consultant L.R. Kimball.

**SDCL 34-45-12
9-1-1 Coordination Fund**

All funds collected from the 2 percent surcharge on prepaid wireless service as well as the share of funds from the $1.25 surcharge are deposited in the 9-1-1 Coordination Fund and continuously appropriated for allowable recurring and non-recurring 9-1-1 costs. In addition to existing annual recurring costs such as board operational expenses and State 9-1-1 Coordinator wages and expenses, the board authorized a contract with L.R. Kimball for NG9-1-1 consulting services. Total expenditures in FY14 were $394,738 with an ending fund balance of $6.49 million, which is a growth in the fund balance of $3.26 million in FY14 (Exhibit B – 9-1-1 Coordination Fund Condition Statement).

It has been two years since the new surcharge collection and disbursement model was put in place. Using FY13 and FY14 data for projection, we expect the annual revenue to the 9-1-1 Coordination Fund to be $3.66 million per year through the end of FY2018. Per SDCL 34-45-4, the $1.25 surcharge will be reduced to $1.00/line on July 1, 2018. The board is monitoring surcharge revenue closely and has estimated the initial five-year cost of the NG9-1-1 system to be $18.8 million. Using these figures the board projects a positive balance in the 9-1-1 Coordination Fund through FY2018. However, if the surcharge is reduced to $1.00/line the board projects the 9-1-1
Coordination Fund will have a negative balance starting in FY2020. The board will look for possible solutions to the eventual shortfall. One solution is to maintain the surcharge at $1.25/line level, although many options still need to be vetted.

**SDCL 34-45-18.2**

**Promulgation of Rules**

During FY14 seven rules were amended (§§50:02:04:01, 50:02:04:02, 50:02:04:03, 50:02:04:05, 50:02:04:06, 50:02:04:07, and 50:02:04:09) relating to 9-1-1. The effect of the rules was to define “County 911 Coordinator”, to conform to legislative changes, to make the rules uniform in regard to required procedures, to remove outdated references, to correct a statutory reference, to clarify financial and accounting standards requirements, and to define allowable personnel costs for County 9-1-1 Coordinators and other 9-1-1 or PSAP employees.

**SDCL 34-45-20(1)**

**Evaluate PSAPs**

On behalf of the board, the State 9-1-1 Coordinator conducts on-site compliance reviews with the PSAPs to document their level of compliance with
administrative rule. Those PSAPs eligible for the incentive funds mentioned in section 34-45-8.5 of this report are reviewed on an annual basis. The remaining PSAPs are visited as time allows. There are six PSAPs that have not yet been visited. Those PSAPs along with the 11 incentive PSAPs will be reviewed in FY15. The compliance review is conducted on-site at the PSAP location using a check-list of the minimum standards for operating and financing a PSAP as outlined in ARSD 50:02:04 inclusive. The compliance review data from the 23 PSAPs visited to date has been compiled and reflected in the tables below.

Figure 2 (below) shows 12 PSAPs were found to be compliant with administrative rules, 11 PSAPs were found to be non-compliant with one or more rules, and six PSAPs have not yet been reviewed.

* PSAPs not reviewed: Bon Homme, Charles Mix, Clay, Deuel, Union, Yankton
** Non-compliant PSAPs: Butte, Custer, Fall River, Lake, Marshall, Meade, Miner, Moody, Roberts, Spearfish, Spink
*** Compliant PSAPs: Brookings, Brown, Central SD Comm (Pierre), Huron, Lawrence (Deadwood), Lincoln, Metro (Sioux Falls), Mitchell, North Central Regional 911 (Mobridge), Pennington, Watertown, Winner
The 11 non-compliant PSAPs were found to have varying degrees of non-compliance. Eight PSAPs were lacking the requirement: *Written procedure for handling calls and dispatching responders from a separate, independent location other than the main PSAP within 60 minutes of an event that renders the main PSAP inoperative.* The second most common area of non-compliance was identified at six PSAPs: *Have established standardized call taking guidelines for fire and law enforcement calls and a policy requiring the use of the guidelines.* Figure 3 (below) shows the percent of administrative rules each PSAP was not compliant with.

![PSAP Level of Non-Compliance with ARSD 50:02:04](image)

Figure 3.

The PSAPs found to be least compliant with administrative rule were Roberts County, Moody County and Miner County. Roberts County was non-compliant with 33 percent (28 out of 84 items) of the required administrative rules, Moody County was non-compliant with 20 percent (17 out of 84 items) and
Miner County was non-compliant with 17 percent (14 out of 84 items). A written report documenting the findings was provided to each agency with an offer of additional technical assistance.

It should be noted that while the board was given rule-making authority by the legislature, the board has no authority to enforce the rules. This has generated considerable discussion by the board regarding how to handle counties or PSAPs that are non-compliant and remain non-compliant. The board will continue its educational approach to non-compliance.

**SDCL 34-45-20(2)**
**Develop Uniform Statewide 9-1-1 Plan**

In August of 2013 the board finalized and approved the Statewide 9-1-1 Master Plan. A copy of the Master Plan can be found on the 9-1-1 webpage at [http://dps.sd.gov/documents/RPT130815skwSD911_MasterPlan.pdf](http://dps.sd.gov/documents/RPT130815skwSD911_MasterPlan.pdf). The completed plan serves as a roadmap for future 9-1-1 services and transition to a statewide NG9-1-1 system.

Following approval of the Master Plan, two subcommittees, the GIS (Geographic Information System) sub-committee and the ESInet (Emergency Services Internet Protocol Network) sub-committee, were formed to begin writing two RFPs. RFP #2228 Emergency Services IP Network, Call Handling System and Managed Services was completed and released on January 3, 2014, along
with RFP #2229 Statewide Geographic Information System Data and Managed Services. Response to both RFPs was required on or before March 21, 2014. Six responses to the ESInet RFP and ten to the GIS RFP were received. The sub-committees began in-depth reviews of the responses. The ESInet sub-committee met in Pierre March 31-April 2, 2014, to deliberate and select the top three respondents to move forward to the interview phase. The GIS sub-committee met in Pierre April 3-4, 2014, and selected their top four respondents. In late April, each sub-committee heard oral presentations and conducted interviews with the top responders. After reference checks and additional follow-up questions with the vendors, each sub-committee selected their top vendor and presented this recommendation to the Board. At the July 3, 2014, board meeting the board accepted the recommendations and the sub-committees began contract negotiations with the two vendors. Because contracts are not yet in place, the names of the vendors cannot yet be reported. Figures 4 and 5 on the next two pages highlight the significant milestones of the NG9-1-1 project to date and the noteworthy steps of the next two years.

January 2014  Two RFPs for the NG911 system were approved and published.

March 31-April 2  ESInet RFP review committee met in Pierre to discuss the responses. They selected the top 3 vendors for oral interviews and presentations.

April 22-25th  Oral presentations/interviews conducted in Pierre with top 4 GIS and top 3 EISnet responders.

June 2014  Review committees finalized their recommendations and presented to the board at the June 26th board meeting.


August 2013  9-1-1 Master Plan approved by the 9-1-1 Coordination Board. Begin drafting two NG9-1-1 RFPs.

March 2014  Received 6 responses to the ESInet RFP and 10 to the GIS RFP. Review committee began their reviewing the responses.

April 3-4th  GIS RFP review committee met in Pierre to discuss the responses. They selected the top 4 vendors for oral interviews and presentations.

May 2014  Conducted reference checks on top vendors, request additional follow-up information from the vendors, conference calls with review committees to finalize recommendations to board.

July 3  Board approved recommendations from review committees and started contract negotiations with the selected vendors.
Future Milestones | Next Generation 9-1-1 Project

**August 2014**
Sign contracts with selected GIS vendor and ESInet vendor.

**September 2014**
GIS vendor starts data collection from local entities.

- **12 months**
  All carriers migrated to new NG system. New ESInet installed, tested and PSAP migration from the legacy system taking place.

- **24 months**
  Remaining 14 PSAPs cutover to the new system and 9-1-1 equipment.

- **September 2014**
  Sign contract with consultant for project management services to oversee deployment and implementation.

- **December 2014**
  All 29 PSAPs pre-deployment evaluations/reviews have been completed. First PSAP migrates to the CPE.

- **18 months**
  15 PSAPs cutover to new network and new 9-1-1 equipment operational.

- **30 months**
  System transition complete. All systems functionality complete. Project implementation Complete.

**Aug 2014**
**Sept 2014**
**Sept 2014**
**Dec 2014**
**July 2015**
**Dec 2015**
**July 2016**
**Dec 2016**
South Dakota contains 33 PSAPs including four on Indian Reservations that provide 9-1-1 service to the citizens of the state. The 29 local PSAPs consist of 10 city, 18 county and one independent.

The board collects annual financial information related to 9-1-1 from local governments and the PSAPs to ensure accurate data can be provided to the Governor and Legislature (Exhibit C - City/County Annual 9-1-1 Financial Report). The counties and PSAPs report their financial data based on the calendar year (their fiscal year). The 2013 annual report process was recently completed. A total of 73 reports were received from 28 PSAPs and 45 counties. The four tribally run PSAPs were invited to submit an annual report but none were received. The only other entity that did not submit a report was Roberts County therefore their data is absent from Exhibit C.

Statewide 9-1-1 surcharge distributed to counties and PSAPs in calendar year 2013 was $9.7 million. 9-1-1 expenditures reported was $22.1 million. Based on these numbers, 43 percent of total statewide 9-1-1 costs are funded by the 9-1-1 surcharge.

The PSAPs reported a total of 311 full and part time employees working during calendar year 2013. The total number of 9-1-1 calls answered across the state in 2013 was nearly 297,000.
The PSAPs reported their total calls answered (both 9-1-1 and non-emergency calls combined) were nearly 1.5 million.

Compliance with financial 9-1-1 administrative rules has improved among the counties and PSAPs this year compared to last year. One county, compared to 23 counties or PSAPs last year, was identified as having used 9-1-1 funds for a non-allowable expense. The county paid some non-allowable employee wages for a portion of the year. Once the issue was brought to their attention they changed their process, which corrected the issue for the remainder of the year. Other areas of non-compliance last year were street name signs or non-allowable communication equipment. Each of the respective counties or PSAPs were notified of the error last year and for 2013 no further non-compliance issues were noted in those areas. It appears the educational approach the board has taken with the counties and PSAPs in the Annual Financial Report process has increased compliance each year.

Last year we reported the board, in cooperation with Department of Legislative Audit, identified significant non-compliance issues involving Yankton County in their budget years 2010, 2011, and 2012. It included two major non-compliant expenditures for the purchase and annual maintenance costs for new public safety software package, and payment of all responder radio narrow banding costs with 9-1-1 surcharge funds. The board contacted the county and requested a response outlining how Yankton County would correct the problems and prevent them in the future. To date, Yankton County has not responded to the board.
In the past two years, several counties were identified each year as having paid County 9-1-1 Coordinator wages that were not allowable. The original rule (ARSD 50:02:02:09) stated an employee had to spend at least 50 percent of their time on 9-1-1 duties in order for any portion of their salary to be paid from the 9-1-1 fund. Several counties reported their county 9-1-1 coordinator duties make up less than one-third of the employees total workload and therefore would never be an allowable 9-1-1 expense. The board realized the hardship this created for some counties and agreed the amount of salary paid from the 9-1-1 fund should be equivalent to the percent of time spent carrying out county 9-1-1 coordinator duties. So a county coordinator spending 15 percent of their time on 9-1-1 could have 15 percent of their wage paid from the 9-1-1 fund. This greatly improved compliance with the allowable wages section of the Annual Report.

Respectfully submitted:

________________________________
Ted Rufflet, Jr. – Chairperson
9-1-1 Coordination Board
July 31, 2014

________________________________
Trevor Jones – Secretary
Department of Public Safety
July 31, 2014
## 911 Uniform Surcharge & 911 Prepaid Wireless Surcharge
### FY2014 Dept of Revenue Collections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telecom Lines</td>
<td>292,779</td>
<td>292,624</td>
<td>291,907</td>
<td>305,303</td>
<td>273,142</td>
<td>287,815</td>
<td>268,041</td>
<td>287,573</td>
<td>268,041</td>
<td>269,416</td>
<td>280,695</td>
<td>279,204</td>
<td>1,029,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless Lines</td>
<td>555,766</td>
<td>554,986</td>
<td>556,114</td>
<td>543,986</td>
<td>543,063</td>
<td>550,792</td>
<td>545,062</td>
<td>551,071</td>
<td>543,921</td>
<td>537,810</td>
<td>541,218</td>
<td>544,261</td>
<td>2,501,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOIP Lines</td>
<td>2,138</td>
<td>2,128</td>
<td>2,139</td>
<td>2,149</td>
<td>2,428</td>
<td>2,330</td>
<td>10,205</td>
<td>3,211</td>
<td>2,921</td>
<td>2,965</td>
<td>3,427</td>
<td>4,347</td>
<td>37,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lines</td>
<td>845,883</td>
<td>844,946</td>
<td>848,245</td>
<td>845,995</td>
<td>850,219</td>
<td>847,926</td>
<td>814,758</td>
<td>821,500</td>
<td>823,449</td>
<td>826,281</td>
<td>820,034</td>
<td>822,856</td>
<td>3,708,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total 911 Emergency Surcharge ($1.25/line) | 10,692,088.75 | 1,057,353.75 | 1,061,161.25 | 1,062,761.25 | 1,066,312.50 | 1,023,918.75 | 1,051,421.25 | 1,052,285.00 | 1,064,818.75 | 1,018,447.50 | 1,026,875.00 | 1,029,311.25 | 12,547,517.50 |
| Less: Allowance       | 221,189.10 | 21,917.14 | 21,971.71  | 21,955.13  | 21,906.38  | 21,118.45  | 21,621.32  | 21,525.17  | 22,048.47  | 21,034.57  | 21,253.94  | 21,347.71  | 259,190.52  |
| Net Surcharge Collected | 10,470,899.65 | 1,035,436.61 | 1,039,189.54 | 1,040,806.12 | 1,044,406.12 | 1,042,295.05 | 1,030,717.53 | 1,030,759.83 | 1,032,769.28 | 1,032,823.93 | 1,031,621.06 | 1,031,963.54 | 1,2,288,326.98 |

| Amount of Surcharge Distributed to counties (70%) | 7,329,630.18 | 719,505.05 | 727,432.60 | 729,904.34 | 719,966.28 | 711,980.61 | 732,620.74 | 729,939.40 | 709,189.98 | 705,686.31 | 703,903.75 | 705,574.51 | 730,925.63 | 8,601,829.88 |
| Public Safety Emergency 911 Fund (30%) | 3,141,269.47 | 310,065.35 | 317,756.98 | 319,214.78 | 319,321.79 | 318,949.96 | 311,286.29 | 309,766.58 | 705,230.85 | 701,696.31 | 703,383.73 | 705,424.73 | 7,696,697.19 |

### 26% = Incentive Funds to Eligible PSAPS

- 816,730.03  
- 80,764.04  
- 81,056.78  
- 81,182.86  
- 81,462.87  
- 78,218.41  
- 80,324.38  
- 80,169.17  
- 81,336.02  
- 77,798.20  
- 79,438.44  
- 78,621.15  
- 78,989.10  

### 74% = 911 Coordination Fund for Next Gen911

- 2,324,539.43  
- 229,866.91  
- 230,750.07  
- 231,056.82  
- 231,858.18  
- 229,965.54  
- 229,806.92  
- 221,484.06  
- 217,425.65  
- 223,247.87  
- 225,787.06  
- 224,531.99  
- 2,769,587.88 |

### PrePaid Wireless Surcharge (2%) | 684,651.60  
- 70,387.69  
- 71,628.30  
- 78,028.04  
- 73,315.87  
- 70,017.17  
- 77,603.31  
- 83,484.67  
- 70,784.96  
- 88,132.82  
- 85,203.82  
- 100,323.09  
- 947,496.33  |

## Exhibit A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL RECEIPTS</td>
<td>$138,755</td>
<td>$252,314</td>
<td>$238,372</td>
<td>$189,724</td>
<td>$2,882,527</td>
<td>$3,660,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS</td>
<td>$28,239</td>
<td>$85,019</td>
<td>$67,717</td>
<td>$80,972</td>
<td>$213,757</td>
<td>$394,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET (Receipts less Disbursements)</td>
<td>$110,516</td>
<td>$167,295</td>
<td>$170,655</td>
<td>$108,752</td>
<td>$2,668,770</td>
<td>$3,265,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEGINNING CASH BALANCE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$110,516</td>
<td>$277,811</td>
<td>$448,466</td>
<td>$557,218</td>
<td>$3,225,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDING CASH BALANCE</td>
<td>$110,516</td>
<td>$277,811</td>
<td>$448,466</td>
<td>$557,218</td>
<td>$3,225,988</td>
<td>$6,491,547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## City/County Annual 911 Financial Report

### Calendar Year 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County or PSAP Name</th>
<th>Report Received</th>
<th>PSAP Contract Revenue</th>
<th>Total Expenditures</th>
<th>Fund Balance - Ending</th>
<th>$ paid to PSAP for 911 services</th>
<th># of 911 Calls</th>
<th>Total Calls</th>
<th># of Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bon Homme County 911</td>
<td>3/14/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$39,919.05</td>
<td>$246,358.76</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>20,600</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookings Police Department</td>
<td>3/28/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$581,088.13</td>
<td>$159,405.41</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>8,069</td>
<td>60,473</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown County Communications</td>
<td>4/8/2014</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td>$928,645.23</td>
<td>$462,400.00</td>
<td>$9,376.63</td>
<td>9,545</td>
<td>68,274</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte County Dispatch Center</td>
<td>5/27/2014</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>$16,864.30</td>
<td>$200,531.34</td>
<td>$24,438.40</td>
<td>2,808</td>
<td>47,992</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central South Dakota Communications</td>
<td>4/1/2014</td>
<td>$129,018.04</td>
<td>$567,248.56</td>
<td>$330,101.86</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>16,608</td>
<td>54,780</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Mix County 911</td>
<td>3/24/2014</td>
<td>$50,300.00</td>
<td>$293,766.08</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$16,845.25</td>
<td>5,086</td>
<td>41,405</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay County Emergency Services Communication Center</td>
<td>2/18/2014</td>
<td>$287,337.45</td>
<td>$555,674.90</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$5,863</td>
<td>22,363</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custer County Communications Center</td>
<td>3/27/2014</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$343,032.61</td>
<td>$122,367.40</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>3,942</td>
<td>43,969</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuel County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>3/14/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$180,580.43</td>
<td>$281,077.78</td>
<td>$4,414.00</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>23,066</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall River County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>4/2/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$256,613.57</td>
<td>$135,856.03</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>4,934</td>
<td>13,130</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huron Police Department</td>
<td>4/1/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$483,832.03</td>
<td>$56,100.91</td>
<td>$18,087.34</td>
<td>7,501</td>
<td>19,325</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County 911 Communications</td>
<td>2/18/2014</td>
<td>$68,984.82</td>
<td>$298,835.92</td>
<td>$77,242.05</td>
<td>$2,165.01</td>
<td>2,937</td>
<td>13,073</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Co 911</td>
<td>2/21/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$211,322.02</td>
<td>$406,798.60</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>6,828</td>
<td>60,436</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln County Comm</td>
<td>2/19/2014</td>
<td>$64,689.24</td>
<td>$607,213.00</td>
<td>$94,724.96</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>10,182</td>
<td>10,183</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall County 911</td>
<td>3/17/2014</td>
<td>$14,942.79</td>
<td>$114,537.89</td>
<td>($428,74.77)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>7,993</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meade County Telecom</td>
<td>2/21/2014</td>
<td>$49,152.04</td>
<td>$545,934.38</td>
<td>$9,492.53</td>
<td>$3,300.00</td>
<td>8,646</td>
<td>23,054</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Communications Agency</td>
<td>3/30/2014</td>
<td>$3,276,206.00</td>
<td>$3,362,050.00</td>
<td>$2,109,209.00</td>
<td>$50,124.00</td>
<td>85,090</td>
<td>256,021</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miner County Dispatch</td>
<td>3/27/2014</td>
<td>$68,350.00</td>
<td>$146,330.99</td>
<td>$16,317.22</td>
<td>$258.00</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Police Department</td>
<td>3/31/2014</td>
<td>$172,726.64</td>
<td>$686,232.77</td>
<td>$429,789.55</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>12,674</td>
<td>203,674</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moody County Emergency Management</td>
<td>2/21/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$79,844.05</td>
<td>$41,669.75</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>2,336</td>
<td>3,897</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central Regional 911 Center</td>
<td>3/26/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$314,588.88</td>
<td>($463,37.03)</td>
<td>$173,350.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennington County 911</td>
<td>3/28/2014</td>
<td>$452.13</td>
<td>$2,836,188.01</td>
<td>$637,118.20</td>
<td>$116,883.34</td>
<td>58,245</td>
<td>318,971</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>3/27/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$3,300.00</td>
<td>$114,537.89</td>
<td>$428,74.77</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>7,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearfish Police Department</td>
<td>4/1/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$378,295.23</td>
<td>$371,588.34</td>
<td>$12,402.73</td>
<td>4,420</td>
<td>31,526</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spink County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>3/11/2014</td>
<td>$121,57.58</td>
<td>$177,351.88</td>
<td>$2,363.58</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>2,052</td>
<td>11,965</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>3/6/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$394,350.70</td>
<td>$15,163.96</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>7,436</td>
<td>57,618</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watertown Police Department</td>
<td>3/5/2014</td>
<td>$545,460.26</td>
<td>$749,680.77</td>
<td>$148,350.83</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>10,782</td>
<td>41,172</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winner Police Department</td>
<td>3/27/2014</td>
<td>$330,608.99</td>
<td>$495,751.13</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>10,932</td>
<td>43,536</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yankton Police Department</td>
<td>3/27/2014</td>
<td>$684,457.71</td>
<td>$584,042.05</td>
<td>$4,905.00</td>
<td>$45,603.40</td>
<td>5,137</td>
<td>260,952</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Exhibit C

#### Roberts County Sheriff's Office Did Not Submit

- Spearfish Police Department
- Spink County Sheriff's Office
- Union County Sheriff's Office
- Watertown Police Department
- Winner Police Department
- Yankton Police Department

#### Other Counties

- Aurora County
- Beadle County
- Bennett County
- Brookings County
- Brule County
- Buffalo County
- Campbell County
- Clark County

---

Additional notes or comments can be added here if necessary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Previous Amount</th>
<th>New Amount</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Old Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clay County</td>
<td>2/14/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$272,101.32</td>
<td>$272,101.32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codington County</td>
<td>2/24/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$278,270.94</td>
<td>$277,858.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corson County</td>
<td>2/24/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$578.25</td>
<td>$42,724.57</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davison County</td>
<td>2/18/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$216,269.85</td>
<td>$216,269.85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day County</td>
<td>6/30/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$651,409.90</td>
<td>$397,04.59</td>
<td>$294,364.31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>2/26/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$10,520.10</td>
<td>$10,520.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmunds County</td>
<td>3/4/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$278,270.94</td>
<td>$277,858.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faulk County</td>
<td>2/21/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$34,776.50</td>
<td>$41,423.23</td>
<td>$6,646.73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County</td>
<td>2/27/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$87,114.23</td>
<td>$79,511.99</td>
<td>$7,602.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory County</td>
<td>2/13/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$34,776.50</td>
<td>$41,423.23</td>
<td>$6,646.73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haakon County</td>
<td>3/24/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$88,026.71</td>
<td>$83,339.68</td>
<td>$4,687.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlin County</td>
<td>3/3/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$68,845.53</td>
<td>$51,710.02</td>
<td>$17,135.51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand County</td>
<td>3/14/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$52,120.45</td>
<td>$48,861.37</td>
<td>$3,259.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardin County</td>
<td>2/20/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$30,133.04</td>
<td>$24,149.72</td>
<td>$5,983.32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanson County</td>
<td>2/13/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$16,290.09</td>
<td>$16,290.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes County</td>
<td>3/18/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$220,502.05</td>
<td>$220,502.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchinson County</td>
<td>3/27/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$62,143.90</td>
<td>$60,552.68</td>
<td>$1,591.22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde County</td>
<td>3/25/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$22,582.08</td>
<td>$(2,911.51)</td>
<td>$22,993.59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson County</td>
<td>3/18/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$47,573.74</td>
<td>$29,986.19</td>
<td>$17,587.55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerauld County</td>
<td>2/14/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$25,382.37</td>
<td>$24,149.72</td>
<td>$1,232.65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones County</td>
<td>2/18/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$11,772.08</td>
<td>$9,777.16</td>
<td>$2,004.92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsbury County</td>
<td>3/3/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$77,331.01</td>
<td>$68,720.55</td>
<td>$8,610.56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyman County</td>
<td>2/27/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$61,158.96</td>
<td>$61,158.96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCook County</td>
<td>2/14/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$56,881.85</td>
<td>$33,708.00</td>
<td>$23,173.85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McPherson County</td>
<td>3/17/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$26,812.87</td>
<td>$26,812.87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellette County</td>
<td>3/25/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$22,935.11</td>
<td>$(4,674.03)</td>
<td>$18,261.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnehaha County</td>
<td>3/3/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,110,095.88</td>
<td>$2,110,095.88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins County</td>
<td>3/14/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$32,238.43</td>
<td>$32,238.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter County</td>
<td>2/14/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,904.07</td>
<td>$79,543.85</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanborn County</td>
<td>3/28/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$23,000.00</td>
<td>$23,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley County</td>
<td>2/20/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$27,706.50</td>
<td>$22,717.80</td>
<td>$5,988.70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sully County</td>
<td>3/28/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$41,735.41</td>
<td>$38,020.40</td>
<td>$3,715.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd County</td>
<td>2/19/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$142,512.21</td>
<td>$103,961.22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripp County</td>
<td>2/21/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$105,176.36</td>
<td>$105,176.36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner County</td>
<td>2/21/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$87,193.75</td>
<td>$70,296.36</td>
<td>$7,897.39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walworth County</td>
<td>3/17/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$67,000.00</td>
<td>$67,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yankton County</td>
<td>2/24/2014</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$170,140.20</td>
<td>$155,048.19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotals: 73/74  $5,327,203.69  $22,142,022.36  $9,305,184.01  $5,527,125.81  297,270  1,559,048  325