



**Fourth Annual 988 Fee Accountability Report – National Suicide Hotline Designation Act of 2020**

**Prepared by the:  
Wireline Competition Bureau**

**Submitted to the:  
Senate Committees on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, and Appropriations  
House of Representatives Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Appropriations**

**November 19, 2025**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1  
II. BACKGROUND..... 2  
III. DISCUSSION ..... 8  
    A. Established 988 Fee-Based Funding Mechanisms..... 9  
    B. 988 Fees Imposed During Calendar Year 2024..... 10  
    C. Description of Authority for the Collection of 988 Fees During Calendar Year 2024..... 21  
    D. Description of Authority that Approves and Determines Expenditures and Mandated Uses for 988 Fees for Calendar Year 2024..... 32  
    E. Description of Uses of Collected 988 Fees During Calendar Year 2024..... 52  
    F. Description of the Total Amount of 988 Fees Collected During Calendar Year 2024..... 67  
    G. Use of 988 Fees to Fund Programs Other than 988 Services..... 71  
    H. Indian Tribes and Alaska Natives ..... 93  
IV. CONCLUSION ..... 94

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This report is submitted by the Wireline Competition Bureau (Bureau) of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC or Commission) to Congress pursuant to the National Suicide Hotline Designation Act of 2020 (988 Act).<sup>1</sup> The 988 Suicide & Crisis Lifeline (988 Lifeline or Lifeline) is a national network of more than 200 crisis centers that provide critical life-saving services for people in suicidal, mental health, and substance use crises.<sup>2</sup> This is the fourth annual report on the collection and distribution of fees to implement and support the 988 Lifeline by the states, the District of Columbia, U.S. territories, and Tribal entities, and covers the period of January 1, 2024 to December 31, 2024.<sup>3</sup> Nine states—California, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, Minnesota, Nevada, Oregon, Virginia, and Washington—submitted survey responses to the Bureau indicating that they have implemented a fee-based funding mechanism and collected 988 fees during the period covered by this report.<sup>4</sup> These states, which have increased in number from the five states that implemented and collected a fee during the 2023 reporting period, all reported that they used, or were only allowed to use, collected 988 fees solely for purposes that are reasonably attributable to the permissible uses specified in the 988 Act.<sup>5</sup> The Bureau also received submissions from 12 Tribal authorities and one tribally owned and operated telecommunications company, which is four more submissions than the calendar year 2023 reporting period. None of the Tribal entities have established a 988 fee-based funding mechanism.

<sup>1</sup> National Suicide Hotline Designation Act of 2020, Pub. L. No. 116-172, § 4, 134 Stat. 832, 833 (2020), <https://www.congress.gov/116/plaws/publ172/PLAW-116publ172.pdf> (988 Act). Pursuant to the 988 Act, the Bureau submitted its first annual 988 fee accountability report within two years of the date of enactment of the 988 Act, and will continue to submit reports annually “[t]o ensure efficiency, transparency, and accountability in the collection and expenditure” of any fees or charges to support or implement 988 services. *Id.* This Fourth Annual Report was due to Congress by October 17, 2025. However, due to a partial lapse in federal government funding, the Commission suspended most of its regular operations between October 1, 2025 and November 12, 2025. *See Impact of Potential Lapse in Funding on Commission Operations*, Public Notice, DA 25-922 (rel. Sept. 30, 2025); FCC Plan for Due to Lapse of Congressional Appropriation (rel. Sept. 30, 2025), <https://www.fcc.gov/document/fcc-shutdown-plan-september-2025>. As a result, submission of this annual report was delayed.

<sup>2</sup> 988 Suicide & Crisis Lifeline, *Our Crisis Centers*, <https://988lifeline.org/our-crisis-centers/> (last visited Sept. 11, 2025).

<sup>3</sup> The period of January 1, 2024 to December 31, 2024 is hereinafter referred to as calendar year 2024.

<sup>4</sup> *See infra* Sections III.C, F.

<sup>5</sup> *See* 988 Act § 4(a)(2) (describing permissible uses); *see also infra* Sections III.E, G.

## II. BACKGROUND

2. Individuals throughout the United States continue to face mental health struggles, emotional distress, and substance use crises every day, which has created an urgent need to address the impact of suicide on American communities.<sup>6</sup> The U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention report that over 600,000 Americans sought care from the emergency department related to self-harm injuries in 2022, and in 2023 more than 49,000 individuals died by suicide.<sup>7</sup> The 988 Lifeline, a national network of crisis centers, combines local care and best practices with national resources to provide confidential support for people experiencing emotional, suicidal, and substance use crises 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, through calls, texts, and chat services.<sup>8</sup>

3. To help Americans in crisis, the Commission has taken numerous actions to improve access to the 988 Lifeline’s specially trained counselors and life-saving resources.<sup>9</sup> When Congress enacted the National Suicide Hotline Improvement Act of 2018 (Act), it emboldened the Commission’s efforts to improve access to life-saving mental health resources. The Act tasked the Commission with studying the feasibility of designating a simple, easy-to-remember dialing code for a nationwide suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system.<sup>10</sup> Following the Commission’s efforts, Congress enacted the National Suicide Hotline Designation Act of 2020 (988 Act), amending section 251(e) of the Communications Act of 1934 to designate 988 as the “universal telephone number within the United States for the purpose of the national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system operating through the [Lifeline].”<sup>11</sup> Additionally, the Commission adopted rules designating 988 as the new Lifeline number requiring wireless service providers and covered text providers to route 988 calls and covered text messages to the 988 Lifeline’s toll free access number by July 16, 2022.<sup>12</sup> Since July 2022, the 988 Lifeline has received over 12 million calls, over 3 million text messages, and approximately 2.6

---

<sup>6</sup> Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Suicide Data and Statistics*, <https://www.cdc.gov/suicide/facts/data.html> (March 26, 2025).

<sup>7</sup> Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Suicide and Self-Harm Injury*, <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/fastats/suicide.htm> (last visited Sept. 11, 2025).

<sup>8</sup> 988 Lifeline crisis centers are supported by local and state resources as well as the Department of Health and Human Services’ Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). The 988 Lifeline also offers specialized services for veterans and Spanish speakers. Veterans, service members, and their families may connect to the Veterans Crisis Line operated by the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) by pressing “1” after calling the 988 Lifeline, texting the short code 838255, or visiting the online chat portal available at [www.veteranscrisisline.net](http://www.veteranscrisisline.net). Help-seekers may reach a Spanish language line by pressing “2” after calling the 988 Lifeline or texting “Ayuda” to 988. As of July 17, 2025, the 988 Lifeline “no longer silo[s] LGB+ youth services, also known as the ‘Press 3 Option’” when dialing 988 or texting “PRIDE” to 988. SAMHSA, SAMHSA Statement on 988 Press 3 Option, <https://www.samhsa.gov/about/news-announcements/statements/2025/samhsa-statement-988-press-3-option> (June 17, 2025).

<sup>9</sup> See, e.g., *Implementation of the National Suicide Hotline Improvement Act of 2018*, WC Docket No. 18-336, Third Report and Order and Third Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 39 FCC Rcd 11823 (2024) (*Third Report and Order*); *Implementation of the National Suicide Hotline Improvement Act of 2018*, WC Docket No. 18-336, Fourth Report and Order, FCC 25-42 (2025) (*Fourth Report and Order*).

<sup>10</sup> National Suicide Hotline Improvement Act of 2018, Pub. L. No. 115-233, 132 Stat. 2424 (2018).

<sup>11</sup> See 988 Act § 3 (amending Section 251(e) of the Communications Act of 1934 by adding subsection (e)(4)).

<sup>12</sup> See *Implementation of the National Suicide Hotline Improvement Act of 2018*, WC Docket No. 18-336, Report and Order, 35 FCC Rcd 7373, 7385, para. 27 (2020); *Implementation of the National Suicide Hotline Improvement Act of 2018*, WC Docket No. 18-336, Second Report and Order, 36 FCC Rcd 16901, 16921-25, paras. 34-40 (2021); see also 47 CFR §§ 52.200(b), 52.201(a). In June 2025, the Bureau issued a public notice announcing that the 988 Lifeline will continue to receive and respond to short message service (SMS) messages and that no new texting formats had been implemented or requested. *Wireline Competition Bureau Confirms No New Texting Formats For Text-to-988*, WC Docket No. 18-336, Public Notice, DA 25-517 (WCB June 13, 2025).

million chats.<sup>13</sup> In the same period, the 988 Lifeline also routed an additional 2 million contacts to the Veterans Crisis Line.<sup>14</sup>

4. *Commission Action to Improve Access to the 988 Lifeline.* Since the filing of the *Third Annual 988 Fee Accountability Report*, the Commission has adopted further rules to improve access to localized care. In October 2024, building off the efforts of wireless providers, SAMHSA, and the VA, the Commission established rules that required wireless providers to route 988 calls to the 988 Lifeline based on the general geographic location of the handset at the time the call is initiated, rather than the area code of the caller's phone number.<sup>15</sup> To provide routing parity, the Commission in July 2025 adopted similar rules to require wireless and interconnected text providers to route covered 988 text messages to crisis centers based on the general geographic location of the handset at the time the text is initiated.<sup>16</sup> The Commission's georouting rules for both calls and text messages will improve help-seekers' access to localized care and resources while protecting the privacy of the help-seeker by requiring wireless providers to aggregate data to ensure that precise location data is not transmitted.<sup>17</sup>

5. *The 988 Act Fee Provisions.* The 988 Act provides that “[n]othing in [the] Act . . . or any Commission regulation or order may prevent the imposition and collection of a fee or charge applicable to a commercial mobile service or an IP-enabled voice service” by a “State, a political subdivision of a State, an Indian Tribe, or village or regional corporation serving a region established pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.)” (states and other reporting entities).<sup>18</sup> Pursuant to the 988 Act, 988 fees may only be imposed, collected, and used pay expenses expected to be incurred that are reasonably attributable to: (1) the efficient and effective routing of calls made to 988 to an appropriate crisis center; and (2) personnel and the provision of acute mental health, crisis outreach, and stabilization services directly responding to individuals contacting the Lifeline.<sup>19</sup> Section 4(b) of the 988 Act requires the Commission to submit a report to the Committees on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and Appropriations of the Senate and the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Appropriations of the House of Representatives that: (1) details the status of the collection and distribution of 988 fees or charges in the states and other reporting entities; and (2) includes findings on the amount of revenues obligated or expended by the states and other reporting entities for any purpose other than the purpose for which any such fees or charges are specified.<sup>20</sup> Past 988 fee accountability reports are located on the Commission's website at <https://www.fcc.gov/988-fee-reports-and-reporting>.

---

<sup>13</sup> SAMHSA, 988 Lifeline Performance Metrics, <https://www.samhsa.gov/mental-health/988/performance-metrics> (last visited Sept. 11, 2025).

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* In 2007, SAMHSA and the VA partnered to establish 1-800-273-8255 (TALK), now 988, as the access point for the Veterans Crisis Line (VCL). Callers dialing 988 and selecting option 1 will be connected to the VCL. For text-to-988, individuals are given the option to connect with counselors from the VCL or the main 988 Lifeline. See SAMHSA, *Lifeline Timeline*, <https://www.samhsa.gov/mental-health/988/lifeline-timeline> (last visited Sept. 11, 2025); Veterans Crisis Line, *How It Works*, <https://www.veteranscrisisline.net/> (last visited Sept. 11, 2025); see also 988 Suicide & Crisis Lifeline, *What to Expect*, <https://988lifeline.org/get-help/what-to-expect/> (last visited Sept. 11, 2025).

<sup>15</sup> *Third Report and Order*, 39 FCC Rcd at 11833 & 11851-53, paras. 17 & 49-52. Nationwide wireless providers were required to comply with the Commission's rules by January 13, 2025. Non-nationwide providers must comply with these rules by December 16, 2026.

<sup>16</sup> *Fourth Report and Order*, FCC 25-42, at 11-12, paras. 22-25.

<sup>17</sup> See *Third Report and Order*, 39 FCC Rcd at 11846, para. 37; *Fourth Report and Order*, FCC 25-42 at 12-13, para. 25.

<sup>18</sup> 988 Act § 4(a)(1).

<sup>19</sup> *Id.* § 4(a)(2).

<sup>20</sup> *Id.* § 4(b).

6. *Information Collection.* To collect the necessary data to compile this *Fourth Annual 988 Fee Accountability Report*, the Commission received authorization from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to solicit information from states, the District of Columbia, U.S. territories, and Tribal entities<sup>21</sup> regarding the collection and use of 988 fees in their jurisdictions.<sup>22</sup> In April 2025, the Bureau issued a public notice announcing the information collection for calendar year 2024.<sup>23</sup> The Bureau also performed outreach to the governors and mental health authorities for each state, the District of Columbia, five U.S. territories, and, in coordination with the Commission’s Office of Native Affairs and Policy, Tribal entities, to gather information through a questionnaire.

7. The questionnaire for this annual fee report sought information on each jurisdiction’s authority to collect and distribute 988 fees or charges, the amount of revenue collected from any authorized 988 fees or charges, and the use of any revenue collected from the 988 fees or charges, covering the period of January 1, 2024 to December 31, 2024.<sup>24</sup> The questionnaire also asked each jurisdiction to confirm whether collected 988 fees or charges were used solely for 988 purposes, and requested information on what uses the jurisdiction considered permissible and how such uses support 988, consistent with the 988 Act.<sup>25</sup>

### **III. DISCUSSION**

8. The Bureau received information collection responses for this fourth annual report from all states, the District of Columbia, five U.S. territories,<sup>26</sup> and 13 Tribal entities.<sup>27</sup> Nine states—California, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, Minnesota, Nevada, Oregon, Virginia, and Washington—reported collecting and distributing 988 fees during calendar year 2024, and the total amount collected exceeded \$174 million.<sup>28</sup> All nine states reported that they used, or were only allowed to use, 988 fees solely for 988 purposes.<sup>29</sup>

#### **A. Established 988 Fee-Based Funding Mechanisms**

9. The Bureau sought information on whether the states or other reporting entities have established a funding mechanism designated for or imposed for the purposes of 988 support or

---

<sup>21</sup> For purposes of this report, “Tribal entities” or “Tribal authorities” include Indian Tribes and villages or regional corporations, as described in section 4(a)(1) of the 988 Act.

<sup>22</sup> See Office of Management and Budget (OMB), OMB Control Number 3060-1301 (Mar. 28, 2022); *see also* OMB, Notice of OMB Action, OMB Control No. 3060-1301 (Jan. 10, 2025), [https://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAViewICR?ref\\_nbr=202410-3060-016](https://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAViewICR?ref_nbr=202410-3060-016).

<sup>23</sup> *Wireline Competition Bureau Seeks Information for the Annual Information Collection on 988 Funds Mandated by the National Suicide Hotline Designation Act of 2020*, WC Docket No. 18-336, Public Notice, DA 25-326 (WCB Apr. 10, 2025).

<sup>24</sup> See *infra* Appx. B, FCC Questionnaire.

<sup>25</sup> See *infra* Appx. B, FCC Questionnaire.

<sup>26</sup> The responding U.S. territories included American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

<sup>27</sup> See *infra* Appx. A for a list of respondents. The individual responses from the states, the District of Columbia, U.S. territories, and Tribal entities are available on the Commission’s Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS) in WC Docket No. 18-336.

<sup>28</sup> The Bureau calculated this figure based on the total amount of collected 988 fees reported by the states and other reporting entities at Section E, Question 2.

<sup>29</sup> See California Response at 9-10; Colorado Response at 11-12; Colorado Addendum Response at 11-12; Delaware Response at 9; Maryland Response at 10-11; Minnesota Response at 9-10; Nevada Response at 10; Oregon Response at 10; Virginia Response at 9; Washington Response at 10; Washington Addendum Response at 10 (Washington’s addendum response is substantively identical to its initial response, with only the “draft” watermark removed).

implementation.<sup>30</sup> Ten states—California, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, Minnesota, Nevada, Oregon, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington<sup>31</sup>—and the U.S. Virgin Islands<sup>32</sup> reported that their jurisdictions have established a 988 fee-based funding mechanism. As described in detail below, nine of those states reported collecting 988 fees or charges during calendar year 2024,<sup>33</sup> and one state—Vermont—reported that they will begin collecting or imposing 988 fees after the reporting period at issue.<sup>34</sup>

**B. 988 Fees Imposed During Calendar Year 2024**

10. *Description of 988 Fees Imposed During Calendar Year 2024 by Service Type.* In order to provide an overview of the sources of 988 fees, the Bureau directed states and other reporting entities to describe the amount of fees imposed for the implementation and support of 988 services for each service type (wireline, wireless, prepaid wireless, Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP), and other).<sup>35</sup> The Bureau also asked respondents to identify the jurisdiction receiving the remittance by distinguishing among the state, county, local authority, Indian Tribe, village, regional corporation, or other jurisdictional authority for each service type.<sup>36</sup> While the permissive language of the 988 Act addresses the collection of fees or charges applicable to commercial mobile services or IP-enabled voice services, some states have reported collecting 988 fees for wireline services.<sup>37</sup> As such, this report provides a general discussion of any reported 988 wireline fees collected or imposed during calendar year 2024.

11. As described below in Table 1, nine states—California, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, Minnesota, Nevada, Oregon, Virginia, and Washington—reported imposing fees for the purpose of 988

---

<sup>30</sup> See FCC Questionnaire, Section B, Question 1. The California Valley Miwok Tribe responded “Yes” at Section B, Question 1, but identified California’s state legislation as the legal authority for the funding mechanism. See California Valley Miwok Tribe Response at 3 (B1, B1a). Illinois and New Mexico reported “No” at Section B, Question 1. See Illinois Response at 3; New Mexico Response at 3. The Bureau notes that New Mexico enacted legislation providing for the collection and transfer of a percentage of a state “telecommunications relay service surcharge” to a new “988 lifeline fund.” The provisions of the legislation became effective on July 1, 2025, which is after New Mexico submitted its questionnaire response and the reporting period at issue. See S.B. 535, 57th Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. (N.M. 2025). Additionally, Illinois enacted legislation in June 2025 establishing a “Statewide 9-8-8 Trust Fund,” and designating a 1.65% increase in the rate of the state’s “intrastate telecommunications” tax as a “statewide 9-8-8 surcharge.” See H.B. 2755, 104th Gen. Assemb. (Ill. 2025).

<sup>31</sup> See California Response at 3; Colorado Response at 3; Colorado Addendum Response at 3; Delaware Response at 3; Maryland Response at 3; Minnesota Response at 3; Nevada Response at 3; Oregon Response at 3; U.S. Virgin Islands Addendum Response at 3; Vermont Response at 3; Virginia Response at 3; Washington Addendum Response at 3.

<sup>32</sup> The Legislature of the U.S. Virgin Islands passed Bill No. 35-0224 to establish a “territory-wide 9-8-8 fee,” and the Governor approved the bill in Act No. 8957 on December 31, 2024. See 2024 V.I. Sess. Laws 8957. The U.S. Virgin Islands identified “Act 8957” as the legal authority for its funding mechanism but did not provide responses to Section D, Section E (Questions 1-3, 5), or Section F of the FCC’s questionnaire, which requested descriptions of any authorized 988 fees collected, expenditures of 988 fees, and diversion or transfer of 988 fees for other uses. See U.S. Virgin Islands Addendum Response at 3, 5-9.

<sup>33</sup> California Response at 7-8; Colorado Response at 9-10; Colorado Addendum Response at 9-10; Delaware Response at 7; Maryland Response at 8-9; Minnesota Response at 7; Nevada Response at 7-8; Oregon Response at 7-8; Virginia Response at 6-7; Washington Addendum Response at 7-8.

<sup>34</sup> Vermont reported that “[f]unding 988 with Act 145 [did] not take effect until July 1, 2025” and that “[n]o funds were collected and used for the purposes of 988 in calendar year 2024.” Vermont Response at 5-8 (D1, D2a, E2a, E2b); see also H.B. 657, 2024 Gen. Assemb. (Vt. 2024).

<sup>35</sup> See FCC Questionnaire, Section E, Question 1. The U.S. Virgin Islands did not respond to Section E, Question 1, but reported having an established 988 funding mechanism during calendar year 2024. See U.S. Virgin Islands Addendum Response at 3, 6-7.

<sup>36</sup> FCC Questionnaire, Section E, Question 1.

<sup>37</sup> See 988 Act § 4(a)(1).

support and implementation during calendar year 2024.<sup>38</sup> Four states—California, Nevada, Virginia, and Washington—reported that they imposed the same amount of fees for each service type during calendar year 2024 as in calendar year 2023, while one state—Colorado—decreased the amount of fees imposed.<sup>39</sup> Four new states—Delaware, Maryland, Minnesota, and Oregon—reported that they began imposing fees during calendar year 2024.<sup>40</sup>

12. *California* reported imposing a monthly 8-cent “988 surcharge” on wireline, wireless, and VoIP “access lines,”<sup>41</sup> as well as an 8-cent “988 surcharge” on the purchase of “prepaid mobile telephony services” during calendar year 2024, which is consistent with calendar year 2023.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> See California Response at 7; Colorado Response at 9; Colorado Addendum Response at 9; Delaware Response at 6-7; Maryland Response at 8; Minnesota Response at 7; Nevada Response at 7; Oregon Response at 7-8; Virginia Response at 6-7; Washington Addendum Response at 7-8.

<sup>39</sup> Compare California Calendar Year (CY) 2023 Response at 9; Colorado CY 2023 Response at 11-12; Nevada CY 2023 Response at 9; Virginia CY 2023 Supplemental Response at 1; Washington CY 2023 Response at 9, with California Response at 7; Colorado Response at 9; Colorado Addendum Response at 9; Nevada Response at 7; Virginia Response at 6-7; Washington Addendum Response at 7-8.

<sup>40</sup> Delaware Response at 6-7; Maryland Response at 8; Minnesota Response at 7; Oregon Response at 7-8.

<sup>41</sup> See California Response at 3, 7 (B1a, E1) (identifying Cal. Gov’t Code §§ 53123.1-53123.6 as legal authority for the funding mechanism via hyperlink and describing the fees or charges imposed by service type); Cal. Gov’t Code § 53123.4(b)(1) (Deering 2024) (noting that the state’s “fund shall consist of the revenue generated by the 988 surcharge assessed on users under Section 41020 of the Revenue and Taxation Code”); Cal. Rev. & Tax Code § 41020(a)(1) (describing the monthly “988 surcharge” imposed on each “access line”). California defines “access line” to mean “any of the following: (a) A wireline communications service line[;] (b) A wireless communications service line[;] and] (c) A VoIP service line . . . .” Cal. Rev. & Tax Code § 41007.1.

<sup>42</sup> See California Response at 3, 7 (B1a, E1); Cal. Rev. & Tax Code § 41020(a)(2) (describing the “988 surcharge” imposed on the purchase of “prepaid mobile telephony services”). California defines “prepaid mobile telephony services” as the “right to utilize a mobile device for mobile telecommunications services or information services, including the download of digital products delivered electronically, content, and ancillary services, or both telecommunications services and information services, that must be purchased in advance of usage in predetermined units or dollars.” Cal. Rev. & Tax Code § 41007.5(b).

13. *Colorado* reported imposing a “prepaid wireless 988 charge” and a monthly “988 surcharge” for wireline, wireless, and VoIP services per “988 access connection,”<sup>43</sup> both at rates of 14 cents,<sup>44</sup> which is a decrease from the 27-cent charge reported in calendar year 2023.<sup>45</sup>

14. *Delaware* reported imposing a 60-cent fee for wireline, wireless, and prepaid wireless services.<sup>46</sup> Pursuant to state statute, a monthly 60-cent “behavioral health crisis intervention services surcharge” is imposed on residential telephone, business, wireless, and “nontraditional communication” services,<sup>47</sup> and a 60-cent “surcharge” is imposed per retail transaction for prepaid wireless telecommunications services.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> See Colorado Response at 6, 9 (D1, E1) (identifying Colo. Rev. Stat. § 27-64-103 and describing the fees or charges imposed by service type); Colo. Rev. Stat. § 27-64-103(4) (2024) (describing the “988 surcharge” and “prepaid wireless 988 charge” imposed by the state’s “988 crisis hotline enterprise”). Colorado defines “988 access connection” to mean “any communications service including wireline, wireless cellular, interconnected voice over internet protocol, or satellite in which connections are enabled, configured, or capable of making 988 calls. ‘988 access connection’ does not include facilities-based broadband services. The number of 988 access connections is determined by the configured capacity for simultaneous outbound calling.” *Id.* § 40-17.5-101(2).

<sup>44</sup> At Section E, Question 1, Colorado indicated that 14-cent fees or charges were imposed for wireline, wireless, prepaid wireless, and VoIP services, but also reported that the surcharge for calendar year 2024 was 18 cents at Section C, Question 1b. See Colorado Response at 5, 9; Colorado Addendum Response 5, 9. Because of this discrepancy, the Bureau considered publicly available data from Colorado on the amount of the surcharge imposed during 2024. See Colorado Department of Revenue, Taxation Division, *Prepaid Wireless Charge*, <https://tax.colorado.gov/prepaid-wireless-charge> (last visited Sept. 11, 2025) (indicating that the 988 charge for 2024 was 14 cents); Colorado Public Utilities Commission, *Colorado Telecom Surcharges*, <https://sites.google.com/state.co.us/telecom-surcharges/> (last visited Sept. 11, 2025) (indicating that the state’s 988 surcharge was 14 cents per line per month effective January 1, 2024, and decreased to 7 cents effective January 1, 2025).

<sup>45</sup> See Colorado Response at 9 (E1); Colorado Addendum Response at 9 (E1); *Third Annual 988 Fee Accountability Report* at 8, para. 18.

<sup>46</sup> Delaware Response at 7 (E1).

<sup>47</sup> See Delaware Response at 3, 6-7 (B1a, E1) (stating that “16 Del. C. § 10222A defines a monthly behavioral health crisis intervention services surcharge (988 fee) of 60 cents per month on telecommunications services” and describing the amount of fees or charges imposed by service type). Section 10222A of the Delaware Code provides that the surcharge on residential telephone service is imposed “per residence exchange access line or per basic rate interface (“BRI”) integrated services digital network (“ISDN”) arrangement, where the residence exchange access service is provided via a BRI ISDN arrangement.” Del. Code Ann. tit. 16, § 10222A(a)(1). The surcharge on business telephone service is imposed “per business exchange access line and trunk or per BRI ISDN arrangement where the business exchange access service is provided via a BRI ISDN arrangement.” *Id.* § 10222A(a)(2). The surcharge on wireless service is imposed “on all wireless service customers for each wireless telephone number for which the . . . customers are billed by the provider” and the surcharge on “nontraditional communication services” is imposed on “subscribers of such services where the provider is required to or opts to provide 988 service.” *Id.* § 10222A(a)(3)-(4). Delaware’s statute defines business telephone service, residential telephone service, and wireless service for purposes of the 988 surcharge subchapter but does not specifically define “nontraditional communication services.” See *id.* § 10221A.

<sup>48</sup> See Delaware Response at 6-7 (E1); Del. Code Ann. tit. 16, § 10223A (2024) (describing the “behavioral health crisis intervention services surcharge on prepaid wireless telecommunications service retail transactions”). Delaware defines “prepaid wireless telecommunications service” as “a wireless telecommunications service that allows a caller to dial 988 to access the 988 system, which service must be paid for in advance and is sold in predetermined units or dollars of which the number declines in a known amount.” *Id.* § 10221A(6).

15. *Maryland* reported imposing a 25-cent fee per line per month for wireline and wireless services.<sup>49</sup> Pursuant to state statute, a “9-8-8 fee” is imposed on “each subscriber to switched local exchange access service, [commercial mobile radio service (CMRS)], or other 9-8-8 accessible service.”<sup>50</sup>

16. *Minnesota* reported imposing a 12-cent fee on wireline, wireless, prepaid wireless, and VoIP services.<sup>51</sup> Pursuant to state statute, a monthly “988 telecommunications fee” is imposed “for each consumer access line, including trunk equivalents as designated by the [Minnesota] Public Utilities Commission,”<sup>52</sup> and a “prepaid wireless 988 fee” is imposed “on each retail transaction.”<sup>53</sup> The amount of the 988 telecommunications fee is “adjusted as needed to provide continuous operation of the lifeline centers and 988 hotline,” and to account for volume increases and maintenance.<sup>54</sup> Additionally, the amount of the prepaid wireless 988 fee is adjusted proportionately to any changes in the monthly 988 telecommunications fee imposed,<sup>55</sup> and the Minnesota Department of Revenue provides notice of any such fee changes.<sup>56</sup> Minnesota also reported that increases “above 12 cents must be authorized through a legislative bill that is approved by the [state’s legislature] and signed by the Governor.”<sup>57</sup>

17. *Nevada* reported imposing a monthly 35-cent “surcharge” on wireline, wireless, prepaid wireless, VoIP, and other services.<sup>58</sup> Pursuant to state statute, Nevada’s State Board of Health imposes the surcharge on “[e]ach access line of each customer of a company that provides commercial mobile

---

<sup>49</sup> Maryland Response at 8 (E1). Maryland did not report imposing 988 fees for prepaid wireless service during calendar year 2024. *Id.*

<sup>50</sup> See Maryland Response at 3 (B1a) (identifying “Maryland Senate Bill 974” as the legal authority for the funding mechanism); S.B. 974, 446th Gen. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (Md. 2024); Md. Code Ann., Health-General § 7.5-5A-03.1(d) (2024) (describing the “switched local exchange access 9-8-8 service fee”). Maryland defines “9-8-8-accessible service” as “telephone service or another communications service that connects an individual dialing the digits 9-8-8 to the 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline.” *Id.* § 7.5-5A-03.1(a)(2). Maryland defines commercial mobile radio service (CMRS) as “mobile telecommunications service that is: (1) [p]rovided for profit with the intent of receiving compensation or monetary gain; (2) [a]n interconnected, two-way voice service; and (3) [a]vailable to the public.” *Id.* § 7.5-5A-01(b)(1)-(3). At Section E, Question 1, Maryland reported that 25-cent fees or charges were imposed for wireline and wireless services. See Maryland Response at 8. Maryland’s statute also appears to impose 988 fees on VoIP service. The Bureau requests that, in the future, Maryland provide more specificity in its description identifying the amount of 988 fees or charges imposed for each service type.

<sup>51</sup> Minnesota Response at 7 (E1).

<sup>52</sup> See Minnesota Response at 3 (B1a) (identifying “Minn Stat. § 145.561, subd. 4” as the legal authority for the funding mechanism); Minn. Stat. § 145.561, subd. 4(b) (2024) (describing the monthly “988 telecommunications fee”).

<sup>53</sup> See Minnesota Response at 5 (C2a) (stating that “Minn Stat. § 145.561, subd. 5 established the funding mechanism to collect the 988 fee from prepaid wireless telecommunications services”); Minn. Stat. § 145.561, subd. 5(a) (noting that “[p]repaid wireless telecommunications services are subject to the prepaid wireless 988 fee established in section 403.161, subdivision 1, paragraph (c)”; *id.* § 403.161, subd. 1(c) (describing the “prepaid wireless 988 fee”).

<sup>54</sup> See Minn. Stat. § 145.561, subd. 4(f).

<sup>55</sup> See *id.* § 403.161, subd. 7(a) (describing prepaid wireless fee changes).

<sup>56</sup> See Minn. Stat. § 403.161, subd. 7(b) (stating that the “department shall post notice of any fee changes on its website at least 30 days in advance of the effective date of the fee changes”); *id.* § 403.16, subd. 3 (defining “department” as “the [Minnesota] Department of Revenue”); Minnesota Department of Revenue, *Prepaid Wireless E911, TAM, and 988 Fees*, <https://www.revenue.state.mn.us/prepaid-wireless-e911-tam-and-988-fees> (last visited Sept. 11, 2025) (noting that Minnesota’s 988 fee was 12 cents during the period from September 1, 2024 to June 30, 2025).

<sup>57</sup> Minnesota Response at 4 (C1b).

<sup>58</sup> See Nevada Response at 7 (E1); Nev. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 433.708 (describing surcharges imposed on “certain communications lines”).

communication services or IP-enabled voice services”<sup>59</sup> and on “[e]ach access line or trunk line of each customer to the local exchange of any telecommunications provider.”<sup>60</sup>

18. *Oregon* reported imposing a 40-cent fee for wireless, prepaid wireless, and VoIP services.<sup>61</sup> Pursuant to state legislation, a monthly “9-8-8 coordinated crisis services tax” is imposed on consumers of “telecommunications service” or VoIP service with “access to the emergency communications system,”<sup>62</sup> and a prepaid wireless tax is imposed “per retail transaction.”<sup>63</sup>

19. *Virginia* reported imposing a monthly 12-cent “postpaid wireless 988 charge” on “each CMRS device capable of two-way interactive voice communication”<sup>64</sup> and an 8-cent “prepaid wireless 988 charge” on retail transactions during calendar year 2024.<sup>65</sup>

20. *Washington* reported imposing a 40-cent “statewide 988 behavioral health crisis response and suicide prevention line tax” for wireline, wireless, prepaid wireless, VoIP, and radio access line services during calendar year 2024.<sup>66</sup> Pursuant to state statute, a monthly 40-cent tax is imposed on all radio access lines, interconnected voice over internet protocol service lines, and switched access lines in

---

<sup>59</sup> See Nevada Response at 3-4 (B1a, B3) (referencing “NRS 433.708”); Nev. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 433.708(1)(a) (describing the surcharge imposed on “[e]ach access line . . . that provides commercial mobile communication services or IP-enabled voice services”). Nevada defines “access line” to mean “any voice connection between a customer and a carrier that provides the customer with access to telecommunication in [Nevada] and allows a customer to access the hotline . . . by dialing the digits 9-8-8.” *Id.* § 433.708(8)(a).

<sup>60</sup> See Nev. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 433.708(1)(b) (describing the surcharge imposed on “[e]ach access line or trunk line . . . to the local exchange of any telecommunications provider”); *id.* § 433.708(8)(a) (defining “access line”). Nevada defines “trunk line” as “a line which provides a channel between of a switchboard owned by a customer of a telecommunications provider and the local exchange of the telecommunications provider.” *Id.* § 433.708(8)(d).

<sup>61</sup> See Oregon Response at 3, 7-8 (B1a, E1) (noting that the state established “a 0.40 cent telecom tax to fund 988” and describing the fees or surcharges imposed by service type).

<sup>62</sup> See Oregon Response at 3 (B1a) (referencing H.B. 2757, 82nd Leg. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (Or. 2023) (enrolled) via hyperlink); Or. Rev. Stat. § 403.200(1) (describing the “9-8-8 coordinated crisis services tax” imposed). Oregon’s statute provides that the tax “must be applied on a telecommunications circuit designated for a particular consumer or subscriber” and “[o]ne consumer or subscriber line must be counted for each circuit that is capable of generating usage on the line side of the switched network.” Or. Rev. Stat. § 403.200(2). With respect to “providers of central office based services,” the tax “must be applied to each line that has unrestricted connection to the switched network.” *Id.* With respect to “cellular, wireless or other common carriers,” the tax “applies to a subscriber on a per instrument basis and only if the subscriber’s place of primary use . . . is within [Oregon].” *Id.*

<sup>63</sup> See Or. Rev. Stat. § 403.200(1) (describing the “9-8-8 coordinated crisis services tax” imposed). Oregon defines “prepaid wireless telecommunications service” to mean “a telecommunications service that is sold in predetermined units or dollar amounts, must be paid for in advance and provides the purchaser with the ability to use mobile wireless service as well as other non[-]telecommunications services including content, ancillary services and the download of digital products delivered electronically.” *Id.* § 403.105(17).

<sup>64</sup> See Virginia Response at 3, 6-7 (B1a, E1) (identifying section 37.2-311.5 of the Code of Virginia via hyperlink and describing the fees or charges imposed by service type); Va. Code Ann. § 37.2-311.5(A)(2) (describing the “monthly postpaid wireless 988 charge”).

<sup>65</sup> See Virginia Response at 6-7 (E1); Va. Code Ann. § 37.2-311.5(A)(1) (describing the “prepaid wireless 988 charge”).

<sup>66</sup> See Washington Addendum Response at 4, 7-8 (B3, E1); Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 82.86.020 (describing the “988 behavioral health crisis response and suicide prevention line tax”).

**Federal Communications Commission**

the state,<sup>67</sup> and a 40-cent tax is imposed on prepaid wireless telecommunications service for each retail transaction occurring in the state.<sup>68</sup>

**Table 1 – Description of 988 Fees Imposed for Calendar Year 2024 by Service Type<sup>69</sup>**

State <sup>70</sup>	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance
	Type	Fee/Charge	(e.g., state, county, local authority, Indian Tribe, village or regional corporation, or a combination)
CA	Wireline	\$.08	State
	Wireless	\$.08	
	Prepaid	\$.08	
	VoIP	\$.08	
	Other	“N/A”	
CO	Wireline	\$.14	Colorado Department of Health and Human Services
	Wireless	\$.14	
	Prepaid	\$.14	
	VoIP	\$.14	
	Other	[No Response]	
DE*	Wireline	\$.60	State
	Wireless	\$.60	
	Prepaid	\$.60	
	VoIP	“N/A”	
	Other	“N/A”	
MD*	Wireline	\$.25	State
	Wireless	\$.25	
	Prepaid	[No Response]	
	VoIP	[No Response]	
	Other	[No Response]	
MN*	Wireline	\$.12	Minnesota Department of Health
	Wireless	\$.12	

<sup>67</sup> See Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 82.86.020 (describing the “988 behavioral health crisis response and suicide prevention line tax”); *id.* § 82.86.030 (describing collection of the tax). Washington defines “switched access line” to mean “the telephone service line which connects a subscriber’s main telephone(s) or equivalent main telephone(s) to the local exchange company’s switching office.” Washington defines “radio access line” to mean “the telephone number assigned to or used by a subscriber for two-way local wireless voice service available to the public for hire from a radio communications service company. Radio access lines include, but are not limited to, radio-telephone communications lines used in cellular telephone service, personal communications services, and network radio access lines, or their functional and competitive equivalent. Radio access lines do not include lines that provide access to one-way signaling service, such as paging service, or to communications channels suitable only for data transmission, or to nonlocal radio access line service, such as wireless roaming service, or to a private telecommunications system.” See Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 82.86.010 (stating that the definitions in section 82.14B.020 apply to chapter 82.86); *id.* § 82.14B.020 (defining “switched access line” and “radio access line”).

<sup>68</sup> See Wash. Rev. Code Ann. §§ 82.86.020; 82.86.030. Washington defines “prepaid wireless telecommunications service” to mean “a telecommunications service that provides the right to use mobile wireless service as well as other non[-]telecommunications services including the download of digital products delivered electronically, content, and ancillary services, which must be paid for in full in advance and sold in predetermined units or dollars of which the number declines with use in a known amount.” See *id.* § 82.14B.020(10).

<sup>69</sup> In all tables in this report, brackets indicate information entered by the Bureau, e.g., where the state or other reporting entity provided no response, and unbracketed table entries are taken verbatim from the responses provided by states and other reporting entities unless otherwise noted.

<sup>70</sup> In Table 1, the states marked with asterisk reported that they began imposing 988 fees during calendar year 2024.

**Federal Communications Commission**

	Prepaid	\$ .12	
	VoIP	\$ .12	
	Other	[No Response]	
NV	Wireline	\$ .35	Nevada State General Fund Crisis Response Account
	Wireless	\$ .35	
	Prepaid	\$ .35	
	VoIP	\$ .35	
	Other	\$ .35	
OR*	Wireline	“No fee”	State
	Wireless	\$ .40	
	Prepaid	\$ .40	
	VoIP	\$ .40	
	Other	“Not applicable”	
VA	Wireline	[No Response]	State
	Wireless	\$ .12	
	Prepaid	\$ .08	
	VoIP	[No Response]	
	Other	[No Response]	
WA	Wireline	\$ .40	Washington State Treasury
	Wireless	\$ .40	
	Prepaid	\$ .40	
	VoIP	\$ .40	
	Other	\$ .40 (radio access line)	

**C. Description of Authority for the Collection of 988 Fees During Calendar Year 2024**

21. *Authority for the Collection of 988 Fees During Calendar Year 2024.* The Bureau requested that the states and other reporting entities identify the best description of the type of authority arrangement for the collection of 988 fees, specifically whether 988 fees are collected by the state (or political subdivision) or Tribal entity, by a local authority, or by a hybrid approach.<sup>71</sup> The respondents that reported collecting fees during calendar year 2024—California, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, Minnesota, Nevada, Oregon, Virginia, and Washington—all indicated that the state (or political subdivision) has the authority to collect 988 fees.<sup>72</sup>

22. *California* reported, pursuant to state statute, that monthly “988 surcharges” on each wireline, wireless, and VoIP access line are collected on billing statements by “service suppliers” from service users,<sup>73</sup> while prepaid “988 surcharges” are collected by “sellers” from consumers on each retail transaction.<sup>74</sup> The service suppliers and sellers remit the collected “988 surcharges” to the California

<sup>71</sup> FCC Questionnaire, Section B, Question 2. The California Valley Miwok Tribe also responded to Section B, Question 2, but indicated elsewhere in their questionnaire that California’s state legislation provided authority for the fee-based funding mechanism. See California Valley Miwok Tribe Response at 3-4. Northway Village responded “N/A.” Northway Village Response at 3.

<sup>72</sup> California Response at 3-4; Colorado Response at 4; Colorado Addendum Response at 4; Delaware Response at 3; Maryland Response at 3; Minnesota Response at 3-4; Nevada Response at 3-4; Oregon Response at 3-4; Virginia Response at 3-4; Washington Addendum Response at 3-4.

<sup>73</sup> See California Response at 3, 7 (B1a, E1) (providing citations via hyperlinks to the legal authority for the funding mechanism and describing the charges imposed by service type); Cal. Rev. & Tax Code § 41021(a) (describing surcharge collection by service suppliers from service users); *id.* § 41022 (describing service supplier billing); see also *id.* § 41007 (defining “service supplier”); *id.* § 41009 (defining “service user”).

<sup>74</sup> See California Response at 3, 7; Cal. Rev. & Tax Code § 41028(a) (describing collection of surcharges by sellers from prepaid consumers); *id.* § 41007.5(a)-(d) (defining “prepaid consumer,” “prepaid mobile telephony service,” “retail transaction,” and “seller”).

Department of Tax and Fee Administration,<sup>75</sup> which then transmits the revenue to the California State Treasury for deposit into a “988 State Suicide and Behavioral Health Crisis Service Fund.”<sup>76</sup>

23. Colorado reported, pursuant to state statute, that “service suppliers” collect a monthly “988 surcharge” from service users and remit these surcharges to the Colorado Public Utilities Commission on a monthly basis,<sup>77</sup> while sellers collect a “prepaid wireless 988 charge” from consumers on each retail transaction and remit these charges to the Colorado Department of Revenue.<sup>78</sup> The Colorado State Treasurer ultimately credits the collected monthly surcharges and prepaid wireless 988 charges to the state’s “988 crisis hotline cash fund.”<sup>79</sup>

24. Delaware reported, pursuant to state statute, that providers collect a monthly “behavioral health crisis intervention services surcharge” from “subscribers to telecommunications service[s] with each invoice for service,”<sup>80</sup> and “sellers” collect a surcharge on prepaid wireless telecommunications service from consumers for each retail transaction.<sup>81</sup> Providers remit the collected monthly surcharges to Delaware’s Department of Finance for deposit into the state’s “Behavioral Health Crisis Intervention

---

<sup>75</sup> See Cal. Rev. & Tax Code § 41022(b) (stating that service suppliers “shall remit the combined [911 and 988] surcharges to the department in separate amounts for each surcharge on forms prescribed by the department”); *id.* § 41028(a)(2)(B) (stating that sellers “shall remit the combined [911 and 988] surcharges to the department in separate amounts for each surcharge on forms prescribed by the department”); *id.* § 41004 (defining “department” as the “California Department of Tax and Fee Administration”).

<sup>76</sup> See *id.* § 41135(a) (stating that the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration transmits “the revenues to the [California] State Treasury to be deposited in the State Treasury to . . . the credit of . . . the 988 State Suicide and Behavioral Health Crisis Services Fund”).

<sup>77</sup> See Colorado Response at 3; Colorado Addendum Response at 3 (providing citations via hyperlink to the legal authority for the funding mechanism); Colo. Rev. Stat. § 40-17.5-102 (describing monthly “988 surcharge” collection rules); see also *id.* § 40-17.5-101(5) (defining “commission” as the “public utilities commission of the state of Colorado”); *id.* § 40-17.5-101(12) (defining “service supplier” to mean “a person providing 988 access connections to any service user in the state, either directly or by resale”); *id.* § 40-17.5-101(13) (defining “service user” as “a person who is provided a 988 access connection in the state”).

<sup>78</sup> See Colo. Rev. Stat. § 40-17.5-104 (describing “prepaid wireless 988 charge” collection rules); see also *id.* § 40-17.5-101(7) (defining “department” as the Colorado “department of revenue”); *id.* § 40-17.5-101(6) (defining “consumer”); *id.* § 40-17.5-101(11) (defining “seller” as “a person who sells prepaid wireless telecommunications services to another person”); *id.* § 40-17.5-101(10) (defining “retail transaction” to mean “the purchase of prepaid wireless telecommunications service from a seller for any purpose other than resale”).

<sup>79</sup> See Colo. Rev. Stat. § 40-17.5-102(3)(c)(I) (describing monthly “988 surcharge” collection rules); *id.* § 40-17.5-104(2)(e) (describing “prepaid wireless 988 charge” rules).

<sup>80</sup> See Delaware Response at 3 (B1a) (citing Section 10222A of the Delaware Code); Del. Code Ann. tit. 16, § 10222A(f) (describing collection of the monthly “behavioral health crisis intervention services surcharge”); *id.* § 10222A(a)(1)-(4) (providing that “subscribers of telecommunications service” include “residential subscribers,” “business subscribers,” “wireless service customers,” and “subscribers of such services where the provider is required to or opts to provide 988 services”); *id.* § 10221A(7) (defining “provider” to mean “a telecommunications service provider, including a wireless provider, any other provider that is required to or opts to provide 988 service, or any intermediate entity or pass-through agent providing telecommunications services”).

<sup>81</sup> See Del. Code Ann. tit. 16, § 10223A(a)-(b) (describing the “behavioral health crisis intervention services surcharge on prepaid wireless telecommunications service”); *id.* § 10221A(10) (defining “seller” as “a person who sells prepaid wireless telecommunications service to another person”).

Services Fund,”<sup>82</sup> and sellers remit the collected prepaid wireless surcharges to the Delaware Division of Revenue on a quarterly basis.<sup>83</sup>

25. *Maryland* reported that “telephone companies” add a “9-8-8 fee to all current bills rendered for switched local exchange access service,”<sup>84</sup> while providers add a “9-8-8 fee to all current bills rendered for CMRS or other 9-8-8 accessible service.”<sup>85</sup> The telephone companies and providers “act as a collection agent for” the state’s “9-8-8 Trust Fund” and remit the collected fees on a monthly basis to the state Comptroller that accounts for the fund.<sup>86</sup> The state’s “9-8-8 Trust Fund” is administered by Maryland’s Department of Health.<sup>87</sup>

26. *Minnesota* reported that wireline, wireless, and IP-enabled voice telecommunications service providers collect monthly “988 telecommunications fees” on consumer access lines or trunk equivalents from subscribers,<sup>88</sup> while prepaid wireless telecommunications sellers collect a “prepaid wireless 988 fee” from consumers on each retail transaction.<sup>89</sup> Service providers transfer the collected “988 telecommunications fees” to Minnesota’s Commissioner of Public Safety for deposit into the state’s

---

<sup>82</sup> See Del. Code Ann. tit. 16, § 10222A(a)-(b), (f) (describing collection of the monthly surcharge, payment to the Department of Finance, and deposit into the “Fund”); *id.* § 10221A(4) (defining “Fund” to mean the “Behavioral Health Crisis Intervention Services Fund”).

<sup>83</sup> See Del. Code Ann. tit. 16, ch.102A, § 10223A(h) (stating that the “[s]urcharge collected by sellers must be remitted to the Division of Revenue quarterly”); *id.* § 10212A(a)-(b) (providing that “[m]oney collected under this chapter” must be deposited into the “Behavioral Health Crisis Intervention Services Fund”).

<sup>84</sup> See Maryland Response at 3 (B1a) (identifying “Maryland Senate Bill 974” as the legal authority for the funding mechanism); S.B. 974, 446th Gen. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (Md. 2024); Md. Code Ann., Health-Gen. § 7.5-5A-03.1(e) (2024) (describing the collection of “switched local access 9-8-8 fees” by telephone companies); *see also id.* § 7.5-5A-01 (stating that “telephone company has the meaning stated in § 1-101 of the [state’s] Public Utilities Article”). Maryland’s Public Utilities Code defines “telephone company” to mean “a public service company that: (i) owns telephone lines to receive, transmit, or communicate local exchange telephone services, exchange access telephone services, or teletype communications; (ii) leases, licenses, or sells local exchange telephone services, exchange access telephone services, or teletype communications; or (iii) owns telephone lines to receive, transmit, or communicate telephone services to incarcerated individual facilities.” Md. Pub. Util. Code Ann. § 1-101(nn) (2024).

<sup>85</sup> See Maryland Response at 3 (B1a); S.B. 974, 446th Gen. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (Md. 2024); Md. Code Ann., Health-Gen. § 7.5-5A-03.1(f) (2024) (describing the collection of “9-8-8 fees” by “9-8-8 service carriers”); *id.* § 7.5-5A-03.1(a)(4) (defining “9-8-8 service carrier” to mean “a provider of CMRS or other 9-8-8 accessible service,” but not including “a telephone company”); *id.* § 7.5-5A-03.1(a)(2) (defining “9-8-8 accessible service” to mean “telephone service or another communications service that connects an individual dialing the digits 9-8-8 to the 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline”).

<sup>86</sup> See Maryland Response at 4 (B3); Md. Code Ann., Health-Gen. § 7.5-5A-03.1(e)-(f) (2024); *id.* § 7.5-5A-02 (describing Maryland’s “9-8-8 Trust Fund”).

<sup>87</sup> See Maryland Response at 4 (C1b); Md. Code Ann., Health-Gen. § 7.5-5A-02(c) (providing that the “Department shall administer the Fund”).

<sup>88</sup> See Minnesota Response at 5 (C2a) (citing Minn. Stat. § 145.561, subd. 4); Minn. Stat. § 145.561, subd. 4 (describing the collection and transfer of the monthly “988 telecommunications fee”).

<sup>89</sup> See Minnesota Response at 5 (C2a) (citing Minn. Stat. § 145.561, subd. 5); Minn. Stat. § 145.561, subd. 5(b) (“Collection, remittance, and deposit of prepaid wireless 988 fees are governed by sections 403.161 and 403.162.”); *id.* § 403.161, subd. 3 (“The prepaid wireless E911, telecommunications access Minnesota, and 988 fees must be collected by the seller from the consumer for each retail transaction occurring in this state. The amount of each fee must be combined into one amount, which must be separately stated on an invoice, receipt, or other similar document that is provided to the consumer by the seller.”); *id.* § 403.16, subd. 8 (defining “seller”).

dedicated “988 special revenue account,”<sup>90</sup> whereas prepaid sellers remit the “prepaid wireless 988 fees” with other prepaid wireless fees to the Commissioner of Revenue.<sup>91</sup> Pursuant to state statute, Minnesota’s Commissioner of Revenue divides collected prepaid wireless E911, prepaid wireless telecommunications access, and prepaid wireless 988 fees based on “relative proportion” and deposits the proportion “attributable to the prepaid wireless 988 fee” into the state’s “988 special revenue account.”<sup>92</sup>

27. *Nevada* reported that companies providing commercial mobile communication services or IP-enabled voice services in the state collect a surcharge per access line, while telecommunications providers collect a surcharge per access line or trunk line from customers.<sup>93</sup> Pursuant to state statute, the companies and providers must “[t]ransfer the money collected to the [Nevada Division of Public and Behavioral Health] on or before the last day of the month immediately following the month to which the surcharge applies.”<sup>94</sup> Additionally, collected surcharges “must be deposited in the State Treasury for credit to the [Crisis Response] Account” and the “funds must be carried over into the next state fiscal year.”<sup>95</sup>

28. *Oregon* reported, pursuant to state legislation, that providers of telecommunications or interconnected VoIP services “with access to the emergency communications system” collect a monthly 988 “coordinated crisis services tax” from subscribers,<sup>96</sup> while prepaid wireless telecommunications service or access sellers collect a tax for “prepaid wireless telecommunications service” from consumers for each retail transaction.<sup>97</sup> Service providers and prepaid sellers must “file a return” with the Oregon Department of Revenue “on or before the last day of the month following the end of each calendar

---

<sup>90</sup> See Minnesota Response at 4-5 (B3, C2a) (citing Minn. Stat. § 145.561, subd. 3-4 and noting that “funds are deposited into the State’s 988 Special Revenue Account”); Minn. Stat. § 145.561, subd. 4 (describing collection and transfer of the monthly “988 telecommunications fee”).

<sup>91</sup> See Minn. Stat. § 403.162, subd. 1 (describing remittance of “prepaid 988 fees” by sellers).

<sup>92</sup> See *id.* § 403.162, subd. 5 (detailing deposit of “wireless E911, telecommunications access Minnesota, and 988 fees” by Minnesota’s commissioner of revenue).

<sup>93</sup> See Nevada Response at 3-4 (B1a, B3); Nev. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 433.708(1)(a)-(b) (describing the surcharges imposed on access lines or trunk lines); *id.* § 433.708(2)(a) (describing the collection of surcharges by companies and providers).

<sup>94</sup> See Nevada Response at 4 (B3); Nev. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 433.708(2)(b) (“The companies and providers . . . shall . . . [t]ransfer the money collected to the Division on or before the last day of the month immediately following the month to which the surcharge applies.”); *id.* § 433.084 (defining “Division” as the Nevada “Division of Public and Behavioral Health of the Department”).

<sup>95</sup> See Nevada Response at 4 (B3) (stating that “any funds must be carried over into the next state fiscal year”); Nev. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 433.708(3) (“The Crisis Response Account is hereby created in the State General Fund. Any money collected from the surcharge imposed . . . must be deposited in the State Treasury for credit to the Account. . .”); *id.* § 433.708(5) (“Any money remaining in the Account at the end of each fiscal year does not revert to the State General Fund but must be carried over into the next fiscal year.”).

<sup>96</sup> See Oregon Response at 3 (B1a) (referencing H.B. 2757, 82nd Leg. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (Or. 2023) (enrolled) via hyperlink); Or. Rev. Stat. § 403.200(1), (2) (describing the imposition and collection of a 988 “coordinated crisis services tax”); *id.* § 403.215 (describing returns and payment of tax); see also *id.* § 403.105(19) (defining “provider” to mean “a utility, or other vendor or supplier, that offers communications service or equipment that provides access to the emergency communications system”); § 403.105(25) (defining “subscriber” to mean “a person, other than a consumer, that has telecommunication access to the emergency communications system through local exchange service, cellular service or other wired or wireless means”).

<sup>97</sup> Or. Rev. Stat. § 403.200(5) (describing the collection of the “prepaid wireless telecommunications service” tax by sellers); *id.* § 403.105(6) (defining “consumer” to mean “a person that purchases prepaid wireless telecommunications service in a retail transaction”); § 403.105(24) (defining “seller” to mean “a person that sells prepaid wireless telecommunications service or access to prepaid wireless telecommunications service to a consumer”).

quarter” that details the amount of the tax due during the quarter.<sup>98</sup> Oregon also reported that “[a]ll 988 related funding is paid into a trust fund, including revenues from the 988 telecom tax.”<sup>99</sup>

29. *Virginia* reported, pursuant to state statute, that dealers selling prepaid CMRS collect a “prepaid wireless 988 charge” from “end users” during retail transactions,<sup>100</sup> and CMRS providers and resellers collect a “monthly postpaid wireless 988 charge” from customers for “each CMRS device capable of two-way interactive voice communication.”<sup>101</sup> The 988 charges are ultimately collected by Virginia’s Department of Taxation and all revenue accrues in a “Crisis Call Center Fund,” which is “established on the books of the Comptroller.”<sup>102</sup>

30. *Washington* reported that 988 “taxes” are collected on billing statements by radio communications service, interconnected VoIP, and local exchange companies from subscribers, and by sellers from prepaid wireless consumers for each retail transaction occurring in the state.<sup>103</sup> Companies and sellers remit the collected taxes to the Washington Department of Revenue, and the State Treasurer deposits them into a statewide “988 behavioral health crisis response and suicide prevention line account.”<sup>104</sup>

31. Two additional respondents—the U.S. Virgin Islands and Vermont—indicated that the state (or political subdivision) has the authority to collect 988 fees but did not report doing so during calendar year 2024.<sup>105</sup>

**D. Description of Authority that Approves and Determines Expenditures and Mandated Uses for 988 Fees for Calendar Year 2024**

32. *Authority for the Approval of 988 Fee Expenditures During Calendar Year 2024.* The Bureau requested that states and other jurisdictions identify the entity that has authority to approve the

---

<sup>98</sup> Or. Rev. Stat. § 403.215(1) (“The provider or seller is responsible for collecting the tax under ORS 403.200 and shall file a return with the Department of Revenue on or before the last day of the month following the end of each calendar quarter, reporting the amount of tax due during the quarter, with the tax due under ORS 403.200 (1)(a) and (b) stated separately.”).

<sup>99</sup> Oregon Response at 4 (B3).

<sup>100</sup> See Virginia Response at 3 (B1a); Va. Code Ann. § 37.2-311.5(A)(1) (describing the collection of the “prepaid wireless 988 charge” by dealers from end users); *id.* § 56-484.17:1(A) (defining “dealer” to mean “a person who sells prepaid CMRS to an end user”); *id.* (defining “end user” to mean “a person who purchases prepaid CMRS in a retail transaction”).

<sup>101</sup> Va. Code Ann. § 37.2-311.5(A)(2) (describing the collection of the “monthly postpaid wireless 988 charge” by CMRS providers and resellers of CMRS from customers); *id.* § 56-484.12 (defining “CMRS provider” as “an entity authorized by the Federal Communications Commission to provide CMRS within the Commonwealth”).

<sup>102</sup> See Va. Code Ann. § 37.2-311.5(B) (noting that the “charges imposed . . . shall be collected by the Department of Taxation”); *id.* § 37.2-311.4 (“There is hereby created in the state treasury a special nonreverting fund to be known as the Crisis Call Center Fund. The Fund shall be established on the books of the Comptroller. All revenues accruing to the Fund pursuant to § 37.2-311.5 . . . shall be paid into the state treasury and credited to the Fund. Interest earned on moneys in the Fund shall remain in the Fund and be credited to it. Any moneys remaining in the Fund, including interest thereon, at the end of each fiscal year shall not revert to the general fund but shall remain in the Fund.”).

<sup>103</sup> See Washington Addendum Response at 3-4 (B1a, B2, B3); Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 82.86.020 (describing the tax imposed on radio access lines, interconnected VoIP service lines, and switched access lines); *id.* § 82.86.040 (describing payment and collection).

<sup>104</sup> See Washington Addendum Response at 4 (B3); Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 82.86.020 (describing the tax imposed on radio access lines, interconnected VoIP service lines, and switched access lines); *id.* § 82.86.040 (describing payment and collection).

<sup>105</sup> See U.S. Virgin Islands Addendum Response at 3-4, 6-7; Vermont Response at 3-4; 6-7.

expenditure of 988 fees,<sup>106</sup> and provide a description of any limitations on the approval authority per jurisdiction.<sup>107</sup> Of the states that collected and distributed 988 fees during calendar year 2024, eight states—California, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, Minnesota, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington—responded that the state (or a political subdivision) is the only entity that has authority to approve expenditure of 988 fees,<sup>108</sup> whereas Virginia indicated that the authority is shared between the state and local authorities.<sup>109</sup>

33. *California* reported that the state’s Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES), in consultation with the California Department of Health Care Services (Cal DHCS), “may adopt regulations regarding how funds received shall be disseminated to support the operations of the 988 system and related behavioral health crisis services.”<sup>110</sup> Cal OES, Cal DHCS, and the California Health and Human Services Agency (Cal HHS) establish policies at a state level and two “boards” are in place to ensure that funding meets local level needs.<sup>111</sup> Locally determined “budget requirements, operational costs, and other details” are also validated to ensure alignment with state statutory requirements.<sup>112</sup> California’s state legislature authorizes a budget for Cal OES, Cal DHCS, and Cal HHS that “determines the revenue needed to support 988 each year.”<sup>113</sup> Entities seeking funds from the state’s “988 Suicide and Behavioral Health Crisis Services Fund” must submit an annual “expenditure and outcomes report in a form and manner” determined by Cal OES and Cal DHCS.<sup>114</sup> Moreover, Cal OES, California’s Public Safety Communications, and California’s 911 Emergency Communications Branch “require an existing 988 center or entity seeking collected 988 fee funds to be in full compliance” with a 988 funding policy from the state’s 911 “Operations Manual.”<sup>115</sup>

34. *Colorado* reported that revenue in the state’s “988 crisis hotline cash fund” is appropriated to the Colorado “Behavioral Health Administration and 988 Enterprise Board of Directors

---

<sup>106</sup> FCC Questionnaire, Section C, Question 1. The U.S. Virgin Islands reported that both state (or political subdivision) and local jurisdictions have authority to approve the expenditure of 988 fees but did not report collecting or distributing 988 fees during calendar year 2024. See U.S. Virgin Islands Addendum Response at 4-7.

<sup>107</sup> FCC Questionnaire, Section C, Question 1b.

<sup>108</sup> California Response at 4; Colorado Response at 4; Colorado Addendum Response at 4; Delaware Response at 4; Maryland Response at 4; Minnesota Response at 4; Nevada Response at 4-5; Oregon Response at 4; Washington Addendum Response at 4-5.

<sup>109</sup> Virginia Response at 4.

<sup>110</sup> See California Response at 4 (B3); Cal. Gov’t Code § 53123.4(c) (“The office, in consultation with the State Department of Health Care Services, may adopt regulations regarding how funds received shall be disseminated to support the operations of the 988 system and related behavioral health crisis services.”); *id.* § 53123.1.5(f) (defining “office” as the California “Office of Emergency Services”).

<sup>111</sup> California Response at 5 (C1b).

<sup>112</sup> *Id.*

<sup>113</sup> *Id.*

<sup>114</sup> See California Response at 4 (B3); Cal. Gov’t Code § 53123.4(d) (Deering 2024) (“The office shall require an entity seeking funds available through the 988 Suicide and Behavioral Health Crisis Services Fund to annually file an expenditure and outcomes report in a form and manner as determined by the office and the State Department of Health Care Services.”). California’s statute provides that the “expenditure and outcomes report shall include, but is not limited to, the following: (1) The total budget. (2) Number and job classification of personnel. (3) The number of individuals served. (4) The outcomes for individuals served, if known. (5) The health coverage status of individuals served, if known . . . (8) The number of individuals who used the service and self-identified as veterans or active military personnel, if known.”). *Id.* § 53123.4(d)(1)-(5), (8).

<sup>115</sup> California Response at 4 (B3).

for operation of the 988 crisis hotline.”<sup>116</sup> The state’s “988 crisis hotline enterprise” authorizes expenditures from the “988 crisis hotline cash fund,” which “must align with statutory requirements for the program.”<sup>117</sup> Pursuant to state statute, the Colorado “988 crisis hotline enterprise” is responsible for using revenue from collected 988 charges “to fund the 988 crisis hotline and provide crisis outreach, stabilization, and acute care to individuals calling the 988 crisis hotline.”<sup>118</sup> The Colorado “988 crisis hotline enterprise” is also authorized to engage the services of third-party crisis vendors “to provide crisis outreach, stabilization, acute care, and marketing for the 988 crisis hotline.”<sup>119</sup>

35. *Delaware* reported that the state’s Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health (Delaware DSAMH) has regulatory authority to determine “how 988 surcharge funds are requested,” and has adopted “an internal application process for all 988 surcharge fund disbursement requests.”<sup>120</sup> According to Delaware, “[d]isbursements from the [state’s] fund must align” with expenditure categories set forth under state statute.<sup>121</sup> Additionally, Delaware’s Behavioral Health Crisis Intervention Services Board must make annual recommendations to “the Governor and General Assembly, consistent with the purposes for expenditures” set forth under state statute “for appropriating moneys expected to be received in the next fiscal year.”<sup>122</sup> Moreover, pursuant to state statute, Delaware DSAMH “may not expend the moneys in the [state’s Behavioral Health Crisis Intervention Services Fund] except under an appropriation authorized in the annual appropriation act or annual bond and capital improvement act.”<sup>123</sup>

36. *Maryland* responded that the state’s Department of Health administers a “9-8-8 Trust Fund” and has authority to “approve the allocation of funds to 988 and other aspects directly related to the operation of Maryland’s crisis system.”<sup>124</sup> Pursuant to state statute, Maryland’s “9-8-8 Trust Fund” provides “reimbursement for costs associated with . . . [d]esignating and maintaining 9-8-8 as the universal telephone number” for the Lifeline and “[d]eveloping and implementing a statewide initiative for the coordination and delivery of the continuum of behavioral health crisis response services in the

---

<sup>116</sup> Colorado Response at 4 (B3); Colorado Addendum Response at 4 (B3); *see also* Colo. Rev. Stat. § 27-64-103 (2024) (describing the 988 crisis hotline enterprise).

<sup>117</sup> Colorado Response at 5 (D1).

<sup>118</sup> Col. Rev. Stat. § 27-64-103(1) (2024); *see also id.* § 27-64-102(1) (defining “988 crisis hotline” to mean “a state-identified hotline participating in the national suicide prevention lifeline network to respond to statewide or regional behavioral health crisis calls”).

<sup>119</sup> *See id.* § 27-64-103(4) (2024) (describing the 988 crisis hotline enterprise’s primary powers and duties).

<sup>120</sup> Delaware Response at 3-4 (B3); *see also* Del. Code Ann. tit. 16, § 10214A (“The Division and the Department of Services for Children, Youth and Their Families may adopt regulations or policies and procedures to administer, enforce, and implement this subchapter.”); *id.* § 10201A(9) (defining “Division” as the Delaware “Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health of the Department of Health and Social Services”). Delaware did not provide more specific details about the internal application process. *See generally* Delaware Response.

<sup>121</sup> Delaware Response at 4 (C1b). At Section C, Question 1b, which asked for a description of any limitations on approval authority, Delaware reported, “Disbursements from the fund must align one or more of the allowable expenditure categories described in 16 *Del. C.* § 10213A(b).”

<sup>122</sup> *Id.*

<sup>123</sup> Delaware Response at 4 (C1b). At Section C, Question 1b, which asked respondents to identify any limitations on approval authority, Delaware identified Title 16, Section 10213A(b) of the Delaware Code. As detailed elsewhere in Section 10213A, “The Division may not expend the moneys in the Fund except under an appropriation authorized in the annual appropriation act or annual bond and capital improvement act.” Del. Code Ann. tit. 16, § 10213A(a); *see also id.* § 10201A(9) (defining “Division” to mean the Delaware “Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health of the Department of Health and Social Services”); § 10201A(10) (defining “Fund” as the “Behavioral Health Crisis Intervention Services Fund”).

<sup>124</sup> *See* Maryland Response at 4 (C1b); Md. Code Ann., Health-Gen. § 7.5-5A-02(c) (2024) (providing that the “Department shall administer the Fund”).

State.”<sup>125</sup> The “continuum of behavioral health crises response services” include costs associated with crisis call centers, mobile crisis team services, crisis stabilization centers, and other acute behavioral health care services.<sup>126</sup>

37. *Minnesota* responded that collected “988 telecommunication fees” are deposited into a dedicated “988 special revenue account” to “create and maintain a statewide 988 suicide and crisis lifeline,”<sup>127</sup> which the state uses “for operational and administrative costs associated with 988 services.”<sup>128</sup> The “988 special revenue account” is administered by the state’s commissioner of health.<sup>129</sup>

38. *Nevada* reported that only the state (or political subdivision) has the authority to approve the expenditure of fees collected for 988 purposes, and there are no limitations on such authority.<sup>130</sup> Nevada’s Division of Public and Behavioral Health administers the state’s Crisis Response Account<sup>131</sup> and collected 988 “surcharges” are made available “through the Crisis Response System in operations for suicide prevention, mental health crisis hotline and services provided to persons who access the hotlines.”<sup>132</sup>

39. *Oregon* responded that only the state (or political subdivision) has the authority to approve the expenditure of fees collected for 988 purposes, and there are no limitations on such authority.<sup>133</sup> Oregon also reported that “[a]ll 988 related funding is paid into a trust fund, including revenues from the 988 telecom tax, legislative appropriations, [and] federal funding,”<sup>134</sup> which the Oregon Health Authority then disburses to pay 988 call centers, and any “[r]emaining funds may be used to pay for Mobile Crisis Intervention Services.”<sup>135</sup> Oregon’s statute also provides that “[m]oneys in the 9-8-8 Trust Fund are continuously appropriated to the Oregon Health Authority.”<sup>136</sup>

---

<sup>125</sup> Md. Code Ann., Health-Gen. § 7.5-5A-02(b).

<sup>126</sup> *Id.* § 7.5-5A-02(b)(2).

<sup>127</sup> See Minnesota Response at 4 (B3) (citing Minn. Stat. § 145.561, subd. 3); Minn. Stat. § 145.561, subd. 3(a) (stating that “[a] 988 special revenue account is established as a dedicated account in the special revenue fund to create and maintain a statewide 988 suicide and crisis lifeline system”).

<sup>128</sup> Minnesota Response at 4 (B3).

<sup>129</sup> See Minnesota Response at 4 (B3); Minn. Stat. § 145.561, subd. 3(c) (“The account shall be administered by the commissioner.”); *id.* § 145.561, subd. 1(b) (defining “commissioner” to mean “the [Minnesota] commissioner of health”).

<sup>130</sup> Nevada Response at 4-5 (C1, C1b). At Section C, Question 1, Nevada checked “Yes” in the “State (or political subdivision)” category, and “No” in the “Local” category. Nevada reported “None” at Section C, Question 1b, which asked for a description of any limitations on the approval authority per jurisdiction.

<sup>131</sup> See Nev. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 433.708(3) (“The Division shall administer the Account.”).

<sup>132</sup> Nevada Response at 4 (B3).

<sup>133</sup> Oregon Response at 4 (C1, C1b). At Section C, Question 1, Oregon checked “Yes” in the “State (or political subdivision)” category, and “No” in the “Local” category. Oregon responded “No applicable limitations” at Section C, Question 1b.

<sup>134</sup> Oregon Response at 4 (B3); see also Or. Rev. Stat. § 430.624 (describing the state’s “9-8-8 Trust Fund” and noting that “[m]oneys in the [fund] are continuously appropriated to the Oregon Health Authority”).

<sup>135</sup> Oregon Response at 4 (B3).

<sup>136</sup> Or. Rev. Stat. § 430.624(2) (“Moneys in the 9-8-8 Trust Fund are continuously appropriated to the Oregon Health Authority for the purposes specified in ORS 430.627 and 430.628.”).

40. *Virginia* reported that both the state (or political subdivision) and local jurisdictions have authority to approve the expenditure of 988 fees.<sup>137</sup> Virginia’s Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services (DBHDS) administers the state’s crisis call center,<sup>138</sup> and disbursements from the Crisis Call Center Fund “are made by the State Treasurer on warrants issued by the Comptroller upon written request signed by” the Commissioner of DBHDS.<sup>139</sup> Virginia reported that collected “funds are disbursed to Community Services Boards representing their region to contract with a 988 crisis call center,” which then uses the “funds to enhance their program and act as the primary answering point for that area.”<sup>140</sup>

41. *Washington* reported that the State Legislature is the only entity that has authority to appropriate 988 funds.<sup>141</sup> According to Washington, the 2021 State budget, which was passed at the time of the state’s implementation of the 988 tax, “appropriated funding to accountable parties, identified the fund source supporting the work, and detailed funding requirements.”<sup>142</sup> Washington’s 2021 State budget went into effect in July 2021, and “the entities allocated 988 tax revenue to support activities were able to begin spending as revenue began accruing.”<sup>143</sup> The state’s “enacted budget and subsequent enacted budgets ultimately authorize statewide spending.”<sup>144</sup>

42. *Mandated Use.* The Bureau also sought information on whether states and other reporting entities had established a funding mechanism that mandates how collected 988 fees may be used.<sup>145</sup> Of the respondents that reported collecting and distributing 988 fees during calendar year 2024, eight states—California, Colorado, Delaware, Minnesota, Nevada, Oregon, Virginia, and Washington—responded that they have a mechanism mandating how collected 988 fees may be used,<sup>146</sup> whereas one state—Maryland—reported it has no such mechanism.<sup>147</sup>

---

<sup>137</sup> See Virginia Response at 4 (C1). In response to Section C, Question 1, Virginia checked “Yes” for both State and Local approval authority. Virginia did not provide a response to Section C, Question 1b, which asked respondents to briefly describe any limitations on the approval authority per jurisdiction (e.g., limited to fees collected by the entity, limited to wireline or wireless service, etc.).

<sup>138</sup> See Virginia Response at 3 (B1a) (providing a citation to the legal authority for the funding mechanism via hyperlink); Va. Code Ann. § 37.2-311.2 (describing the department’s duties in administering the Commonwealth’s crisis call center); see also *id.* § 37.2-100 (defining “department” to mean the “Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services”); § 37.2-311.1(A) (defining “crisis call center” to mean “a call center that provides crisis intervention that meets NSPL [National Suicide Prevention Lifeline] standards for risk assessment and engagement and the requirements of § 37.2-311.2”).

<sup>139</sup> See Va. Code Ann. § 37.2-311.4 (“Expenditures and disbursements from the Fund shall be made by the State Treasurer on warrants issued by the Comptroller upon written request signed by the Commissioner.”); *id.* § 37.2-100 (defining “Commissioner” to mean “the Commissioner of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services”).

<sup>140</sup> Virginia Response at 4 (B3).

<sup>141</sup> Washington Addendum Response at 4 (C1b).

<sup>142</sup> Washington Addendum Response at 4 (B3); see also, e.g., Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 82.86.020.

<sup>143</sup> See Washington Addendum Response at 4 (B3) (referencing Washington’s 2021 Operating Budget and providing a hyperlink to S.B. 5902, 67th Leg. Reg. Sess. (Wash 2021)).

<sup>144</sup> Washington Addendum Response at 4 (B3).

<sup>145</sup> FCC Questionnaire, Section C, Question 2.

<sup>146</sup> California Response at 5; Colorado Response at 5; Colorado Addendum Response at 5; Delaware Response at 4; Maryland Response at 4-5; Minnesota Response at 5; Nevada Response at 5; Oregon Response at 5; Virginia Response at 4-5; Washington Addendum Response at 5.

<sup>147</sup> Maryland Response at 4-5. As noted below, Maryland reported that the fees are allocated “based on the costs to fully support and fund” the state’s 988 system. See *infra* para. 46.

43. *California* reported, pursuant to state statute, that revenue collected from the state’s “988 surcharge . . . shall be used solely for the operations of the 988 center and mobile crisis teams as defined in the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021.”<sup>148</sup> California continues to prioritize expenditures of collected “988 surcharges” by first funding “988 centers, including the efficient and effective routing of telephone calls, personnel, and the provision of acute behavioral health services through telephone call, text, and chat to the 988 number,”<sup>149</sup> followed by “the operation of mobile crisis teams accessed via telephone calls, texts, or chats made to or routed through 988.”<sup>150</sup> Additionally, the 988 surcharge revenue must be used to “supplement, not supplant, federal, state, and local funding for 988 centers and behavioral crisis services” and may only be used for “service and operation expenses that are not reimbursable through Medicaid federal financial participation, Medicare, health care service plans, or disability insurers.”<sup>151</sup> California’s state revenue and taxation code also provides that before disbursing funds from the “988 State Suicide and Behavioral Health Crisis Services Fund” for these specified purposes, the funds must be used to pay the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration “for the cost of the administration of the 988 surcharge,” and “to pay other state departments for their costs in administration of the 988 Suicide & Crisis Lifeline.”<sup>152</sup>

44. *Colorado* reported that the state has established a funding mechanism that mandates how collected 988 fees may be used and identified Section 40-17.5-102 of the Colorado Revised Code as the legal citation for such criteria,<sup>153</sup> which provides that 988 surcharges are collected to fund the “988 crisis hotline enterprise” as described in Section D above.<sup>154</sup>

45. *Delaware* responded that the state has established a funding mechanism that mandates how collected 988 fees may be used and identified Title 16, Section 10213A(b) of the Delaware Code as the legal authority governing such expenditures.<sup>155</sup> Section 10213A(b) of the Delaware Code identifies several purposes for which “[m]oneys in the [state’s Behavioral Health Crisis Intervention Services Fund] may be expended.”<sup>156</sup> The permissible categories of expenditures that specifically reference 988 include “[e]stablishing, operating, maintaining, and improving 988” and “[r]aising public awareness of 988.”<sup>157</sup> Moreover, pursuant to state statute, Delaware DSAMH “may not expend the moneys in the [state’s

---

<sup>148</sup> See California Response at 5 (C2a) (providing legal citations to the funding mechanism that mandates how collected 988 fees can be used); Cal. Gov’t Code § 53123.4(b)(1). California defines “988 center” to mean “a center operating on a county or regional basis in California and participating in the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline network to respond to statewide or regional 988 calls.” Cal. Gov’t Code § 53123.1.5(b).

<sup>149</sup> See Cal. Gov’t Code § 53123.4(b)(2)(A) (Deering 2024).

<sup>150</sup> *Id.* § 53123.4(b)(2)(B) (“Second, the operation of mobile crisis teams accessed via telephone calls, texts, or chats made to or routed through 988 as specified under Section 4(a)(2)(B) of [the 988 Act].”).

<sup>151</sup> *Id.* § 53123.4(b)(5)-(6).

<sup>152</sup> See California Response at 5 (C2a); Cal. Rev. & Tax Code § 41136(b).

<sup>153</sup> See Colorado Response at 5 (C2, C2a). Colorado checked “Yes” in response to Section C, Question 2, which asked whether the state established a funding mechanism that mandates how collected 988 fees may be used. At Section C, Question 2a, Colorado identified the legal citation to the funding mechanism for any such criteria as “C.R.S. 40-17.5-102.” *Id.*

<sup>154</sup> See Colorado Response at 5 (C2a); Col. Rev. Stat. § 40-17.5-102 (988 surcharge collection rules).

<sup>155</sup> Delaware Response at 4 (C2a) (“16 *Del. C.* § 10213A(b) outlines the permissible categories of expenditures for which the fund may be utilized.”).

<sup>156</sup> Del. Code Ann. tit. 16, § 10213A(b) (listing permitted expenditures “in furtherance of the administration of” Delaware Code Chapter 102A, entitled “988 Behavioral Health Crisis Intervention Services”). The permissible purposes identified by Delaware’s state statute are detailed below in Section E.

<sup>157</sup> See Delaware Response 5 (D1); Del. Code Ann. tit. 16, § 10213A(b)(1), (5).

Behavioral Health Crisis Intervention Services Fund] except under an appropriation authorized in the annual appropriation act or annual bond and capital improvement act.”<sup>158</sup>

46. *Maryland* reported that the state has not established a funding mechanism mandating how collected 988 fees can be used,<sup>159</sup> and explained that its funding mechanism uses “a procurement (internal) process outlined in a condition of award.”<sup>160</sup> Maryland’s Department of Health allocates fees “based on the costs to fully support and fund” the state’s 988 system, as well as the call volume of individual call centers.<sup>161</sup> Pursuant to state legislation, the “9-8-8 Trust Fund” may only be used to carry out the purposes of the fund and for “related administrative expenses” of the state’s Comptroller.<sup>162</sup> Moreover, expenditures may only be made “in accordance with the State budget.”<sup>163</sup>

47. *Minnesota* reported that, pursuant to state statute, all “988 telecommunications fee revenue must be used to supplement, and not supplant, federal, state, and local funding for suicide prevention.”<sup>164</sup> Additionally, the state’s 988 special revenue account “shall only be used to offset costs that are or may reasonably be attributed to: (1) implementing, maintaining, and improving the 988 suicide and crisis lifeline, including staff and technology infrastructure enhancements needed to achieve the operational standards and best practices set forth by the 988 administrator and the [Minnesota Department of Health]; (2) data collection, reporting, participation in evaluations, public promotion, and related quality improvement activities as required by the 988 administrator and the [Minnesota Department of Health]; and (3) administration, oversight, and evaluation of the account.”<sup>165</sup>

48. *Nevada* reported that, pursuant to state statute, the Nevada Division of Public and Behavioral Health must use “available funds and expenditures” to support: (1) the “implementation of a hotline for persons who are considering suicide, or in a behavioral health crisis event” that may be accessed by dialing 988;” (2) the establishment of “at least one support center that meets the requirements set by the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline Program;” (3) the “provision of crisis stabilization services at hospitals that hold crisis stabilizations center endorsements;” and (4) the establishment of “a mobile crisis team.”<sup>166</sup>

---

<sup>158</sup> Delaware Response at 4 (C1b). At Section C, Question 1b, which asked respondents to identify any limitations on approval authority, Delaware identified Title 16, Section 10213A(b) of the Delaware Code. As detailed elsewhere in Section 10213A, “The Division may not expend the moneys in the Fund except under an appropriation authorized in the annual appropriation act or annual bond and capital improvement act.” Del. Code Ann. tit. 16, § 10213A(a); *see also id.* § 10201A(9) (defining “division” to mean the Delaware “Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health of the Department of Health and Social Services”); *id.* § 10201A(10) (defining “Fund” as the “Behavioral Health Crisis Intervention Services Fund”).

<sup>159</sup> Maryland Response at 4-5. At Section C, Question 2, Maryland responded “No” as to whether the state has established a funding mechanism that mandates *how* collected 988 fees can be used.

<sup>160</sup> Maryland Response at 5 (C2b).

<sup>161</sup> *Id.*

<sup>162</sup> Md. Code Ann., Health-Gen. § 7.5-5A-02(f) (2024).

<sup>163</sup> *Id.* § 7.5-5A-02(h).

<sup>164</sup> *See* Minnesota Response at 5 (C2a) (citing Minn. Stat. § 145.561, subd. 4); Minn. Stat. § 145.561, subd. 4(e) (describing the “988 telecommunications fee”).

<sup>165</sup> *See* Minnesota Response at 4 (B3) (citing Minn. Stat. § 145.561, subd. 3); Minn. Stat. § 145.561, subd. 3 (describing the “988 special revenue account”); *id.* § 145.561, subd. 1(c) (defining “Department” as the Minnesota “Department of Health”).

<sup>166</sup> *See* Nevada Response at 5 (C2a); Nev. Rev. Stat. § 433.708(3) (stating that the “Division” must use money in the Crisis Response Account to “carry out the provisions of NRS 433.702 to 433.710, inclusive, to the extent authorized by 47 U.S.C. § 251a”); *id.* § 433.704(1) (describing the duties of the Division and implementation of a hotline); *see also id.* § 433.084 (defining “Division”).

49. *Oregon* reported that, pursuant to state legislation, revenue from the state’s 988 “coordinated crisis services tax” shall be used only for the state’s “crisis call center system and crisis hotline center;” and, “to the extent that the crisis call center system and crisis hotline system are fully funded, the expansion and ongoing funding of mobile crisis intervention teams.”<sup>167</sup>

50. *Virginia’s* state statute provides that all revenues from collected prepaid and postpaid wireless 988 charges accrue to the “Crisis Call Center Fund” and “shall be used solely for the purposes of establishing and administrating the crisis call center.”<sup>168</sup> Additionally, “[e]xpenditures and disbursements from the Fund are made by the State Treasurer on warrants issued by the Comptroller upon written request signed by the Commissioner” of the Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services.<sup>169</sup>

51. *Washington* reported that expenditures from the state’s “988 behavioral health crisis response and suicide prevention line account” may only be used for: “(a) ensuring the efficient and effective routing of calls made to the 988-crisis hotline to an appropriate crisis hotline center or crisis call center hub; and (b) personnel and the provision of acute behavioral health, crisis outreach, and crisis stabilization services, by directly responding to the 988 crisis hotline.”<sup>170</sup>

**E. Description of Uses of Collected 988 Fees During Calendar Year 2024**

52. *Actual Uses of 988 Fees During Calendar Year 2024.* The Bureau asked states and other reporting entities to provide a statement identifying with specificity, for the annual period ending December 31, 2024, “all activities, programs, and organizations for whose benefit your state (or political subdivision), Indian Tribe, village, regional corporation, or other jurisdictional authority has obligated or expended fees collected for 988 purposes and how these activities, programs, and organizations support 988 services or enhancements of such services, consistent with the 988 Act.”<sup>171</sup>

---

<sup>167</sup> See Oregon Response at 5 (C2a) (referencing H.B. 2757, 82nd Leg. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (Or. 2023) (enrolled) via hyperlink); Or. Rev. Stat. § 430.627(2). At Section C, Question 2a, Oregon also provided information regarding the use of “[m]oneys other than revenues from the 9-8-8 coordinated crisis services tax that are deposited into the fund[.]” (emphasis added).

<sup>168</sup> See Virginia Response at 5 (C2a); Va. Code Ann. § 37.2-311.5(B); *id.* § 37.2-311.4 (establishing the state’s “Crisis Call Center Fund” and providing that “[m]oneys in the Fund shall be used solely for the purposes of establishing and administering the crisis call center pursuant to the provisions of §§ 37.2-311.1, 37.2-311.2, and 37.2-311.3”); see also § 37.2-311.1(A) (defining “crisis call center” as “a call center that provides crisis intervention that meets [National Suicide Prevention Lifeline (NSPL)] standards for risk assessment and engagement ant the requirements of § 37.2-311.2”); § 37.2-311.2 (describing the “powers and duties” of the crisis call center); § 37.2-311.3 (providing standards for community care teams and mobile crisis teams).

<sup>169</sup> See Va. Code Ann. § 37.2-311.4 (describing expenditures from the Commonwealth’s “Crisis Call Center Fund”); *id.* § 37.2-100 (defining “Commissioner” to mean “the Commissioner of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services”).

<sup>170</sup> Washington Addendum Response at 5 (C, C2a) (identifying “RCW 82.86” as the legal citation for the funding mechanism that mandates how 988 fees can be used). Under section 82.86.050 of the Washington Revised Code, expenditures from the account “may only be used for: (a) [e]nsuring the efficient and effective routing of calls made to the 988 crisis hotline to an appropriate crisis hotline center or designated 988 contact hub; (b) [p]ersonnel and the provision of acute behavioral health, crisis outreach, and crisis stabilization services, as defined in RCW 71.24.025, by directly responding to the 988 crisis hotline and enhancing mobile crisis service standards and performance provided through mobile rapid response crisis teams and community-based crisis teams endorsed under RCW 71.24.903.” Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 82.86.050(2) (as amended effective July 23, 2023).

<sup>171</sup> FCC Questionnaire, Section D, Question 1. The U.S. Virgin Islands did not respond to Section D, Question 1, and several states or other reporting entities responded “Unknown,” “N/A,” or similar. See California Valley Miwok Tribe Response at 5; Louisiana Response at 5; Puerto Rico Response at 5; U.S. Virgin Islands Response at 5; U.S. Virgin Islands Addendum Response at 5; Vermont Response at 5.

53. *California* reported that “the 988 State Suicide and Behavioral Health Crisis Services Fund was used for state operations (personnel) expenditures by CalOES, CalHHS, DHCS, and the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration” during calendar year 2024.<sup>172</sup> California also reported that “the fees allocated to [these] state entities . . . included a significant portion that was allocated to support local activities under the category ‘local assistance.’”<sup>173</sup>

54. *Colorado* responded that the state used 988 fees in calendar year 2024 to (1) “contract with the 988 hotline operator, supporting call center staff and capacity building,” (2) “988 crisis marketing,” (3) “data collection and evaluation,” and (4) “State administrative costs such as personnel and operating costs.”<sup>174</sup>

55. *Delaware* reported that “permissible categories of expenditures” from the state’s “Behavioral Health Crisis Intervention Services Fund” are set forth by state statute but did not specify whether collected surcharges were used for such purposes.<sup>175</sup> Under Section 10213A of the Delaware Code, money in the fund may be expended for any of the following purposes: “(1) Establishing, operating, maintaining, and improving 988 or crisis intervention services, including personnel costs, technology, and infrastructure enhancements necessary to achieve operational and clinical standards and evidence-based best practices. (2) Establishing, operating, or contracting for crisis teams for adults and children. (3) Recruiting and retaining qualified personnel. (4) Providing specialized training related to serving at-risk communities, including providing culturally and linguistically competent services. (5) Raising public awareness of 988, behavioral health crisis intervention services available in this State, and education on behavioral health conditions. (6) Data collection and analysis, reporting, evaluation participation, and related quality improvement activities. (7) Administration, oversight, and evaluation of the Fund. (8) Reimbursement of money appropriated by the General Assembly to implement this chapter. (9) Any other purpose authorized by the annual appropriation act or annual bond and capital improvement act.”<sup>176</sup>

56. *Maryland* reported that the state provided funding to nine 988 call centers in 2024<sup>177</sup> and described conditions of awards related to certain costs and expenses, as well as specific activities and programs listed in a “statement of work for each call center.”<sup>178</sup> Specifically, Maryland identified costs related to “988 program project management;” “staff recruitment, training and retention;” “behavioral health crisis hotline service provider” accreditation; equipment “associated with 988 staff or the 988 system in general;” and technology “associated with 988 care traffic control related improvements.”<sup>179</sup> Maryland also identified expenses related to “providing 988 call, text, or chat services, including phone system and interactive voice response (IVR) system provision;” “post-988 call related care coordination, follow-up services, and referral services;” data collection “related to 988 calls, texts, or chats or 988

---

<sup>172</sup> California Response at 5-6 (D1).

<sup>173</sup> California Response at 6 (D1). In its response to Section D, Question 1, California also reported, “State Operations = \$10.9M. Local Assistance = \$32.7M.” *Id.*

<sup>174</sup> Colorado Response at 8 (D1). At Section D, Question 1, Colorado also provided text from Section 27-64-103 of the Colorado Code. The complete questionnaire responses of all states and other reporting entities are available in ECFS (WC Docket No. 18-336).

<sup>175</sup> See Delaware Response at 4-5 (C2, D1); Del. Code Ann. tit. 16, § 10213A (describing disbursements from the state’s Behavioral Health Crisis Intervention Services Fund).

<sup>176</sup> Delaware Response at 5 (D1); Del. Code Ann. tit. 16, § 10213A(b).

<sup>177</sup> Maryland Response at 5 (D1). At Section D, Question 1, Maryland identified the 988 call centers as “Mental Health Association of Frederick County, EveryMind, Community Crisis Services Inc, Grassroots, Baltimore Crisis Services Inc, Baltimore Crisis Response Inc, Central Maryland Regional Crisis Systems, Eastern Shore Crisis Response, and LifeCrisis Inc.”

<sup>178</sup> See Maryland Response at 5-7 (D1).

<sup>179</sup> *Id.* at 5-6 (D1).

related activities;” “coordination of mobile crisis unit dispatch or warm handoff;” and “coordination of 911 call diversion to 988 for behavioral health crisis calls.”<sup>180</sup> The “statement of work” activities and programs included but were not limited to network agreements; call, text, and chat services; warm handoffs or referrals; follow-up conduct; quality assurance data; 988/911 collaboration; outreach and education; meeting participation; and cooperation with “MDH/BHA requests.”<sup>181</sup>

57. *Minnesota* reported that funds from the state’s 988 special revenue account were used “for operational and administrative costs associated with 988 services.”<sup>182</sup> During calendar year 2024, the state used collected 988 fees to support four 988 Lifeline centers, including staffing and technology, as well as “state administrative costs (personnel and operating costs).”<sup>183</sup> Minnesota also reported that the state’s 988 Lifeline centers were funded by grants using collected 988 fees, beginning September 1, 2024, which supported “operations and staffing.”<sup>184</sup>

58. *Nevada* reported that the state’s activities focused on recruiting or hiring “for state positions,” developing the state’s Crisis Response System program, evaluating community needs, and “planning for infrastructure and capacity to follow the requirements and regulations set forth” in relevant state and federal law.<sup>185</sup>

59. *Oregon* responded that the state distributed funds to two 988 call centers for “988 Lifeline service via call, text, and chat,” as well as to 36 counties for “Mobile Crisis Intervention Services” during calendar year 2024.<sup>186</sup>

60. *Virginia* reported that Community Services Boards (CSB) for Region 10, Planning District 1, Fairfax, and Western Tidewater, as well as the Richmond Behavioral Health Authority (RBHA), received funding “to contract with 988 call centers to enhance coverage and act as primary routing points for 988 calls.”<sup>187</sup> The CSBs for Region 10, Fairfax, and Western Tidewater, and the RBHA also “contract[ed] with PRS who enhanced training and staffing for their center[s].”<sup>188</sup> Additionally, “Planning District 1 contracted with Frontier Health to enhance staffing for 988 calls.”<sup>189</sup>

61. *Washington’s* Department of Health (DOH) received 988 tax revenue to implement the state’s “988 Crisis System Section,” including “program staffing, project management services, system support, training, committee support, program staff, program support staff, and contracts with [the state’s]

---

<sup>180</sup> *Id.*

<sup>181</sup> Maryland Response at 6-7 (D1). Maryland’s reference to “MDH/BHA” appears mean the state’s Department of Health and Behavioral Health Administration.

<sup>182</sup> Minnesota Response at 4 (B3).

<sup>183</sup> Minnesota Response at 5 (D1). At Section D, Question 1, Minnesota noted that fee collection began on September 1, 2024.

<sup>184</sup> Minnesota Response at 6 (D2a). At Section D, Question 2a, which requested information on grants paid for through the use of collected 988 fees, Minnesota responded, “The Minnesota 988 Suicide & Crisis Lifeline Center Grant program funds 988 centers to provide compassionate and confidential support for people accessing the 988 Lifeline in Minnesota. The grant supports 988 Lifeline Center operations and staffing. Minnesota awarded [four] 988 Lifeline Centers with this grant. Minnesota 988 Lifeline Centers are funded by grants using collected 988 fees, beginning September 1, 2024.”

<sup>185</sup> Nevada Response at 5 (D1). At Section D, Question 1, Nevada identified the state and federal law as S.B. 237, 82d Leg., Reg. Sess. (Nev. 2023); Nev. Rev. Stat. §§ “433.702-433.70 [sic];” and 47 U.S.C. § 251a.

<sup>186</sup> Oregon Response at 5 (D1). At Section D, Question 1, Oregon identified the two 988 call centers as “Lines for Life and Northwest Human Services.”

<sup>187</sup> Virginia Response at 5 (D1).

<sup>188</sup> *Id.*

<sup>189</sup> *Id.*

three 988 Suicide & Crisis Lifeline crisis centers.”<sup>190</sup> Washington DOH used these funds to support “crisis center capacity, infrastructure, and state program development.”<sup>191</sup> Additionally, the state appropriated 988 tax funds to the Washington Health Care Authority (HCA) to support planning for the information technology (IT) and technical components required by state legislation.<sup>192</sup> The Washington HCA used these funds for staff support “to collaborate with partners associated with the [state’s] Crisis Response Improvement Strategy Committee,” and to prepare “other deliverables” required by state legislation.<sup>193</sup>

62. Washington’s state statute and operational budget for the 2023-2025 biennium assigned DOH several key responsibilities, including routing 988 calls; managing call center contracts; funding operations, training, and call center information technology and program staff; participating in and providing support to the State’s Crisis Response Improvement Strategy (CRIS) Committee; and developing a Tribal crisis line.<sup>194</sup> Washington also appropriated supplemental funding “to enhance DOH’s capacity to route 988 calls and contract with call centers to support operations.”<sup>195</sup> Additionally, the Washington HCA was tasked with providing staff and contracted support to create a technical and operational plan; participating in the CRIS Committee; and collaborating with “managed care organizations, county authorities, and behavioral health administrative service organizations related to crisis services, and the development of processes and best practices for crisis services.”<sup>196</sup>

63. *Specific Expenditure Categories.* The Bureau also requested that respondents identify whether collected 988 fees were authorized to be used for specific expenditure categories, including: (1) operating costs for customer premises equipment, and the lease, purchase, or maintenance of buildings and facilities; (2) personnel costs (crisis counselors’ salaries and training); (3) administrative costs associated with program administration, administrative personnel, and travel expenses; (4) mobile dispatch costs, which are costs related to dispatching mobile crisis teams; and (5) grant programs paid for through the use of collected 988 fees.<sup>197</sup> Table 2 details the responses received from the nine states—California, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, Minnesota, Nevada, Oregon, Virginia, and Washington—that reported using collected 988 fees during calendar year 2024.<sup>198</sup>

64. With respect to operating costs, all nine states—California, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, Minnesota, Nevada, Oregon, Virginia, and Washington—responded that collected 988 fees may be used for operating costs associated with the lease, purchase, or maintenance of customer premises

---

<sup>190</sup> Washington Addendum Response at 6 (D1).

<sup>191</sup> *Id.*

<sup>192</sup> *Id.*

<sup>193</sup> *Id.*

<sup>194</sup> Washington Addendum Response at 5 (D1).

<sup>195</sup> *Id.*

<sup>196</sup> *Id.* at 6 (D1).

<sup>197</sup> FCC Questionnaire, Section D, Question 2. Vermont and the U.S. Virgin Islands did not respond to Section D, Question 2, but reported having established 988 funding mechanisms during CY 2024. See Vermont Response at 3, 5-6; U.S. Virgin Islands Addendum Response at 3, 5-6. Several other reporting entities responded “unknown,” “N/A,” or “No.” See California Valley Miwok Tribe Response at 5-6; Northway Village Response at 5-6; Puerto Rico Response at 5-6.

<sup>198</sup> See California Response at 6; Colorado Response at 8; Colorado Addendum Response at 8; Delaware Response at 5-6; Maryland Response at 7; Minnesota Response at 5-6; Nevada Response at 6; Oregon Response at 6-7; Virginia Response at 5-6; Washington Addendum Response at 6-7.

**Federal Communications Commission**

equipment.<sup>199</sup> Eight states—California, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, Minnesota, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington—reported that collected 988 fees may also be used for operating costs associated with the lease, purchase, or maintenance of buildings or facilities;<sup>200</sup> whereas, Virginia responded that these costs are not an allowed use of collected 988 fees.<sup>201</sup> With respect to mobile dispatch costs, eight states—California, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, Nevada, Oregon, Virginia, and Washington—reported that collected 988 fees may be used for costs related to dispatch (e.g., equipment) or mobile crisis teams;<sup>202</sup> whereas, Minnesota responded that these costs are not an allowed use of collected 988 fees.<sup>203</sup> All nine states indicated that 988 fees may be used for personnel and administrative costs.<sup>204</sup>

**Table 2 – Allowed Uses of Collected 988 Fees During Calendar Year 2024**

State	Operating Costs		Personnel Costs		Administrative Costs			Mobile Dispatch Costs	Grants
	Lease, purchase, maintenance of CPE (hardware and software)	Lease, purchase, maintenance of building/facilities	Crisis counselor’s salaries	Training of crisis counselors	Program admin.	Travel	Admin. personnel	Costs related to dispatch (e.g., equipment) of mobile crisis teams	Grants paid for through the use of 988 fees
CA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
CO	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
DE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
MN	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
NV	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
OR	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
VA	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
WA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

65. *Grants.* The Bureau requested information on grants that states or other reporting entities paid for through the use of collected 988 fees during calendar year 2024, and the purposes of such grants.<sup>205</sup> Three states—Delaware, Minnesota, and Oregon—responded that grants may be paid for through the use of 988 fees;<sup>206</sup> whereas, six states—California, Colorado, Maryland, Nevada, Virginia, and Washington—indicated that grant programs were not allowed uses of collected 988 fees during

<sup>199</sup> California Response at 6; Colorado Response at 8; Colorado Addendum Response at 8; Delaware Response at 5; Maryland Response at 7; Minnesota Response at 6; Nevada Response at 6; Oregon Response at 6; Virginia Response at 5; Washington Addendum Response at 6.

<sup>200</sup> California Response at 6; Colorado Response at 8; Colorado Addendum Response at 8; Delaware Response at 5; Maryland Response at 7; Minnesota Response at 6; Nevada Response at 6; Oregon Response at 6; Washington Addendum Response at 6.

<sup>201</sup> Virginia Response at 5.

<sup>202</sup> California Response at 6; Colorado Response at 8; Colorado Addendum Response at 8; Delaware Response at 6; Maryland Response at 7; Nevada Response at 6; Oregon Response at 6; Virginia Response at 6; Washington Addendum Response at 7.

<sup>203</sup> Minnesota Response at 6.

<sup>204</sup> California Response at 6; Colorado Response at 8; Colorado Addendum Response at 8; Delaware Response at 6; Maryland Response at 7; Minnesota Response at 6; Nevada Response at 6; Oregon Response at 6-7; Virginia Response at 5-6; Washington Addendum Response at 6-7.

<sup>205</sup> FCC Questionnaire, Section D, Question 2-2a.

<sup>206</sup> Delaware Response at 6; Minnesota Response at 6; Oregon Response at 7.

**Federal Communications Commission**

calendar year 2024.<sup>207</sup> Table 3 details the descriptions of any grants paid for through the use of collected 988 fees during calendar year 2024.<sup>208</sup>

**Table 3 – Grants Paid for Through the Use of Collected 988 Fees Calendar Year 2024**

State	Description and Purpose of Grants Paid for Through the Use of Collected 988 Fees During Calendar Year 2024
<b>DE</b>	“Community based grant programs were not paid for through the use of 988 fees from 01/01/2024 – 12/31/2024, however they are an allowable expenditure as long as they align with the permissible categories.”
<b>MN</b>	“The Minnesota 988 Suicide & Crisis Lifeline Center Grant program funds 988 centers to provide compassionate and confidential support for people accessing the 988 Lifeline in Minnesota. The grant supports 988 Lifeline Center operations and staffing. Minnesota awarded [four] 988 Lifeline Centers with this grant. Minnesota 988 Lifeline Centers are funded by grants using collected 988 fees, beginning September 1, 2024.”
<b>OR</b>	“There were no applicable grants paid for through the use of collected 988 fees in 2024[.]”

66. *Other Allowed Uses.* The questionnaire also requested that states and other reporting entities describe any other allowed uses for collected 988 fees during calendar year 2024 other than for specific expenditure categories or grants.<sup>209</sup> Five states—California, Maryland, Minnesota, Virginia, and Washington—responded that there were no other allowed uses for collected 988 fees during calendar year 2024.<sup>210</sup> Four states—Colorado, Delaware, Nevada, and Oregon—reported other allowed uses of collected 988 fees during calendar year 2024.<sup>211</sup> Table 4 details states’ descriptions of the other allowed uses.

**Table 4 – Other Allowed Uses of 988 Fees During Calendar Year 2024**

State	Descriptions of Any Other Costs Reporting Entity Allowed for Use of Collected 988 Fees During Calendar Year 2024
<b>CO</b>	“The 988 Board and the State issue procurements and contracts to administer services that cover the personnel,

<sup>207</sup> California Response at 6; Colorado Response at 8-9; Colorado Addendum Response at 8-9; Maryland Response at 7-8; Nevada Response at 6; Virginia Response at 6; Washington Addendum Response at 7.

<sup>208</sup> FCC Questionnaire, Section D, Question 2a. Virginia and the U.S. Virgin Islands did not respond to Section D, Question 2a, but reported having established 988 funding mechanisms during calendar year 2024. *See* Virginia Response at 3, 6; U.S. Virgin Islands Addendum Response at 3, 6. Several states or other reporting entities responded “N/A,” “Not Applicable,” “Unknown,” or similar. *See* California Valley Miwok Tribe Response at 6; California Response at 6; Colorado Response at 8-9; Colorado Addendum Response at 8-9; Louisiana Response at 6; Maryland Response at 7-8; Nevada Response at 6; Puerto Rico Response at 6; Vermont Response at 6; Washington Addendum Response at 7.

<sup>209</sup> FCC Questionnaire, Section D, Question 2b. Minnesota, Virginia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands did not respond to Section D, Question 2b, but reported having established 988 funding mechanisms during calendar year 2024. *See* Minnesota Response at 3, 6; Virginia Response at 3, 6; U.S. Virgin Islands Addendum Response at 3, 6. Several states or other reporting entities responded “Unknown,” “N/A,” or similar. *See* California Response at 6; California Valley Miwok Tribe Response at 6; Colorado Response at 9; Colorado Addendum Response at 9; Louisiana Response at 6; Maryland Response at 8; Nevada Response at 6; Puerto Rico Response at 6; Vermont Response at 6; Virginia Response at 6; Washington Addendum Response at 7.

<sup>210</sup> California Response at 6-7; Maryland Response at 8; Minnesota Response at 6; Virginia Response at 6; Washington Addendum Response at 7.

<sup>211</sup> Colorado Response at 8-9; Colorado Addendum Response at 8-9; Delaware Response at 6; Nevada Response at 6-7; Oregon Response at 7.

**Federal Communications Commission**

	operating, infrastructure and administrative costs for the 988 contact center. Additionally, marketing costs and data and evaluation are also covered. Finally, State personnel, operating and administration are covered by the fund.” <sup>212</sup>
<b>DE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Recruiting and retaining qualified personnel.</li> <li>- Raising public awareness of 988, behavioral health crisis intervention services available in this State, and education on behavioral health conditions.</li> <li>- Data collection and analysis, reporting, evaluation participation, and related quality improvement activities.</li> <li>- Reimbursement of money appropriated by the General Assembly to implement this chapter.</li> <li>- Any other purpose authorized by the annual appropriation act or annual bond and capital improvement act.”</li> </ul>
<b>NV</b>	“The State is presently undertaking comprehensive planning, development, and needs assessment processes in strict compliance with the statutory requirements and allowable expenditures as delineated in Senate Bill 237, Nevada Revised Statutes Sections 433.702 through 433.70, and Title 47 of the United States Code, Section 251a.”
<b>OR</b>	“To the extent that call center activities are fully funded, HB 2757 permits expenditure of 988 trust fund dollars on mobile crisis or stabilization services as described above[.]” <sup>213</sup>

**F. Description of the Total Amount of 988 Fees Collected During Calendar Year 2024**

67. *Total Amount of 988 Fees Collected During Calendar Year 2024.* The Bureau asked states and other reporting entities to report the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees by service type, including wireline, wireless, VoIP, prepaid wireless, and any other service-based fees.<sup>214</sup> Table 5 shows the total amount of 988 fees collected by respondents that reported collecting 988 fees during calendar year 2024.<sup>215</sup> The estimated total 988 fees that the states reported collecting ranged from an estimated low of \$3,387,491.00 by Minnesota to an estimated high of \$46,696,385.73 by Washington.<sup>216</sup> As detailed in Table 5, five states—Colorado, Minnesota, Oregon, Virginia, and Washington—provided specific details regarding the total amount of 988 fees collected by service type,<sup>217</sup> whereas four states—California, Delaware, Maryland, and Nevada—did not.<sup>218</sup>

<sup>212</sup> Colorado’s reference to “fund” at Section D, Question 2b appears to mean the “988 crisis hotline cash fund” described elsewhere in its questionnaire response and state statute. *See, e.g.*, Colorado Response at 4; Colorado Addendum Response at 4 (referencing the state’s “988 crisis hotline cash fund”); Col. Rev. Stat. § 27-64-104(1) (“The 988 crisis hotline cash fund, referred to in this section as the ‘fund,’ is created in the state treasury.”).

<sup>213</sup> Oregon’s reference to “as described above” appears to mean the state’s response to Section C, Question 2a regarding mandated use of collected 988 fees, which is discussed in Section D above.

<sup>214</sup> FCC Questionnaire, Section E, Question 2. The U.S. Virgin Islands did not respond to Section E, Question 2, and several other states or reporting entities responded “Unknown,” “None,” or similar. *See* California Valley Miwok Tribe Response at 7; Northway Village Response at 7; Puerto Rico Response at 7; U.S. Virgin Islands Addendum Response at 7; Vermont Response at 7.

<sup>215</sup> California Response at 7-8; Colorado Response at 9-10; Colorado Addendum Response at 9-10; Delaware Response at 7; Maryland Response at 8-9; Minnesota Response at 7; Nevada Response at 7-8; Oregon Response at 8; Virginia Response at 7; Washington Addendum Response at 8. Vermont reported that an amount could not be provided because “[n]o funds were collected and used for the purposes of 988 in calendar year 2024.” *See* Vermont Response at 7.

<sup>216</sup> Minnesota Response at 7; Washington Addendum Response at 8.

<sup>217</sup> *See* Colorado Response at 9-10; Colorado Addendum Response at 9-10; Minnesota Response at 7; Oregon Response at 8; Virginia Response at 7; Washington Addendum Response at 8.

<sup>218</sup> *See* California Response at 7-8; Delaware Response at 7; Maryland Response at 8-9; Nevada Response at 7-8.

**Federal Communications Commission**

**Table 5 – Total Amount of Collected 988 Fees by Service Type for Calendar Year 2024**

State	Wireline	Wireless	Prepaid	VoIP	Other	Total
CA <sup>219</sup>	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$44,276,000.00
CO <sup>220</sup>	\$708,978.58	\$9,980,277.58	\$1,433,549.66	\$1,742,466.10	\$706,779.00	\$14,572,050.92
DE <sup>221</sup>	“Unknown”	“Unknown”	“Unknown”	“N/A”	“N/A”	\$9,212,568.86
MD	[No Response]	See Note <sup>222</sup>	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$4,812,066.00 <sup>223</sup>
MN	\$1,324,476.00	\$1,682,682.00	\$300,031.00	\$71,447.00	\$8,855.00	\$3,387,491.00
NV	“Unknown **”	“Unknown **”	“Unknown **”	“Unknown **”	“Unknown **”	\$14,858,677.80 <sup>224</sup>
OR <sup>225</sup>	[No Response]	\$18,200,000.00	\$3,000,000.00	\$2,400,000.00	\$1,300,000.00	\$24,800,000.00
VA	[No Response]	\$11,168,315.67	\$1,073,606.70	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$12,241,922.37
WA	\$2,420,234.53	\$34,278,683.69	\$4,474,344.44	\$5,523,123.07	[No Response]	\$46,696,385.73

68. *Sequestered Account.* The Bureau asked states and other reporting entities whether collected 988 fees were held in a sequestered account to be obligated or expended only in support of 988 services, or enhancements of such services.<sup>226</sup> Of the respondents that reported collecting 988 fees during

<sup>219</sup> At Section E, Question 2a, which asked states and other reporting entities to explain why an amount could not be provided, California reported, “Revenues were remitted as a single total without Service Type category details.” California Response at 8.

<sup>220</sup> At Section E, Question 2, Colorado reported “\$9,980,277,58” as the amount collected for wireless fees. Based on the total amount of fees reported, Colorado appears to have replaced a comma for a decimal point. See Colorado Response at 9-10; Colorado Addendum Response at 9-10.

<sup>221</sup> At Section E, Question 2a, Delaware responded, “A cost breakdown is unavailable. Delaware Department of Finance reports the total amount of 988 surcharge fees collected, however this does not include distinction of service type.” Delaware Response at 7.

<sup>222</sup> At Section E, Question 2, Maryland reported collecting a total amount of “\$4,812,066” under the category for wireless fees. However, at Section E, Question 2a, Maryland responded, “Please note that we do not have a breakout of wireline verses wireless. The total amount collected is placed in the ‘wireless’ category above. Additionally, our telecom fee law started Oct[.] 2024. Therefore the amount reported only represents three months of collections for calendar year 2024.” Maryland Response at 9.

<sup>223</sup> Maryland did not provide an entry for the total amount of fees collected, but did explain at Section E, Question 2a, that the total amount of fees was equal to the amount reported for wireless fees, which Bureau staff has placed in Table 5 for Maryland. See Maryland Response at 9 (E2-2a).

<sup>224</sup> At Section E, Question 2a, Nevada reported that the state could not accurately determine the total amount of collected 988 fees by service type for calendar year 2024 due to the state’s data collection methods. Nevada Response at 8. However, Nevada’s “Crisis Response System program staff are in the process of revising the reporting and data collection forms to be implemented for the 2025 calendar year, with the aim of enhancing reporting accuracy and data quality[.]” *Id.*

<sup>225</sup> The Bureau notes that the sum of the 988 fees reported by Oregon under the wireless, prepaid wireless, VoIP, and Other – Interest categories does not equal the reported total amount collected. At Section E, Question 2a, Oregon reported that “[t]he split across service type is approximate for reasons such as exemptions applied without specification of service type.” Oregon Response at 8.

<sup>226</sup> FCC Questionnaire, Section E, Question 2b. The U.S. Virgin Islands did not respond to Section E, Question 2b. See U.S. Virgin Islands Addendum Response at 8. California Valley Miwok Tribe, Vermont, and Puerto Rico responded “Unknown,” “N/A,” or similar. See California Valley Miwok Tribe Response at 7; Vermont Response at 7-8; Puerto Rico Response at 7.

**Federal Communications Commission**

calendar year 2024, eight states—California, Colorado, Maryland, Minnesota, Nevada, Oregon, Virginia, and Washington—specifically responded “Yes,”<sup>227</sup> whereas Delaware did not.<sup>228</sup>

69. *Combined Funds.* The Bureau asked states and other reporting entities whether, for the annual period ending December 31, 2024, any 988 fees that were collected were combined with any federal, state, local, Tribal, village, or regional corporation funds, grants, special collections, or general budget appropriations that were designated to support 988 services.<sup>229</sup> As detailed in Table 6, seven of the states that reported collecting 988 fees during calendar year 2024 indicated that they combined collected 988 fees with other funds or grants to support 988 services,<sup>230</sup> whereas two states reported that 988 fees were not combined with other funds.<sup>231</sup>

**Table 6 – States Reporting Whether 988 Fees Were Combined with Other 988 Funds**

<b>Responses Regarding Combination of Collected 988 Fees With Any Funds, Grants, Special Collections, or General Budget Appropriations That Were Designated to Support 988 Services</b>			
<b>State</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>If yes, description of the funds and amounts that were combined with 988 fees.</b>
<b>CA</b>	X		“988 Fees: \$44,276,000 SAMHSA 988 State and Territories Grants: \$23,865,421 Community Mental Health Services Block Grant: \$9,543,000.”
<b>CO</b>	X		“In the fall of 2023[,] SAMHSA awarded the Behavioral Health Administration \$4,047,034 for Year 1 of the Cohort II Cooperative Agreement. In the fall of 2024[,] SAMHSA awarded the Behavioral Health Administration \$3,944,774 in initial award and \$102,260 in supplemental award. The total amount of Federal awards that Colorado received and that were available to use during 2024 was \$8,094,068.”
<b>DE</b>		X	“N/A”
<b>MD<sup>232</sup></b>	X		“See the answer to question #3 above regarding federal grant funding for 988. Additionally, the state provided general funds in calendar year 2024 for support and funding of Maryland’s 988 system.”
<b>MN</b>	X		“The State Legislature authorized a one-time appropriation from the General Fund to support 988 funding until the 988 fee collection began. This one-time appropriation spanned July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2024 for the amount of \$4,000,000 to support 988 Lifeline Center operations and \$564,000 for MDH administrative costs that included staffing and travel for 988 related activities.  The state was awarded a SAMHSA Cooperative Agreement in the amount of \$2,993,068 (September 30, 2023 – September 29, 2024)[.]”
<b>NV</b>	X		“The U.S Treasury American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (ARPA) grant for the period of March 2021 – 12/31/2024 was awarded to the state of Nevada and the Crisis Response System received awards

<sup>227</sup> See California Response at 8; Colorado Response at 10; Colorado Addendum Response at 10; Maryland Response at 9; Minnesota Response at 8; Nevada Response at 8; Oregon Response at 8; Virginia Response at 7; Washington Addendum Response at 8 (all responding “Yes” at Section E, Question 2b).

<sup>228</sup> At Section E, Question 2b, Delaware responded, “The 988 surcharge is housed under the Behavioral Health Crisis Intervention Services fund and is a dedicated funding source for the operation and maintenance of 988, the crisis intervention services system, and the continuum of behavioral health services in Delaware.” Delaware Response at 8.

<sup>229</sup> FCC Questionnaire, Section E, Question 4. At Section E, Question 4, Louisiana, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands responded “No,” but did not report collecting 988 fees during calendar year 2024. See Louisiana Response at 6-8; Puerto Rico Response at 6-8; U.S. Virgin Islands Addendum Response at 6-8. California Valley Miwok Tribe responded “Unknown.” See California Valley Miwok Tribe Response at 8.

<sup>230</sup> See California Response at 8; Colorado Addendum Response at 11; Maryland Response at 10; Minnesota Response at 8; Nevada Response at 8-9; Virginia Response at 8; Washington Addendum Response at 9.

<sup>231</sup> See Delaware Response at 8; Oregon Response at 9.

<sup>232</sup> Maryland’s reference to “Question #3 above” appears to mean Section E, Question 3 of the FCC’s Questionnaire.

**Federal Communications Commission**

			through the State of Nevada’s Governor’s Finance Office to provide services for a 988-call center, crisis stabilization centers across the state, and behavioral health services for uninsured/underinsured individuals experiencing a behavioral health crisis event(s). The Federal Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) 988 Cooperative Agreement grants for the period of April 2022 to April 2025 awarded \$1,069,192 with an additional supplemental funding in the amount of \$1,000,000. The Federal Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) 988 improvement grant was award for the period of September 2023 through September 2026 in the amount of \$6,378,595.”
<b>OR</b>		X	“MHBG COVID CCA - \$107,196; MHBG COVID American Rescue Plan Act - ARPA - \$60,998; OR Coop Agreement to Improve 988 Capacity - \$3,461,006; 988 State & Territory Cooperative Agreement - \$525,055; State Funds - \$7,102,258.85; Medicaid - \$1,454,679”
<b>VA</b>	X		“Our total distribution from our 988 tax in Virginia was the listed \$10,150,818. SAMSHA provided an additional \$1,338,190.15 for a total of \$11,489,008.2”
<b>WA</b>	X		“General Fund State dollars: \$450,000.00 25N Line Tax Fund: \$24,040,308.96 GFS – AZ1 Proviso: \$250,000.00”

70. *Proportional Contribution.* The Bureau requested that states and other reporting entities provide an estimate of the proportional contribution from each funding source towards the total cost to support 988 in their jurisdiction.<sup>233</sup> Table 7 details the responses received from the nine states that reported collecting 988 fees during calendar year 2024.<sup>234</sup>

**Table 7 – Estimates of Proportional Contribution from Each Funding Source**

State	State/Tribal Authority 988 Fees	Local/Political Subdivision 988 Fees	General Fund-State/Tribal	General Fund-County	Federal Grants	State/Tribal Grants
CA <sup>235</sup>	“N/A”	“N/A”	“N/A”	“N/A”	“N/A”	“N/A”
CO	64.29%	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	35.71%	[No Response]
DE	20%	0%	0%	0%	80%	0%
MD	37%	[No Response]	40%	[No Response]	23%	[No Response]
MN	31%	[No Response]	42%	[No Response]	27%	[No Response]
NV	33.09%	0%	0%	0%	66.91%	0%
OR	50%	0%	15%	0%	35%	0%
VA	[No Response]	88%	[No Response]	[No Response]	12%	[No Response]
WA	83%	0%	2%	0%	15%	0%

**G. Use of 988 Fees to Fund Programs Other than 988 Services**

71. *Requirements Under the 988 Act to Perform Diversion Analysis.* Section 4(a)(1) of the 988 Act provides that “[n]othing in [the] Act . . . or any Commission regulation or order may prevent the imposition and collection of a fee or charge applicable to a commercial mobile service or an IP-enabled

<sup>233</sup> FCC Questionnaire, Section E, Question 5. The U.S. Virgin Islands did not respond to Section E, Question 5. See U.S. Virgin Islands Addendum Response at 9.

<sup>234</sup> See California Response at 9; Colorado Response at 11; Colorado Addendum Response at 11; Delaware Response at 8-9; Maryland Response at 10; Minnesota Response at 9; Nevada Response at 9; Oregon Response at 9-10; Virginia Response at 8-9; Washington Addendum Response at 9-10.

<sup>235</sup> At Section E, Question 5, California reported, “[The state] does not have all necessary information for CY 2024 related to county support of 988 services and cannot determine proportional funding. In addition to the State 988 Fee, other state funding sources to support 988 services are listed in Question 4.a. above.” California Response at 9. California’s reference to “Question 4.a” appears to mean Section E, Question 4a of the FCC’s Questionnaire.

voice service specifically designated by” a state or other reporting entity “for [988] related services, if the fee or charge is held in a sequestered account to be obligated or expended only in support of [988] related services, or enhancement of such services, as specified in the provision of State or local law adopting the fee or charge.”<sup>236</sup> Congress required that any 988 fees collected under section 4 of the 988 Act only be “imposed, collected, and used to pay” expected expenses that are “reasonably attributed to—(A) ensuring the efficient and effective routing of calls made to . . . [988] . . . to an appropriate crisis center; and (B) personnel and the provision of acute mental health, crisis outreach and stabilization services by directly responding to . . . [988] . . . .”<sup>237</sup> Under section 4(b)(2) of the 988 Act, the Commission is required to annually report “findings on the amount of revenues obligated or expended by each State [or other reporting entity] . . . for any purpose other than the purpose for which any such [988] fees or charges are specified.”<sup>238</sup>

72. To make the findings specified by section 4(b)(2) of the 988 Act, the Bureau considers the 988-related purposes specified by Congress in section 4(a)(2) and, given the 988 Act’s reference to “State or local law adopting the fee or charge” in section 4(a)(1), the applicable state statute governing the collection and expenditure of 988 fees. The FCC’s questionnaire asked the states and other reporting entities to confirm whether collected 988 fees were “made available or used solely for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism, consistent with the 988 Act,” and requested descriptions of the fees collected and the allowed uses of such fees.<sup>239</sup> The Bureau also sought specific information regarding the amount of any 988 fees collected for 988 purposes that were made available or used for any purposes other than the ones designated by the funding mechanism or used for purposes otherwise unrelated to 988 implementation or support, including any fees transferred, loaned, or otherwise used for the state’s general fund.<sup>240</sup>

73. We remind all states and other reporting entities that the Bureau’s diversion analysis relies on clear and specific documentation of how fees are made available and used for 988 purposes, and that lack of such clarity and specificity may lead to the Bureau making a finding of fee diversion. We recognize that states providing documentation for this year’s report may have relied on our acceptance of the same or similar level of documentation in prior reports to guide their disclosure of how the state obligated or expended collected 988 fees. In preparing this year’s fee diversion assessment, therefore, we have generally found the same level of documentation as in prior years sufficient to support findings that jurisdictions have not diverted funds. However, we take this opportunity to advise states and other reporting entities that we may require additional documentation in future reports in order to determine that reporting entities have not engaged in diversion of 988 fees.

74. *Use of 988 Fees for Purposes Other than 988 Services.* The respondents that reported collecting and distributing 988 fees during calendar year 2024—California, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, Minnesota, Nevada, Oregon, Virginia, and Washington—all reported that they used, or were only allowed to use, collected 988 fees solely for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism, consistent with the 988 Act.<sup>241</sup> Eight states—California, Colorado, Maryland, Minnesota, Nevada, Oregon, Virginia, and Washington—reported that collected 988 fees were held in a sequestered account

---

<sup>236</sup> 988 Act § 4(a)(1).

<sup>237</sup> *Id.* § 4(a)(2).

<sup>238</sup> *Id.* § 4(b)(2).

<sup>239</sup> FCC Questionnaire, Sections C-F.

<sup>240</sup> FCC Questionnaire, Section F. The U.S. Virgin Islands did not respond to Section F. *See* U.S. Virgin Islands Response at 9.

<sup>241</sup> *See* California Response at 9-10; Colorado Addendum Response at 11-12; Delaware Response at 9; Maryland Response at 10-11; Minnesota Response at 9-10; Nevada Response at 10; Oregon Response at 10; Virginia Response at 9; Washington Addendum Response at 10.

to be obligated or expended only in support of 988 services or enhancements of such services.<sup>242</sup> As explained further below, the Bureau finds that Delaware, Maryland, Oregon, and Washington’s state statutes may authorize expenditures of 988 fees beyond 988 purposes. However, the Bureau did not receive sufficient information to find that these states diverted 988 fees for non-988 purposes and the Bureau requests that future submissions provide clearer explanations, as indicated below. Therefore, based on the information submitted for calendar year 2024, the Bureau finds that all nine states reported expenses or permissible expenditures that can reasonably be attributed to the purposes specified by the 988 Act.

75. *California* reported that the “988 State Suicide and Behavioral Health Crisis Services Fund” was used during calendar year 2024 “for state operations (personnel) expenditures by [Cal OES], [Cal HHS], DHCS, and the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration,” and a significant portion of the fees allocated to those entities “supported local activities under the category ‘local assistance.’”<sup>243</sup> As in calendar year 2023, Cal OES, Cal HHS, and Cal DHCS set policies at the state level and two state “boards” ensured that funding aligned with local needs.<sup>244</sup> California also continued to validate locally determined “budget requirements, operational costs, and other details” to ensure alignment with state statutory requirements, and existing 988 centers or entities seeking collected 988 surcharge funds were required to comply with the state’s 911 “Operations Manual” budget policy for 988.<sup>245</sup> In its questionnaire response, California did not provide more specific details about the state’s 911 “Operations Manual,” 988 funding policy, or the “local activities under the category ‘local assistance.’” The Bureau requests that, in the future, California provide more specificity in its statements identifying how the state obligated or expended fees collected for 988 purposes.

76. California’s statute provides that revenue collected from 988 surcharges “shall be used solely for the operations of the 988 center and mobile crisis teams as defined in the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021.”<sup>246</sup> The state’s legislature may also “consider additional uses for the revenue generated by the 988 surcharge” based on recommendations made by Cal HHS and a state 988 advisory group.<sup>247</sup> California’s statute provides that expenditures of collected “988 surcharges” are prioritized for purposes that have a nexus to 988 services. Specifically, California prioritizes expenditures of “988 surcharges” by first funding “988 centers, including the efficient and effective routing of telephone calls, personnel, and the provision of acute behavioral health services through telephone call, text, and chat to the 988

---

<sup>242</sup> See California Response at 8; Colorado Response at 10; Colorado Addendum Response at 10; Maryland Response at 9; Minnesota Response at 8; Nevada Response at 8; Oregon Response at 8; Virginia Response at 7; Washington Addendum Response at 8 (all responding “Yes” at Section E, Question 2b).

<sup>243</sup> California Response at 5-6. California also reported, “State Operations = \$10.9M. Local Assistance = \$32.7M.” *id.* at 6. The Bureau encourages California to provide more specificity in its statement identifying the expenditures of fees collected for 988 purposes in next year’s submission.

<sup>244</sup> See California Response at 5; *Third Annual 988 Fee Accountability Report* at 11, para. 27.

<sup>245</sup> See California Response at 4-5; *Third Annual 988 Fee Accountability Report* at 12, para. 27.

<sup>246</sup> See California Response at 5; Cal. Gov’t Code § 53123.4(b)(1). California’s statute refers to mobile crisis teams as defined in the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021. *Id.* § 53123.4(b)(1) (*citing* Pub. L. No. 117-2). The American Rescue Plan Act refers to “community-based mobile crisis intervention services,” as being furnished to an individual who is “outside of a hospital or other facility setting,” and “experiencing a mental health or substance use disorder crisis.” See Pub. L. No. 117-2, 135 Stat. 4. In the *Third Annual 988 Fee Accountability Report*, the Bureau concluded that, to the extent 988 surcharges were used solely for the mobile crisis teams responding to telephone calls, texts, or chats made to or routed through 988, this was consistent with the 988 Act. *Third Annual 988 Fee Accountability Report* at 22-23, para. 61 & n.204.

<sup>247</sup> Cal. Gov’t Code. § 53123.4(b)(1) (Deering 2024); see also *id.* § 53123.3(b) (describing the state’s 988 advisory group). California did not identify any other allowed uses for collected 988 fees during calendar year 2024. See California Response at 6-7.

number,”<sup>248</sup> followed by “the operation of mobile crisis teams accessed via telephone calls, texts, or chats made to or routed through 988 as specified under Section 4(a)(2)(B) of [the 988 Act].”<sup>249</sup> California’s statute provides that costs associated with administration of the “988 surcharge” and the Lifeline must be paid to the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration and “other state departments” prior to disbursing revenue from the “988 State Suicide and Behavioral Health Crisis Services Fund.”<sup>250</sup>

77. *Colorado* reported that collected “988 surcharges” and prepaid “wireless 988 charges” were used in calendar year 2024 to (1) “contract with the 988 hotline operator, supporting call center staff and capacity building,” (2) “988 crisis marketing,” (3) “data collection and evaluation,” and (4) “State administrative costs such as personnel and operating costs.”<sup>251</sup> Colorado’s statute allows service suppliers to “deduct and retain one percent” of the collected monthly 988 surcharges, while sellers can “deduct and retain three and three-tenths percent” of the collected prepaid wireless charges.<sup>252</sup> Additionally, the Colorado Public Utilities Commission is authorized to “retain up to four percent of the collected surcharges” to cover direct and indirect administrative costs, including conducting audits of service suppliers.<sup>253</sup> The Colorado Department of Revenue may also “retain up to three percent of collected charges” to cover “its direct costs of administering the collection and remittance of prepaid wireless 988 charges.”<sup>254</sup>

78. *Delaware* identified several allowed uses of collected fees during calendar year 2024 including: (1) “[r]ecruiting and retaining qualified personnel;” (2) “[r]aising public awareness of 988, behavioral health crisis intervention services available in [the] State, and education of behavioral health conditions;” (3) “[d]ata collection, analysis, reporting, evaluation participation, and related quality improvement activities;” (4) “[r]eimbursement of money appropriated by the General Assembly to implement this chapter;” and (5) “[a]ny other purpose authorized by the annual appropriation act or annual bond and capital improvement act.”<sup>255</sup> Delaware’s statute provides that the state’s Behavioral Health Crisis Intervention Services Fund may be expended for these purposes and also identifies other permissible expenditure categories, including: (1) “[e]stablishing, operating, maintaining, and improving 988 or crisis intervention services, including personnel costs, technology, and infrastructure enhancements;” (2) [e]stablishing, operating, or contracting for crisis teams for adults and children;” (3) “[p]roviding specialized training related to serving at-risk communities, including providing culturally

---

<sup>248</sup> See Cal. Gov’t Code § 53123.4(b)(2)(A) (Deering 2024).

<sup>249</sup> *Id.* § 53123.4(b)(2)(B).

<sup>250</sup> See California Response at 5 (C2a); Cal. Rev. & Tax Code § 41136(b).

<sup>251</sup> See Colorado Addendum Response at 8-9. Colorado initially responded “No” at Section F, Question 1(A), but then corrected its response to “Yes” in its addendum questionnaire.

<sup>252</sup> Colo. Rev. Stat. § 40-17.5-102(3)(b) (2024) (describing monthly “988 surcharge” collection rules); *id.* § 40-17.5-104(2)(b) (describing “prepaid wireless 988 charge” collection rules).

<sup>253</sup> See Colorado Response at 8-9; Colo. Rev. Stat. § 40-17.5-101(5) (defining “commission”); § 40-17.5-102(3)(c)(II) (describing monthly “988 surcharge” collection rules).

<sup>254</sup> See Colorado Response at 8-9; Colo. Rev. Stat. § 40-17.5-101(7) (defining “department”); § 40-17.5-104(2)(e)(II) (describing “prepaid wireless 988 charge” collection rules).

<sup>255</sup> Delaware Response at 6 (describing other allowed uses of collected 988 fees during calendar year 2024). Delaware provided text from Section 10213A of the Delaware Code in response to Section D, Question 1 of the FCC’s questionnaire, which asked states to identify with specificity the activities, programs, and organizations for whose benefit the state obligated or expended 988 fees. Delaware did not provide more specific details or explain how the “permissible expenditure categories” identified in its state statute support 988 services or enhancements of such services. See generally Delaware Response at 5.

and linguistically competent services;” and (4) “[a]dministration, oversight, and evaluation of the Fund.”<sup>256</sup>

79. Delaware’s statute allows sellers to “deduct and retain 3%” of collected prepaid wireless surcharges,<sup>257</sup> while providers may “recover the actual incremental costs of billing, collecting, and remitting the surcharge,” as well as compliance costs associated “with any memorandum of understanding” for “uncollectable” surcharges that are above their normal expenses.<sup>258</sup> Additionally, Delaware DSAMH “may seek reimbursement” from the state’s fund for “reasonable costs incurred in providing services to the [Behavioral Health Crisis Intervention Services Board].”<sup>259</sup>

80. In its questionnaire response, Delaware indicated that fees collected for 988 purposes were made available or used solely for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism, consistent with the 988 Act.<sup>260</sup> However, Delaware’s response did not clearly indicate that collected fees were held in a sequestered account to be obligated or expended only in support of 988 services, or enhancements of such services.<sup>261</sup> Rather, Delaware noted that collected 988 surcharges are housed in the state’s Behavioral Health Crisis Intervention Services fund, which is “a dedicated funding source for the operation and maintenance of 988, *the crisis intervention services system, and the continuum of behavioral health services in Delaware.*”<sup>262</sup> Delaware’s statute authorizing the disbursements from the state’s Behavioral Health Crisis Intervention Services fund appears to identify a variety of purposes for which 988 surcharges may be used, only some of which are clearly 988 related,<sup>263</sup> as opposed to being directed more generally at behavioral health services in the state.<sup>264</sup> Based on the materials currently available, the Bureau has insufficient information regarding the specific expenditures of Delaware’s behavioral health crisis intervention services surcharges and statutory framework to find that Delaware diverted 988 fees. The Bureau requests that, in future responses, Delaware provide clearer and more

---

<sup>256</sup> See Del. Code Ann. tit. 16, § 10213A(b) (describing permissible disbursements from the state’s fund); *id.* § 10201A(10) (defining “fund” to mean the “Behavioral Health Crisis Intervention Services Fund”).

<sup>257</sup> *Id.* § 10223A(j) (describing prepaid wireless surcharge collection rules).

<sup>258</sup> *Id.* § 10222A(g)-(h) (describing monthly surcharge collection rules and the “memorandum of understanding” for “uncollectable surcharges”).

<sup>259</sup> Del. Code Ann. tit. 16, § 10211A(k) (describing the state’s “Behavioral Health Crisis Intervention Services Board”). Delaware’s Behavioral Health Crisis Intervention Services Board’s responsibilities include developing “a comprehensive statewide crisis intervention services plan.” *Id.* § 10211A(b).

<sup>260</sup> Delaware Response at 9.

<sup>261</sup> See *id.* at 8.

<sup>262</sup> Delaware Response at 8 (emphasis added); see also Del. Code Ann. tit. 16, § 10212A(a) (“A special fund, known as the ‘Behavioral Health Crisis Intervention Fund,’ is created to support the operation and maintenance of 988, a *crisis intervention services system, and the continuum of behavioral health services.*” (emphasis added)). Delaware did not clearly define or provide specific details about the state’s “crisis intervention services” or the “continuum of behavioral health services.”

<sup>263</sup> See Del. Code Ann. tit. 16, § 10213A(b)(1), (5) (providing that money in the state’s fund may be used for: “(1) [e]stablishing, operating, maintaining, and improving 988 . . . including personnel costs, technology, and infrastructure enhancements necessary to achieve operational and clinical standards and evidence-based best practices . . . (5) [r]aising public awareness of 988, behavioral health crisis intervention services available in the State . . .”).

<sup>264</sup> See, e.g., *id.* § 10213A(b) (providing that money in the state’s fund may be used for: “(1) [e]stablishing, operating, maintaining, and improving 988 or *crisis intervention services* . . . [;] (2) [e]stablishing, operating, or contracting for crisis teams for adults and children . . . (5) [r]aising public awareness of 988, *behavioral health crisis intervention services available in this State, and education on behavioral health conditions*[;] (6) [d]ata collection and analysis, reporting, evaluation participation, and related quality improvement activities . . . (8) [r]eimbursement of money appropriated by the General Assembly to implement this chapter[; and] (9) [a]ny other purpose authorized by the annual appropriation act or annual bond and capital improvement act” (emphasis added)).

detailed information about its collection, tracking, and expenditure of 988 surcharges and the state’s “behavioral health crisis intervention surcharge fund,” including the nexus between 988 services and any expenditures of 988 surcharges on the “crisis intervention services system” and the “continuum of behavioral health services.”

81. *Maryland* reported that the state provided funding to “nine 988 call centers” in calendar year 2024 and outlined award conditions, as well as specific activities and programs detailed in a “statement of work.”<sup>265</sup> With respect to the conditions of award, Maryland identified costs related to “988 program project management;” administration of “988 hotline services;” technology, hardware, software, phone equipment or services “associated with electronic records and data collection;” “staff recruitment, training and retention;” accreditation for “behavioral health crisis hotline services provider[s];” equipment “associated with 988 staff or the 988 system in general;” and technology “associated with 988 care traffic control” improvements.<sup>266</sup> Maryland also identified expenses related to “providing 988 call, text, or chat services, including phone system and interactive voice response system (IVR) provision;” “post-988 call related care coordination, follow-up services, and referral services;” data collection “related to 988 calls, texts, or chats or 988 related activities;” “coordination of mobile crisis unit dispatch or warm handoff;” and “coordination of 911 call diversion to 988 for behavioral health crisis calls.”<sup>267</sup> With respect to the “statement of work,” Maryland identified activities and programs that included but were not limited to network agreements; call, text, and chat services; warm handoffs or referrals; follow-up conduct; quality assurance data; 988/911 collaboration; outreach and education; meeting participation; and cooperation with “MDH/BHA requests related to participating in the state care traffic control / bed registry and referral systems.”<sup>268</sup>

82. Maryland’s statute permits “9-8-8 service carriers” to retain 0.5% of collected fees “to cover the expenses of billing, collecting, remitting, and keeping records,”<sup>269</sup> and requires the State Comptroller to “distribute to an administrative cost account the amount necessary to administer the fees and to cover the expenses of conducting audits.”<sup>270</sup> The State Comptroller’s distributions to the administrative cost account may not exceed 6% of the collected “9-8-8 fees.”<sup>271</sup> While Maryland reported that the state has not established a funding mechanism mandating how collected 988 fees can be used,<sup>272</sup> Maryland’s statute does identify specific purposes for the “9-8-8 Trust Fund.”<sup>273</sup> In particular, the “9-8-8 Trust Fund” provides “reimbursement for costs associated with . . . [d]eveloping and implementing a statewide initiative for the coordination and delivery of the continuum of behavioral health crisis response services in the State,” including crisis call centers, mobile crisis team services, crisis stabilization centers,

---

<sup>265</sup> See Maryland Response at 5-6.

<sup>266</sup> *Id.*

<sup>267</sup> *Id.*

<sup>268</sup> Maryland Response at 6-7. Maryland’s reference to “MDH/BHA” appears mean the state’s Department of Health and Behavioral Health Administration.

<sup>269</sup> See Md. Code Ann., Health-Gen. § 7.5-5A-03.1(f) (2024).

<sup>270</sup> See *id.* § 7.5-5A-02(1)(2)(i) (“The amount distributed to the administrative cost account may not exceed: (i) For each fiscal years 2025, 2026, and 2027, 6% of the fees collected by the Comptroller[.]”); Maryland Response at 9 (stating that fee collection began in Oct. 2024); Maryland Department of Budget and Management, *Operating Budget*, <https://dbm.maryland.gov/budget/pages/operbudhome.aspx> (last visited Aug. 28, 2025) (noting that Maryland’s Fiscal Year 2025 started on July 1, 2024, and ended on June 30, 2025).

<sup>271</sup> See Md. Code Ann., Health-Gen. § 7.5-5A-02(1).

<sup>272</sup> Maryland Response at 4-5. At Section C, Question 2, Maryland responded “No” as to whether the state has established a funding mechanism that mandates *how* collected 988 fees can be used.

<sup>273</sup> See Maryland Response at 5; Md. Code Ann., Health-Gen. § 7.5-5A-02(b).

and “other acute behavioral health care services.”<sup>274</sup> We note that Maryland’s statute appears to identify purposes that may be directed more generally towards behavioral health care services in the state. However, based on the information currently available, the Bureau has insufficient information to find that Maryland diverted 988 fees. The Bureau requests that, in the future, Maryland provide clearer information about the collection and expenditure of the state’s “9-8-8 fees” and “9-8-8 Trust Fund,” including articulating specific details about the nexus between 988 services and any expenditures of “9-8-8 fees” on the state’s “coordination and delivery of the continuum of behavioral health crisis response service.”

83. *Minnesota* reported that 988 fees were used during calendar year 2024 to support four 988 Lifeline centers, including staffing and technology, as well as “state administrative costs (personnel and operating costs).”<sup>275</sup> Minnesota also reported that the state awarded grants, funded by collected 988 fees, to four “Lifeline Centers” for “operations and staffing,” beginning September 1, 2024.<sup>276</sup> Minnesota’s statute provides that the state’s 988 special revenue account “shall only be used to offset costs that are or may reasonably be attributed to: (1) implementing, maintaining, and improving the 988 suicide and crisis lifeline, including staff and technology infrastructure enhancements needed to achieve the operational standards and best practices set forth by the 988 administrator and the [Minnesota Department of Health]; (2) data collection, reporting, participation in evaluations, public promotion, and related quality improvement activities as required by the 988 administrator and the [Minnesota Department of Health]; and (3) administration, oversight, and evaluation of the account.”<sup>277</sup>

84. Minnesota’s statute further provides that “prepaid wireless E911, telecommunications access Minnesota, and 988 fees” collected by sellers “must be combined in one amount,”<sup>278</sup> which the state’s Commissioner of Revenue then divides based on “relative proportion” and deposits the amount “attributable to the prepaid wireless 988 fee” into the state’s 988 special revenue account.<sup>279</sup> Additionally, Minnesota’s statute permits sellers to retain three percent of the collected “prepaid wireless E911, telecommunications access Minnesota, and 988 fees,” while the state’s Commissioner of Revenue may deposit “an amount not to exceed two percent of collected fees” into a special revenue account.<sup>280</sup>

85. *Nevada* reported that collected 988 fees were made available or used solely for 988 purposes.<sup>281</sup> Nevada state law requires that 988 fees be used “to carry out provisions for (a) ‘National Suicide Prevent Lifeline Program’ such as support the implementation of a hotline for persons considering suicide, or in a behavioral health crisis event, (b) establishing at least one support center that meets the requirements set forth by the National Suicide Prevent Lifeline Program, (c) supporting the

---

<sup>274</sup> Md. Code Ann., Health-Gen. § 7.5-5A-02(b)(2) (2024). Maryland defines “behavioral health care” to include “prevention, screening, early intervention, treatment, recovery, support, wraparound, and rehabilitation services, for individuals with substance-related disorders, addictive disorders, mental disorders, or a combination of these disorders.” *Id.* § 7.5-101(e).

<sup>275</sup> Minnesota Response at 5.

<sup>276</sup> *See id.* at 6. Although Minnesota reported that collected 988 fees were used to fund grants in 2024, those grants appear to be the distribution mechanism for funding its 988 centers.

<sup>277</sup> *See* Minnesota Response at 4 (B3) (citing Minn. Stat. § 145.561, subd. 3); Minn. Stat. § 145.561, subd. 3 (describing the “988 special revenue account”); *id.* § 145.561, subd. 1(c) (defining “Department” as the Minnesota “Department of Health”).

<sup>278</sup> Minn. Stat. § 403.161, subd. 3 (describing “prepaid 988 fee” collection).

<sup>279</sup> *See id.* § 403.162, subd. 5(a)(1)-(3) (providing that Minnesota’s Commissioner of Revenue deposits the relative proportion of the collected fees attributable to the prepaid wireless E911, telecommunications access Minnesota, and 988 fees into specific individual accounts or funds).

<sup>280</sup> *See* Minn. Stat. § 403.162, subd. 2 (describing seller’s fee retention); *id.* § 403.162, subd. 5(b) (describing deposit of fees by Minnesota’s Commissioner of Revenue).

<sup>281</sup> *See* Nevada Response at 10.

provision of crisis stabilization services at hospitals that hold crisis stabilizations center endorsements,<sup>282</sup> (d) establishing a mobile crisis team, that are to the extent authorized by 47 U.S.C. § 251a and following regulations and provisions in NRS 433.702 to 433.710.”<sup>283</sup> Nevada further reported that collected 988 fees are made available “through the Crisis Response System in operations for suicide prevention, mental health crisis hotline and services provided to persons who access the hotlines.”<sup>284</sup> Specifically, Nevada reported using 988 fees for “recruiting [or] hiring for state positions, development of the Crisis Response System program, establishing the needs of the community, and planning for infrastructure and capacity” to meet the requirements and regulations set forth in the relevant statutory authority.<sup>285</sup> With respect to other costs that it allows for use of collected 988 fees, Nevada reported that it “is presently undertaking comprehensive planning, development, and needs assessment processes in strict compliance with the statutory requirements and allowable expenditures as delineated in” state and federal law.<sup>286</sup>

86. *Oregon* started collecting 988 fees in 2024.<sup>287</sup> The state legislature provides that revenue from the 988 coordinated crisis services tax shall only be used for (1) a “crisis call center system and crisis hotline center,”<sup>288</sup> and (2) “[t]o the extent that the crisis call center system and crisis hotline center are fully funded, the expansion and ongoing funding of mobile crisis intervention teams.”<sup>289</sup> Oregon reported distributing funds to two 988 call centers in 2024 “for the purpose of providing 988 Lifeline service via call, text, and chat,” as well as 36 counties for “Mobile Crisis Intervention Services.”<sup>290</sup> We note that Oregon’s funding mechanism permits the use of excess funds to support mobile crisis intervention teams, which may raise fee diversion concerns if such expenses are not “reasonably attributed to . . . personnel and the provision of acute mental health, crisis outreach and stabilization

---

<sup>282</sup> Section 433.704 of Nevada’s statute provides that the state’s Division of Public and Behavioral Health “shall support the implementation of a hotline for persons who are considering suicide or otherwise in a behavioral health crisis that *may be accessed by dialing the digits 9-8-8 by*” taking several actions, including “[s]upporting the provision of crisis stabilization services at hospitals that hold endorsements as crisis stabilization centers.” Nev. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 433.704(1) (emphasis added).

<sup>283</sup> Nevada Response at 5.

<sup>284</sup> *Id.* at 4.

<sup>285</sup> *See id.* at 5 (identifying the relevant statutory authority as “[Senate Bill] 237, [Nevada Revised Statutes Sections] 433.702-433.70 [sic] and 47 U.S.C. § 251a”).

<sup>286</sup> *See id.* at 6-7 (identifying the state and federal law as “Senate Bill 237, Nevada Revised Statutes §§ 433.702 through 433.70 [sic],” and 47 U.S.C. § 251a).

<sup>287</sup> Oregon Response at 3-4, 10.

<sup>288</sup> *See* Oregon Response at 5 (referencing H.B. 2757, 82nd Leg. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (Or. 2023) (enrolled)); Or. Rev. Stat. § 430.627(2)(a)(A) (stating that the “crisis call center system and crisis hotline center” are described in subsections (4) and (5) of section 430.627); *id.* § 430.627(4) (detailing the duties of the authority and requirements for the “crisis hotline center,” which include a requirement to “[h]ave an agreement to participate in the 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline network”); *id.* § 430.627(5) (detailing requirements for the “staff of the crisis hotline center”).

<sup>289</sup> *See* Oregon Response at 5 (referencing H.B. 2757, 82nd Leg. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (Or. 2023) (enrolled)); Or. Rev. Stat. § 430.627(2)(a)(B). Oregon’s statute further provides that “[i]n consultation with local community mental health programs, the Oregon Health Authority shall, to the extent funding is available, require each community mental health program to provide crisis stabilization services to individuals contacting the 9-8-8 suicide prevention and behavioral health crisis hotline who need crisis stabilization services in the community by enhancing and expanding the use of mobile crisis intervention teams.” Or. Rev. Stat. § 430.628(1).

<sup>290</sup> Oregon Response at 5. Additionally, Oregon’s statute states that “Moneys *other than revenues from the 9-8-8 coordinated crisis services tax* that are deposited into the fund shall be used for: (A) A wide array of crisis stabilizations services, including services provided by: (i) Crisis stabilization centers; (ii) Facilities offering short-term respite services; (iii) Peer respite centers; and (iv) Behavioral health urgent care walk-in centers; and (B) Community mental health program provision of crisis stabilization services or funding to cities to establish or maintain one or more mobile crisis intervention teams.” Or. Rev. Stat. § 430.627(2)(b) (emphasis added).

services *by directly responding to the [988 Lifeline]*” as required by the 988 Act.<sup>291</sup> However, the Bureau has insufficient information to find that Oregon diverted 988 fees during the calendar year 2024. The Bureau requests that, in the future, Oregon provide clearer information about the collection and expenditure of the state’s 988 fees, including the nexus between 988 services and any expenditure of 988 fees on mobile crisis intervention teams.

87. *Virginia* established the Crisis Call Center Fund in 2021 pursuant to section 37.2-311.4 of the Code of Virginia which states that “[m]oneys in the Fund shall be used solely for purposes of establishing and administering the crisis call center pursuant to the provisions of [Va. Code Ann.] §§ 37.2–311.1, 37.2-311.2, 37.2-311.3.”<sup>292</sup> In its filing, Virginia reported that collected 988 fees were made available or used solely for 988 purposes,<sup>293</sup> including operating, personnel, administrative, and mobile dispatch costs.<sup>294</sup> Virginia specifically reported that funds were disbursed during calendar year 2024 to Community Service Boards (CSBs) representing their region to contract with (1) “988 call centers to enhance coverage and act as primary routing points for 988 calls,” (2) “PRS [to] enhance[] training and staffing for their center” and (3) “Frontier Health to enhance staffing for 988 calls.”<sup>295</sup> Virginia did not provide more specific details about the Commonwealth’s CSBs or “PRS,” and did not provide an explanation of how the enhanced training and staffing provided by “PRS” supported 988 services or enhancements of such services. The Bureau requests that, in the future, Virginia provide more specificity in its statement identifying the expenditure of fees collected for 988 purposes.

88. *Washington* reported that expenditures from the “statewide 988 behavioral health crisis response and suicide prevention line account” may “only be used for: (a) ensuring the efficient and effective routing of calls made to the 988-crisis hotline to an appropriate crisis hotline center or crisis call center hub; and (b) personnel and the provision of acute behavioral health, crisis outreach, and crisis stabilization services, by directly responding to the 988 crisis hotline.”<sup>296</sup> Washington’s statute provides that expenditures from the account may also be used for “enhancing mobile crisis service standards and performance provided through mobile rapid crisis teams and community-based crisis teams.”<sup>297</sup> Additionally, Washington DOH may use “[t]ax revenue . . . to support on site partnerships” between crisis

---

<sup>291</sup> See 988 Act § 4(a)(2) (emphasis added).

<sup>292</sup> Va. Code Ann. § 37.2–311.4. Virginia defines “crisis call center” to mean “a call center that provides crisis intervention that meets NSPL standards for risk assessment and engagement and the requirements of § 37.2-311.2.” *Id.* § 37.2–311.1(A). The term NSPL refers to “the national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline established by the federal government.” *Id.*

<sup>293</sup> Virginia Response at 9; Va. Code Ann. § 37.2–311.5(B) (stating that collected 988 charges “shall accrue to the Fund and shall be used for the purposes identified in § 37.2-311.4”).

<sup>294</sup> See Virginia Response at 5-6. Operating costs can include the lease, purchase, and maintenance of customer premises equipment (hardware and software), but do not include operating costs associated with the lease, purchase, and maintenance of a building or facility.

<sup>295</sup> Virginia Response at 4-5.

<sup>296</sup> See Washington Addendum Response at 5. At Section D, Question 2, Washington indicated that collected 988 fees may be used for operating, personnel, administrative, and mobile dispatch costs. See *id.* at 6.

<sup>297</sup> See Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 82.86.050(2)(b) (as amended effective July 23, 2023). Washington’s statute further requires that “[t]en percent of the annual receipts from the tax must be dedicated to the establishment grants, performance payments, and supplemental performance payments for mobile rapid response crisis teams and community-based crisis teams endorsed under RCW 71.24.903 and endorsement activities in RCW 71.24.903, up to 30 percent of which is dedicated to mobile rapid response crisis teams and community-based crisis teams endorsed under RCW 71.24.903 that are affiliated with a tribe in Washington.” *Id.*

call centers and designated 988 hubs with public safety answering points “to increase the coordination and transfer of behavioral health calls . . . that are better addressed by . . . the 988 system.”<sup>298</sup>

89. According to the state’s filing, Washington DOH received funds from “988 tax revenue” to implement the state’s “988 Crisis System Section,” which includes program staff support, project management services, system and committee support, training, and contracting with the state’s three 988 Lifeline crisis centers.<sup>299</sup> Washington DOH used these funds to support “crisis center capacity, infrastructure, and state program development.”<sup>300</sup> The state also appropriated 988 tax funds to the Washington HCA “to support planning for the IT and technical components” outlined in state legislation,<sup>301</sup> as well as to provide staff support for collaborating with the state’s CRIS Committee<sup>302</sup> and preparing “other deliverables required in HB 1477 and other legislation.”<sup>303</sup> Washington did not clearly identify the meaning of “other legislation” or “other deliverables” in its questionnaire response. The Bureau requests that, in the future, Washington provide more specificity in its statement identifying how the state obligated or expended fees collected for 988 purposes.

90. Washington also provided details regarding the responsibilities assigned to the Washington HCA and DOH under its state statute and operational budget for the 2023-2025 biennium, as described in Section E above.<sup>304</sup> For example, according to the state’s filing, Washington HCA was tasked with providing staff and contracted support to create a “technical and operational plan.”<sup>305</sup> Under section 71.24.890, Washington DOH and HCA “must coordinate to develop the technology and platforms necessary to manage and operate the behavioral health crisis response and suicide prevention system.”<sup>306</sup> Washington DOH is tasked with developing “a new technologically advanced behavioral health and suicide prevention crisis call center system platform for use in 988 contact hubs,” which must include “the capacity to receive crisis assistance requests through phone calls, texts, chats, and other methods of communicating that may be developed in the future that promote access to the behavioral health crisis

---

<sup>298</sup> See Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 71.24.890(2)(a) (LexisNexis 2024). Washington’s statute also stated that these partnerships “may be expanded to include regional crisis lines administered by behavioral health administrative service organizations.” *Id.* (as amended by 2024 Wash. Sess. Laws Ch. 368, § 4 (effective June 6, 2024)).

<sup>299</sup> Washington Addendum Response at 6.

<sup>300</sup> *Id.*

<sup>301</sup> Washington Addendum Response at 6. At Section D, Question 1, Washington reported, “HCA was appropriated 988 tax funds to support planning for the IT and technical components outlined in the bill.” Washington’s reference to “the bill” appears to mean the state’s operational budget for the 2023-2025 biennium, which was identified as “Engrossed Substitute Bill (ESB) 5187.” *Id.* at 5.

<sup>302</sup> In its questionnaire response, Washington did not provide specific details about the state’s Crisis Response Improvement Strategy (CRIS) Committee. However, Washington’s state legislation indicates that the CRIS Committee was “established for the purpose of providing advice in developing an integrated behavioral health crisis response and suicide prevention system.” See H.B. 1477, 67th Leg., Reg. Sess. § 103 (Wash. 2021); see also Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 71.24.892 (LexisNexis 2024) (describing the state’s CRIS Committee).

<sup>303</sup> Washington Addendum Response at 6.

<sup>304</sup> See *supra* Section E.

<sup>305</sup> See Washington Addendum Response at 6 (describing the responsibilities assigned to Washington HCA in “RCW 71.24 and Washington’s operational budget (ESB 5187) for the 2023-2025 biennium”); Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 71.24.898 (LexisNexis 2024) (describing the technical and operational plan). Washington’s operational budget for the 2023-2025 biennium appropriated funds from the statewide 988 behavioral health crisis response line account to the Washington HCA “for the 988 technology platform implementation project,” which the state’s supplemental budget identified as the project described in section 71.24.890 (5) and (6) of the Washington Revised Code. See Engrossed Substitute S.B. 5092, 67th Leg., Reg. Sess. § 211 (Wash. 2021); Engrossed Substitute S.B. 5187, 68th Leg., Reg. Sess. § 211 (Wash. 2023).

<sup>306</sup> Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 71.24.890(5) (LexisNexis 2024).

system.”<sup>307</sup> Additionally, Washington HCA is tasked with developing technology for “[a] behavioral health integrated client referral system capable of providing system coordination information to designated 988 contact hubs and the other entities involved in behavioral health care.”<sup>308</sup>

91. As we have noted above, pursuant to the 988 Act, expenditures of 988 fees must be “reasonably attributed . . . to ensuring the efficient and effective routing of *calls made to [988]*” and/or “personnel and the provision of acute mental health, crisis outreach and stabilization services by *directly responding to the [988] national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline.*”<sup>309</sup> We note that, in some cases, Washington’s statute appears to authorize uses of funds for behavioral health services that are distinct from those offered by and through the 988 Lifeline.<sup>310</sup> However, based on the information currently available, the Bureau has insufficient information to find that Washington diverted 988 fees. In order to ensure accountability and transparency, the Bureau requests that, in the future, Washington provide more specific information about its collection and expenditure of the state’s 988 tax, including the nexus between 988 services and any expenditure of 988 fees for behavioral health services that appear distinct from services offered by or through the 988 Lifeline.

92. The states that reported collecting and distributing 988 fees during calendar year 2024 all indicated that the fees were made available or solely used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism, consistent with the 988 Act.<sup>311</sup> California, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, Minnesota, Nevada, Oregon, Virginia, and Washington reported expenses or permissible expenditures that can reasonably be attributed to the purposes specified in section 4(a)(2) of the 988 Act.<sup>312</sup> While Delaware, Maryland, Oregon, and Washington’s state statutes appear to authorize expenditures of 988 fees that may be directed more generally towards behavioral health services, the Bureau does not have sufficient information to conclude that 988 fees were obligated or expended for non-988 purposes during calendar year 2024. Therefore, the Bureau does not identify these states as diverting fees for this annual report.

## **H. Indian Tribes and Alaska Natives**

93. The 988 Act also requires the Commission to report on the collection and distribution of 988 fees by Indian Tribes and Alaska Native villages or regional corporations.<sup>313</sup> Pursuant to this requirement, the Bureau issued electronic letters to over 450 entities requesting information on the potential collection and use of 988 funds. The Commission’s Office of Native Affairs and Policy assisted the Bureau’s outreach to encourage response to the information collection request, including through the

---

<sup>307</sup> *Id.* § 71.24.890(5)(a) (LexisNexis 2024). Prior versions of the statute provided that the platform was “for use in designated 988 contact hubs.” *See, e.g.*, 2023 Wash. Sess. Laws Ch. 454, § 5. The statute was amended in 2025 to provide that “[t]his platform . . . shall be implemented as soon as possible and fully funded by June 30, 2027.” *See* 2025 Wash. Sess. Laws Ch. 424, § 980.

<sup>308</sup> Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 71.24.890(5)(b).

<sup>309</sup> *See supra* para. 71.

<sup>310</sup> *See supra* para. 88.

<sup>311</sup> *See* California Response at 9-10; Colorado Addendum Response at 11-12; Delaware Response at 9; Maryland Response at 10-11; Minnesota Response at 9-10; Nevada Response at 10; Oregon Response at 10; Virginia Response at 9; Washington Addendum Response at 10.

<sup>312</sup> 988 Act § 4(a)(2) (providing that 988 fees shall only be “imposed, collected, and used to pay expenses that [a state or reporting entity] is expected to incur that are reasonably attributed to—(A) ensuring the efficient and effective routing of calls made to [the 988 Lifeline] to an appropriate crisis center; and (B) personnel and the provision of acute mental health, crisis outreach and stabilization services by directly responding to [the 988 Lifeline]”).

<sup>313</sup> *Id.* § 4(b).

Office’s “Native News Blasts.”<sup>314</sup> The Bureau received submissions from 12 Tribal authorities and one tribally owned and operated telecommunications company.<sup>315</sup> Of the 13 total submissions, 12 reported they do not have a funding mechanism designated for the purposes of 988 support or implementation.<sup>316</sup> One Tribal entity, the California Valley Miwok Tribe, affirmatively indicated having a 988 funding mechanism, however, questionnaire responses indicate that the Tribal entity may not have a funding mechanism independent of the California state 988 funding mechanism as it cited to California’s Miles Hall Lifeline and Suicide Prevention Act.<sup>317</sup>

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

94. We look forward to updating Congress on the status of the collection and distribution of 988 fees in future 988 fee accountability reports.

---

<sup>314</sup> FCC, *ONAP News Blast Archive*, <https://www.fcc.gov/sites/default/files/FCC-Seeks-Submission-of-988-Suicide-and-Crisis-Lifeline-Fee-Collection-Data.pdf> (last visited Aug. 27, 2025).

<sup>315</sup> Salish Networks, LLC., a Tulalip Tribes Company, submitted a questionnaire response with the filing entity identified as “Indian Tribe.” See Salish Networks Response at 1; Salish Networks, *About Us*, <https://www.salishnetworks.com/Residential/AboutUs> (last visited Sept. 29, 2025).

<sup>316</sup> Aleutian Pribilof Islands Association, Inc. Response at 3; California Valley Miwok Tribe Response at 3; Chemehuevi Indian Tribe of Chemehuevi Valley California Response at 28 (the Tribal entity submitted a response using the CY 2023 FCC questionnaire); Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma Response at 3; Ewiiapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians Response at 3; Jena Band of Choctaw Indians Response at 3; Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation Response at 3; Monacan Indian Nation Response at 3; Navajo Nation Response at 3; Northway Village Response at 3; Quapaw Nation of Oklahoma Response at 3; Salish Networks Response at 3; San Carlos Apache Tribe Response at 3.

<sup>317</sup> California Valley Miwok Tribe Response at 3. See also A.B. 988, 2021-2022 Reg. Sess. (Cal. 2022).

**APPENDIX A  
RESPONSES TO 988 FEE REPORT QUESTIONNAIRE  
CALENDAR YEAR 2024**

**WC Docket No. 18-336<sup>318</sup>**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Authority Enabling Establishment of 988 Fee-Based Funding Mechanism</b>	<b>Fees Collected Calendar Year 2024</b>
<b>States</b>		
AK	None Reported	None Reported
AL	None Reported	None Reported
AR	None Reported	None Reported
AZ	None Reported	None Reported
CA	Yes, A.B. 988, 2021-2022 Reg. Sess. (Cal. 2022).	The total amount collected in fees was \$44,276,000.00.
CO	Yes, S.B. 21-154, 73d Gen. Assemb., 1st Reg. Sess. (Colo. 2021).	The total amount collected in fees was \$14,572,050.92.
CT	None Reported	None Reported
DE	Yes, 16 Del. Code Ann. tit. 16, §§ 10221A-10224A.	The total amount collected in fees was \$9,212,568.86.
FL	None Reported	None Reported
GA	None Reported	None Reported
HI	None Reported	None Reported
IA	None Reported	None Reported
ID	None Reported	None Reported
IL	None Reported <sup>319</sup>	None Reported
IN	None Reported	None Reported
KS	None Reported	None Reported
KY	None Reported	None Reported
LA	None Reported	None Reported
MA	None Reported	None Reported
MD	Yes, S.B. 974, 446th Gen. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (Md. 2024).	The total amount collected in fees was \$4,812,066.00.
ME	None Reported	None Reported
MI	None Reported	None Reported
MN	Yes, S.B. 2995, 93rd Leg., Reg. Sess. (Minn. 2023).	The total amount collected in fees was \$3,387,491.00.
MO	None Reported	None Reported
MS	None Reported	None Reported
MT	None Reported	None Reported
NC	None Reported	None Reported

<sup>318</sup> Individual responses from the states, U.S. territories, District of Columbia, and Tribal entities are available on the Commission’s Electronic Comment Filing System in WC Docket No. 18-336.

<sup>319</sup> Illinois reported “No” at Section B, Question 1 asking whether the state established a funding mechanism designated for or imposed for the purposes of 988 support or implementation. Illinois Response at 3 (B1). However, Illinois enacted legislation in June 2025 establishing a “Statewide 9-8-8 Trust Fund,” and designating a 1.65% increase in the rate of the state’s “intrastate telecommunications” tax as a “statewide 9-8-8 surcharge.” *See* H.B. 2755, 104th Gen. Assemb. (Ill. 2025).

**Federal Communications Commission**

ND	None Reported	None Reported
NE	None Reported	None Reported
NH	None Reported	None Reported
NJ	None Reported	None Reported
NM	None Reported <sup>320</sup>	None Reported
NV	Yes, S.B. 237, 82d Leg., Reg. Sess. (Nev. 2023).	The total amount collected in fees was \$14,858,677.80.
NY	None Reported	None Reported
OH	None Reported	None Reported
OK	None Reported	None Reported
OR	Yes, H.B. 2757, 82d Leg. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (Or. 2023).	The total amount collected in fees was \$24,800,000.00.
PA	None Reported	None Reported
RI	None Reported	None Reported
SC	None Reported	None Reported
SD	None Reported	None Reported
TN	None Reported	None Reported
TX	None Reported	None Reported
UT	None Reported	None Reported
VA	Yes, Va. Code Ann. § 37.2-311.5.	The total amount collected in fees was \$12,241,922.37.
VT	Yes, H.B. 657, 2024 Gen. Assemb. (Vt. 2024).	None Reported
WA	Yes, Wash. Rev. Code § 82.86.020; H.B. 1477, 67th Leg., Reg. Sess. (Wash. 2021).	The total amount collected in fees was \$ 46,696,385.73.
WI	None Reported	None Reported
WV	None Reported	None Reported
WY	None Reported	None Reported
<b>U.S. Territories and District of Columbia</b>		
AS	None Reported	None Reported
D.C.	None Reported	None Reported
Guam	None Reported	None Reported
NMI	None Reported	None Reported
PR	None Reported	None Reported
USVI	Yes, Act 8957, 35th Leg., Reg. Sess. (V.I. 2024).	None Reported
<b>Indian Tribes/Alaska Natives</b>		
Aleutian Pribilof Islands Association, Inc.	None Reported	None Reported
California Valley Miwok Tribe	Yes, A.B. 988, 2021-2022 Reg. Sess. (Cal. 2022). <sup>321</sup>	None Reported

<sup>320</sup> New Mexico reported “No” at Section B, Question 1 asking whether the state established a funding mechanism designated for or imposed for the purposes of 988 support or implementation. New Mexico Response at 3 (B1). However, New Mexico enacted legislation providing for the collection and transfer of a percentage of a state “telecommunications relay service surcharge” to a new “988 lifeline fund.” See S.B. 535, 57th Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. (N.M. 2025). The provisions of the legislation became effective on July 1, 2025, which is after New Mexico submitted its questionnaire response. See *id.*

<sup>321</sup> The California Valley Miwok Tribe identified California’s state legislation as the legal authority for the 988 funding mechanism. See California Valley Miwok Tribe Response at 3.

**Federal Communications Commission**

---

Chemehuevi Indian Tribe of Chemehuevi Valley California <sup>322</sup>	None Reported	None Reported
Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma	None Reported	None Reported
Ewiiapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians	None Reported	None Reported
Jena Band of Choctaw Indians	None Reported	None Reported
Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation	None Reported	None Reported
Monacan Indian Nation	None Reported	None Reported
Navajo Nation	None Reported	None Reported
Northway Village	None Reported	None Reported
Quapaw Nation of Oklahoma	None Reported	None Reported
Salish Networks	None Reported	None Reported
San Carlos Apache Tribe	None Reported	None Reported

---

<sup>322</sup> The Chemehuevi Indian Tribe of Chemehuevi Valley California submitted a copy of the *Third Annual 988 Fee Accountability Report* with their response on Appendix B (FCC Questionnaire for calendar year 2023).

**Federal Communications Commission**

---

**APPENDIX B**  
Annual Collection of Information

Related to the Collection and Use of 988 Fees by States and Other Jurisdictions

Pursuant to OMB authorization 3060-1301, the FCC’s Wireline Competition Bureau (Bureau) seeks the following specific information in order to fulfill the Commission’s obligations under Section 4(b) of the National Suicide Hotline Designation Act of 2020:

**A. Filing Information**

**1. Name of Filing Entity**

<b>State (Or Political Subdivision Thereof), Indian Tribe, Village, Regional Corporation, or Other Jurisdiction</b>

**2. Name, Title and Organization of Individual Filing Report**

Name	Title	Organization

**B. Description of Authority Enabling Establishment of 988 Funding Mechanisms**

**1. Has your state, or any political subdivision, Indian Tribe, village, or regional corporation therein as defined by Section 4(a)(1) of the National Suicide Hotline Designation Act of 2020, established a funding mechanism designated for or imposed for the purposes of 988 support or implementation? Check one.**

▪ Yes ..... No .....

If NO, end survey.

**1a. If YES, provide a citation to the legal authority for the funding mechanism.**

--

**Federal Communications Commission**

**2. Which of the following best describes the type of authority arrangement for the collection of 988 fees? Check one.**

- The state (or political subdivision), Indian Tribe, village, or regional corporation collects the fees .....
- A local authority collects the fees .....
- A hybrid approach where two or more governing bodies  
(e.g., state/political subdivision/Indian Tribe/village/regional corporation and local authority) collect the fees .....

**3. Describe how the 988 fees collected are made available to any state (or political subdivision), Indian Tribe, village, or regional corporation.**

**C. Description of State (Or Political Subdivision), Indian Tribe, Village, Regional Corporation, or Other Jurisdictional Authority That Determines How 988 Fees Are Spent**

**1. Indicate which entities in your state (or political subdivision), Indian Tribe, village, regional corporation, or other jurisdictional authority have the authority to approve the expenditure of fees collected for 988 purposes.**

Jurisdiction	Authority to Approve Expenditure of 988 Fees (Check one)	
	Yes	No
State (or political subdivision), Indian Tribe, Village, or Regional Corporation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local (e.g., county, city, municipality)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**1b. Please briefly describe any limitations on the approval authority per jurisdiction (e.g., limited to fees collected by the entity, limited to wireline or wireless service, etc.).**

Federal Communications Commission

2. Has your state (or political subdivision), Indian Tribe, village, regional corporation, or other jurisdictional authority established a funding mechanism that mandates *how* collected 988 fees can be used? *Check one.*

- Yes .....
- No .....

2a. If you checked YES, provide a legal citation to the funding mechanism of any such criteria.

2b. If you checked NO, describe how your state (or political subdivision), Indian Tribe, village, regional corporation, or other jurisdictional authority decides how collected 988 fees can be used.

**D. Description of Uses of Collected 988 Fees**

1. For the annual period ending December 31, 2024, provide a statement identifying with specificity all activities, programs, and organizations for whose benefit your state (or political subdivision), Indian Tribe, village, regional corporation, or other jurisdictional authority has obligated or expended fees collected for 988 purposes and how these activities, programs, and organizations support 988 services or enhancements of such services, consistent with the 988 Act.

2. Please identify the 988 allowed uses of the collected 988 fees. *Check all that apply.*

Type of Cost	Yes	No
--------------	-----	----

**Federal Communications Commission**

<b>Operating Costs</b>	Lease, purchase, maintenance of customer premises equipment (CPE) (hardware and software)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Lease, purchase, maintenance of building/facility	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Personnel Costs</b>	Crisis counselors' salaries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Training of crisis counselors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Administrative Costs</b>	Program administration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Travel expenses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Administrative personnel	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Mobile Dispatch Costs</b>	Costs related to dispatch (e.g., equipment) of mobile crisis teams	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Grant Programs</b>	Grants paid for through the use of collected 988 fees	<input type="checkbox"/> If YES, see 2a.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Other</b>	Other allowed uses for collected 988 fees	<input type="checkbox"/> If YES, see 2b.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>2a. During the annual period ending December 31, 2024, describe the grants that your state (or political subdivision), Indian Tribe, village, regional corporation, or other jurisdictional authority paid for through the use of collected 988 fees, and the purpose of the grant.</b></p>			
<p> </p>			
<p><b>2b. During the annual period ending December 31, 2024, describe any other costs that your state (or political subdivision), Indian Tribe, village, regional corporation, or other jurisdictional authority allows for use of collected 988 fees.</b></p>			
<p> </p>			

**E. Description of 988 Fees Collected**

<p><b>1. For the annual period ending December 31, 2024, please describe the amount of the fees or charges imposed for the implementation and support of 988 services. Please distinguish among state (or political subdivision), Indian Tribe, village, regional corporation, or other jurisdictional authority for each service type.</b></p>		
Service Type	Fee/Charge Imposed	Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance ( <i>e.g.</i> , state, county, local authority, Indian Tribe, village, or regional corporation, or a combination)
Wireline		
Wireless		
Prepaid Wireless		
Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP)		
Other		

**2. For the annual period ending December 31, 2024, please report the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees or charges described in Question E 1.**

Service Type	Total Amount Collected (\$)
Wireline	
Wireless	
Prepaid Wireless	
Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP)	
Other - Interest	
<b>Total</b>	

**2a. If an amount cannot be provided, please explain why.**

**Federal Communications Commission**

**2b. For the annual period ending December 31, 2024, were the collected fees or charges described in Question E 2 held in a sequestered account to be obligated or expended only in support of 988 services, or enhancements of such services?**

**3. Please identify any other sources of 988 funding.**

Question	Yes	No
<p><b>4. For the annual period ending December 31, 2024, were any 988 fees that were collected by your state (or political subdivision), Indian Tribe, village, regional corporation, or other jurisdictional authority combined with any federal, state, local, Tribal, village, or regional corporation funds, grants, special collections, or general budget appropriations that were designated to support 988 services? <i>Check one.</i></b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>4a. If YES, please describe the funds and amounts that were combined with 988 fees.</b></p>		

5. Please provide an estimate of the proportional contribution from each funding source towards the total cost to support 988 in your state (or political subdivision), Indian Tribe, village, regional corporation, or other jurisdiction.	Percent
State/Indian Tribe/Village/Regional Corporation 988 Fees	%
Local/Political Subdivision 988 Fees	%

**Federal Communications Commission**

General Fund – State/Indian Tribe/Village/Regional Corporation	%
General Fund – County/Political Subdivision	%
Federal Grants	%
State/Indian Tribe/Village/Regional Corporation Grants	%

**F. Description of Diversion or Transfer of 988 Fees for Other Uses**

Question		Yes	No
<p><b>(A) In the annual period ending December 31, 2024, were fees collected for 988 purposes by your state (or political subdivision), Indian Tribe, village, regional corporation, or other jurisdictional authority made available or used solely for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism, consistent with the 988 Act?</b> <i>Check one.</i></p>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>1a. If NO, please identify what amount of fees collected for 988 purposes were made available or used for any purposes other than those designated by the funding mechanism, or were used for purposes otherwise unrelated to 988 implementation or support, including any fees transferred, loaned, or otherwise used for the state's general fund. Along with identifying the amount, please include a statement identifying the non-related purposes for which the collected 988 fees were made available or used.</b></p>			
<b>Amount of Funds (\$)</b>	<b>Identify the non-related purpose(s) for which the 988 fees were used.</b> <i>(Add lines as necessary)</i>		