

STATE CAPITOL  
P.O. BOX 942849  
SACRAMENTO, CA 94249-0007  
(916) 319-2007  
FAX (916) 319-2107

DISTRICT OFFICE  
13405 FOLSOM BLVD., BUILDING 700, STE. A  
FOLSOM, CA 95630  
(916) 294-9774  
FAX (916) 294-9830



COMMITTEES  
VICE CHAIR, APPROPRIATIONS  
VICE CHAIR, COMMUNICATIONS  
AND CONVEYANCE  
VICE CHAIR, EDUCATION  
NATURAL RESOURCES  
PRIVACY AND CONSUMER  
PROTECTION  
TRANSPORTATION  
JOINT LEGISLATIVE AUDIT

February 12, 2026

The Honorable John Harabedian  
Chair, Joint Legislative Audit Committee  
1020 N Street, Room 107  
Sacramento, CA 95814

RECEIVED 2/12/2026

**Re: Request for Audit on Next Generation 911 (NG911) Transition**

Dear Chairman Harabedian:

I am writing to request an audit of the California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) to investigate the transition of California's legacy 911 system to a modern Next Generation 911 (NG911) system. California's 911 network is built on obsolete technology that is more than 50 years old. Failure to urgently upgrade this system could leave the public without reliable access to emergency services during a disaster.

For these reasons, the Legislature passed SB 1211 (Padilla, Statutes of 2014), which directed OES to develop and implement NG911 as an advanced replacement for the state's antiquated system. For over a decade, the plan has been plagued by delays and poor decisionmaking. This ultimately culminated in OES choosing to scrap the existing project late last year after spending over \$450 million.

As the state prepares to start over, an audit is needed to identify lessons learned and ensure that OES has a sound plan to complete the project as quickly and efficiently as possible. Phone customers fund this project through a tax on their monthly bills and cannot afford the cost of further waste. Most importantly, however, Californians facing the threat of wildfires and other disasters cannot afford further delay. The scope of the audit should address the following questions:

- 1) Why did OES choose to pursue a different NG911 strategy than every other state, relying on four regional contracts rather than a statewide approach? Was this decision adequately reviewed and justified?
- 2) Does the new strategy being pursued by OES appropriately consider and address cybersecurity concerns? Will the chosen architecture have sufficient redundancies to ensure system reliability?
- 3) When did OES first identify problems with the selected approach? Why did it take over five years to recognize these problems and change course?

- 4) How much of the monthly 911 surcharge on phone bills was spent on this failed project? Did this divert resources from the existing 911 system? Will the tax need to be increased in order to complete the project?
- 5) Are all OES expenditures of funds from the monthly 911 surcharge legally justified and directly used for 911-related purposes?
- 6) Has OES adequately assigned responsibility for mistakes made in the planning and implementation of NG911 and taken steps to prevent similar errors moving forward?
- 7) How much of the over \$450 million spent has been wasted, and how much can be recouped by integrating completed work into the new project?
- 8) Why does OES estimate that rollout will not be complete until 2030? Are there any steps OES can take to complete the work faster or more efficiently?
- 9) Does OES have an appropriate plan to move forward with a statewide approach? What is the projected cost to complete rollout for all 450 dispatch centers across the state?
- 10) Has OES sought adequate input from dispatch centers to understand their needs and operational challenges?
- 11) Has OES complied with all applicable laws and state policies in its procurements? Are the new procurements needed to complete the project currently on schedule?
- 12) Does OES have a reasonable and appropriate statewide deployment plan to complete the project on time and within existing budget resources?

Thank you for your consideration of this request. Should you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact my office at 916-319-2007 or email [Teresa.trujillo@asm.ca.gov](mailto:Teresa.trujillo@asm.ca.gov).

Respectfully,



JOSH HOOVER  
Assemblyman, 7<sup>th</sup> District



JAMES GALLAGHER  
Assemblyman, 3<sup>rd</sup> District



HEATH FLORA  
Assemblyman, 9<sup>th</sup> District



TOM LACKEY  
Assemblyman, 34<sup>th</sup> District



DAVID J. TANGIPA  
Assemblyman, 8<sup>th</sup> District



CARL DEMAIO  
Assemblyman, 75<sup>th</sup> District



LAURIE DAVIES  
Assemblywoman, 74<sup>th</sup> District



JUAN ALANIS  
Assemblyman, 22<sup>nd</sup> District



TRI TA  
Assemblyman, 70<sup>th</sup> District




GREG WALLIS  
Assemblyman, 47<sup>th</sup> District




HEATHER HADWICK  
Assemblyman, 1<sup>st</sup> District



PHILLIP CHEN  
Assemblyman, 59<sup>th</sup> District



LETICIA CASTILLO  
Assemblywoman, 58<sup>th</sup> District



STAN ELLIS  
Assemblyman, 32<sup>nd</sup> District



JEFF GONZALES  
Assemblyman, 36<sup>th</sup> District



DIANE B. DIXON  
Assemblywoman, 72<sup>nd</sup> District



JOE PATTERSON  
Assemblyman, 5<sup>th</sup> District



NATASHA JOHNSON  
Assemblywoman, 63<sup>rd</sup> District



ALEXANDRA M. MACEDO  
Assemblywoman, 33<sup>rd</sup> District



KATE SANCHEZ  
Senator, 6<sup>th</sup> District



ROGER NIELLO  
Senator, 6<sup>th</sup> District