**Approved by OMB**

**3060-1122**

**Expires: March 31, 2021**

**Estimated time per response: 10-55 hours**

Annual Collection of Information

Related to the Collection and Use of 911 and E911 Fees by States and Other Jurisdictions

Pursuant to OMB authorization 3060-1122, the FCC’s Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau seeks the following specific information in order to fulfill the Commission’s obligations under Section 6(f)(2) of the NET 911 Act:

1. **Filing Information**
2. **Name of State or Jurisdiction**

|  |
| --- |
| **State or Jurisdiction** |
| Washington |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Title** | **Organization** |
| Adam R. Wasserman | State 911 Coordinator | State 911 Coordination Office, Emergency Management Division, Washington Military Department |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section A** |
|       |

1. **Overview of State or Jurisdiction 911 System**
2. **Please provide the total number of active Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) in your state or jurisdiction that receive funding derived from the collection of 911/E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2019:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PSAP Type[[1]](#footnote-1)** | **Total** |
| Primary | 48 |
| Secondary | 13 |
| **Total** | 61 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section B1** |
| In addition to the numbers above there are an additional 18 operational PSAPs in the state (3 Primary, 15 Secondary) for a total of 79 operational PSAPs.ADD TRIBAL, FEDERAL.  |

1. **Please provide the total number of active telecommunicators[[2]](#footnote-2) in your state or jurisdiction that were funded through the collection of 911 and E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2019:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Number of Active Telecommunicators** | **Total** |
| Full-Time | 1,268 |
| Part-time |       |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section B2** |
| The numbers shown are as reported by the County 911 Coordinators for the PSAPs in their jurisdictions which they have authority over. These numbers DO NOT include the number of Telecommunicators working in tribal or federal government PSAPs (i.e. military installations, National Parks, DOE).       |

1. **For the annual period ending December 31, 2019, please provide an estimate of the total cost to provide 911/E911 service in your state or jurisdiction.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Amount****($)** | $300,000,000.00 |

**3a. If an amount cannot be provided, please explain why.**

|  |
| --- |
|       |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section B3** |
| The costs shown are as reported by the County 911 Coordinators for the county costs to provide 911 in their jurisdiction, plus the costs paid by the State 911 Coordination Office, and are in alignment with the preliminary findings of an on-going legislature-directed study of the cost to provide 911. These numbers DO NOT include the costs of 911 incured by tribal or federal government PSAPs (i.e. military installations, National Parks, DOE).       |

1. **Please provide the total number of 911 calls your state or jurisdiction received during the period January 1, 2019 to December 31, 2019.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of Service** | **Total 911 Calls** |
| Wireline | 548,339 |
| Wireless  | 4,415,157 |
| VoIP | 345,047 |
| Other | 9,250 |
| **Total** | 5,317,793 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section B4** |
| The numbers shown are as reported by the County 911 Coordinators for the PSAPs in their jurisdictions which they have some authority over, plus the numbers reported by 3 DoD PSAPs. These numbers may include calls that were not dialed 911 but were emergency calls for assitance. Additionally, these number may not include call/session volume from other PSAPs in their jurisdiction not under their authority; i.e: a military installation.The "Other" type above is for Text-to-911session volume.  |

1. **Description of Authority Enabling Establishment of 911/E911 Funding Mechanisms**
2. **Has your State, or any political subdivision, Indian tribe, village or regional corporation therein as defined by Section 6(f)(1) of the NET 911 Act, established a funding mechanism designated for or imposed for the purposes of 911 or E911 support or implementation (please include a citation to the legal authority for such mechanism)?** *Check one.*
* Yes ………………….. [x]
* No ………………..….. [ ]

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

|  |
| --- |
| The State of Washington and all Washington State Counties are authorized by the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 82.14B.030 to impose an enhanced 911 excise tax on the use of switched access lines, radio access lines, pre-paid and voice over IP access lines.  |

**1b. If YES, during the annual period January 1, 2019 to December 31, 2019, did your state or jurisdiction amend, enlarge, or in any way alter the funding mechanism.**

|  |
| --- |
| No |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section C1** |
|       |

1. **Which of the following best describes the type of authority arrangement for the collection of 911/E911 fees?** *Check one*.
* The State collects the fees ………………………………….. [ ]
* A Local Authority collects the fees ……………………….. [ ]
* A hybrid approach where two or more governing bodies

 (*e.g.*, state and local authority) collect the fees …………….. [x]

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section C2** |
|       |

1. **Describe how the funds collected are made available to localities.**

|  |
| --- |
| State and county fees are collected by the carriers and submitted to the Department of Revenue who then deposits them into the state and respective county's enhanced 911 accounts. Use of the fees is controlled by two mechanisms. The first is the limitations imposed by RCW 82.14B.010 and RCW 82.14B.050 that together permit utilization of the county tax. The second is the requirement associated with counties receiving assistance from the State 911 Program, RCW 38.52.510. A definitive list of permitted uses for the funds has been directed by Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 118-66 which requires the counties to spend their local collection on those items on the list before being eligible for state assistance, and places limits on the amount that will be considered for reimbursement for many items. The funding collected from the 911 excise taxes is less than the total funding required to operate Enhanced 911 in Washington State. The remaining support comes from other local government sources.  |

1. **Description of State or Jurisdictional Authority That Determines How 911/E911 Fees are Spent**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Indicate which entities in your state have the authority to approve the expenditure of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes.**
 |
| **Jurisdiction** | **Authority to Approve** **Expenditure of Funds*****(Check one)*** |
| **Yes** | **No** |
| State | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Local (*e.g.*, county, city, municipality) | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **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.)** |
| Washington State Counties are given certain latitude in both statute and administrative code for the use of the locally collected 911 funds to the degree that they must commit to expenditures in support of 911 equal to the amount that the tax generates. The rules promulgated by the State E911 Program, for the use of county funds before being eligible for state assistance, provides definitive control over the use of the funds in all 39 counties. The appropriate use of both the funds needs to take into account both the restrictions and the latitude of the enabling statutes. For counties receiving state assistance, it is clear that the excise taxes collected are used in direct support of E911 activities. The latitude provided the counties, permits them some discretion in the use of the funds, but in each case the fiscal commitment of local government to E911 activities exceeds the local excise tax collection.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section D1** |
|       |

1. **Has your state established a funding mechanism that mandates *how* collected funds can be used? *Check one*.**
* Yes ………………….. [x]
* No ………………..….. **[ ]**

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

|  |
| --- |
| A definitive list of permitted uses for E911 excise tax funds is specified by Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 118-66. http://apps.leg.wa.gov/wac/default.aspx?cite=118-66  |

**2b.** **If you checked NO, describe how your state or jurisdiction decides how collected funds can be used.**

|  |
| --- |
|       |

1. **Description of Uses of Collected 911/E911 Fees**
2. **Provide a statement identifying with specificity all activities, programs, and organizations for whose benefit your state, or political subdivision thereof, has obligated or expended funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes and how these activities, programs, and organizations support 911 and E911 services or enhancements of such services.**

|  |
| --- |
| RCW 38.52.520 specifies the duties of the State of Washington E911 Coordination Office. These duties include: Coordinating and facilitating the implementation and operation of enhanced 911 emergency communication systems throughout the state; Considering the base needs of individual counties for specific assistance, specify rules defining the purposes for which available state enhanced 911 funding may be expended, efforts to modernize their (counties) existing enhanced 911 emergency communications systems; and Enhanced 911 operational costs. RCW 38.52.540 further specifies that “Moneys in the (state E911 fund) account must be used only to support the statewide coordination and management of the enhanced 911 system, for the implementation of wireless enhanced 911 statewide, for the modernization of enhanced 911 emergency communications systems statewide, and to help supplement, within available funds, the operational costs of the system, including adequate funding of counties to enable implementation of wireless enhanced 911 service and reimbursement of radio communications service companies for costs incurred in providing wireless enhanced 911 service pursuant to negotiated contracts between the counties or their agents and the radio communications service companies”. Additionally, “the state enhanced 911 coordinator, with the advice and assistance of the enhanced 911 advisory committee, is authorized to enter into statewide agreements to improve the efficiency of enhanced 911 services for all counties and shall specify by rule the additional purposes for which moneys, if available, may be expended from this account”. During calendar year 2019, the State of Washington expended funds to provide the current statewide network, as well as build out and transition costs, to the new NG911 Emergency Services IP Network (ESInet), county 911 operational and equipment replacement/modernization costs, statewide training programs for telecommunicators, statewide 911 planning and collaboration, and contracted legal assistance for the transition of the new statewide NG911 network. Operational funding provides assistance to qualifying local jurisdictions for the operation of county and state primary PSAPs including: salary and benefit support for telecommunicators, county 911 coordinators, MSAG, Mapping/GIS, Information Technology, public education and training; PSAP call-taking hardware / software maintenance; and modernization/replacement of authorized PSAP equipment to NG911 standard. Statewide training programs include: Telecommunicator training (basic and advanced), PSAP supervisor, Telecommunicator Emergency Response Team (TERT), Communications training officer (CTO) program, and TTY/TDD/Text-to-911 instruction; Funding to counties to support local telecommunicator training programs, county 911 coordinator training and national conference participation, and CTO trainer salary reimbursement.  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Please identify the allowed uses of the collected funds. *Check all that apply*.**
 |
| **Type of Cost** | **Yes** | **No** |
| **Operating Costs** | Lease, purchase, maintenance of customer premises equipment (CPE) (hardware and software) | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Lease, purchase, maintenance of computer aided dispatch (CAD) equipment (hardware and software) | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Lease, purchase, maintenance of building/facility | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **Personnel Costs** | Telecommunicators’ Salaries | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Training of Telecommunicators | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **Administrative Costs** | Program Administration | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Travel Expenses | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **Dispatch Costs** | Reimbursement to other law enforcement entities providing dispatch | **[ ]**  | **[x]**  |
| Lease, purchase, maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks | **[ ]**  | **[x]**  |
| **Grant Programs** |  | **[x]** **If YES, see 2a.** | **[ ]**  |
| **2a. During the annual period ending December 31, 2019, describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of the grant.** |
| The state provides operational funding grants to smaller counties that do not collect sufficient local 911 excise tax revenues to support a basic level 911 program. These grants provide for salaries, equipment, maintenance, and training funds.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section E2** |
|       |

1. **Description of 911/E911 Fees Collected**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Please describe the amount of the fees or charges imposed for the implementation and support of 911 and E911 services. Please distinguish between state and local fees for each service type.**
 |
| **Service Type** | **Fee/Charge Imposed** | **Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance****(*e.g.*, state, county, local authority, or a combination)** |
| Wireline | $.25 state / $.70 county per month  | Combination of state and county  |
| Wireless | $.25 state / $.70 county per month  | Combination of state and county  |
| Prepaid Wireless | $.25 state / $.70 county per month  | Combination of state and county  |
| Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) | $.25 state / $.70 county per month  | Combination of state and county  |
| Other |       |       |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section F1** |
|       |

1. **For the annual period ending December 31, 2019, please report the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees or charges described in Question F 1.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Service Type** | **Total Amount Collected ($)** |
| Wireline | STATE = $2,687,262.87COUNTIES = $7,441,822.09  |
| Wireless | STATE = $17,663,669.56COUNTIES = $48,138,740.07  |
| Prepaid Wireless | STATE = $3,547,193.27COUNTIES = $8,295,770.19 |
| Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) | STATE = $2,999,296.18COUNTIES = $10,228,319.38 |
| Other | $0.00 |
| **Total** | STATE = $26,897,421.88COUNTIES = $74,104,651.73 COMBINED TOTAL=$101,002,073.61 |

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

|  |
| --- |
|       |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section F2** |
|       |

1. **Please identify any other sources of 911/E911 funding.**

|  |
| --- |
| County and/or PSAP customer/agency user fees and/or local government general funds or public safety tax collections.Washington State Patrol pays the majority of the costs associated with their 8 PSAPs out of their general fund operating budget.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. **For the annual period ending December 31, 2019, were any 911/E911 fees that were collected by your state or jurisdiction combined with any federal, state or local funds, grants, special collections, or general budget appropriations that were designated to support 911/E911/NG911 services?** *Check one.*
 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **4a.** **If YES, please describe the federal, state or local funds and amounts that were combined with 911/E911 fees.** |
| All local jurisdictions contribute additional local funds to augment State and County E911 excise taxes in covering the costs of 911 statewide. On average statewide, it is estimated that 70% of the actual cost of providing Washington State approved 911 activities comes from these local sources. In many cases, this comes from local government general use funds, individual agency user fees, and a 1/10 of 1% sales tax for this purpose. In addition, Washington State Patrol operates 3 Primary and 5 Secondary PSAPs with the majority of funding coming from their general departmental budget. In 2019, the State's 911 program received an award of $2,862,056.00 from the federal 911 grant. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section F4** |
|       |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **Please provide an estimate of the proportional contribution from each funding source towards the total cost to support 911 in your state or jurisdiction.**
 | **Percent** |
| State 911 Fees | 7.62% |
| Local 911 Fees | 21.74% |
| General Fund - State | 0% |
| General Fund - County | 70.64% |
| Federal Grants | 0% |
| State Grants | 0% |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section F5** |
| All local jurisdictions contribute additional local funds to augment State and County E911 excise taxes in covering the costs of 911 statewide. On average statewide, it is estimated that approximately 70% of the actual cost of providing Washington State approved 911 activities comes from these local sources. In many cases, this comes from local government general use funds, individual agency user fees, and a 1/10 of 1% sales tax for this purpose. |

1. **Description of Diversion or Transfer of 911/E911 Fees for Other Uses**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. **In the annual period ending December 31, 2019, were funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes in your state or jurisdiction made available or used solely for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism?** *Check one*.
 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **1a.** **If NO, please identify what amount of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes were made available or used for any purposes other than the ones designated by the funding mechanism or used for purposes otherwise unrelated to 911 or E911 implementation or support, including any funds 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 911 or E911 funds were made available or used.** |
| **Amount of Funds ($)** | **Identify the non-related purpose(s) for which the 911/E911 funds were used. (*Add lines as necessary*)** |
|       |       |
|       |       |
|       |       |
|       |       |
|       |       |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section G1** |
|       |

1. **Oversight and Auditing of Collection and Use of 911/E911 Fees**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. **Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures to determine whether collected funds have been made available or used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism or otherwise used to implement or support 911?** *Check one.*
 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **1a.** **If YES, provide a description of the mechanisms or procedures and any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2019.** *(Enter “None” if no actions were taken.)* |
| The State E911 Coordination Office through its county grant programs, regularly audits the use of county and state 911 excise tax funds, as they are the basis for the award amounts of the grants. Additionally, the Office of the Washington State Auditor conducts routine audits of all state, county or local entities, and these audits include the proper use of 911-dedicated funds.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. **Does your state have the authority to audit service providers to ensure that the amount of 911/E911 fees collected from subscribers matches the service provider’s number of subscribers?** *Check one.*
 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **2a. If YES, provide a description of any auditing or enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2019.** *(Enter “None” if no actions were taken.)* |
| The Washington Department of Revenue conducts periodic audits of service provider collection and remittance of state and county 911 excise tax. No reported corrective actions were taken during this period.  |

1. **Description of Next Generation 911 Services and Expenditures**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. **Does your state or jurisdiction classify expenditures on Next Generation 911 as within the scope of permissible expenditures of funds for 911 or E911 purposes?** *Check one.*
 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **1a. If YES, in the space below, please cite any specific legal authority:** |
| Washington Administrative Code 118-66-030 (25) includes “modernization to next generation 9-1-1 systems” as part of the “Enhanced 9-1-1 emergency communications system”. Additionally, WAC 118-66-050 (3) (ii) lists “NG9-1-1 network” as an authorized expense.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. **In the annual period ending December 31, 2019, has your state or jurisdiction expended funds on Next Generation 911 programs?** *Check one.*
 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **2a. If YES, in the space below, please enter the dollar amount that has been expended.** |
| **Amount****($)** | $15,000,000.00 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section I2** |
| This amount is based on the cost to operate our statewide NG911 Core Services ESInet plus an estimated amount which the counties spent. This amount is likely higher depending upon how County operating costs are catagorized. For example, because our state is still in a transitional phase from E911 to NG911, the cost for the salery of a Telecommunicator could be considered as a NG911 cost.  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **For the annual period ending December 31, 2019, please describe the type and number of NG911 Emergency Service IP Network(s) (ESInets) that operated within your state.**
 |
| **Type of ESInet** | **Yes** | **No** | **If Yes, Enter Total PSAPs Operating on the ESInet** | **If Yes, does the type of ESInet interconnect with other state, regional or local ESInets?** |
| **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. A single, state-wide ESInet
 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  | 65 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| 1. Local (*e.g.*, county) ESInet
 | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| 1. Regional ESInets
 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  | [If more than one Regional ESInet is in operation, in the space below, provide the total PSAPs operating on each ESInet]      | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 1:U.S. Navy Region Northwest | 1 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 2:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 3:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 4:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 5:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 6:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 7:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 8:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 9:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 10:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 11:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 12:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 13:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 14:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 15:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 16:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 17:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 18:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 19:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 20:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 21:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 22:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 23:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 24:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 25:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 26:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 27:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 28:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 29:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 30:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 31:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 32:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 33:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 34:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 35:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section I3** |
| AT&T provides an ESInet to the US Navy and the the Navy Region Northwest Regional Dispatch Center (RDC) is connected to that ESInet. Our ESInet system service provider, Comtech, and AT&T have made the necessary interconnections to ensure that our NGCS can deliver calls to the Navy RDC and vice versa. |

1. **Please provide a description of any NG911 projects completed or underway during the annual period ending December 31, 2019.**

|  |
| --- |
| In 2016, Washington State began a transition to a replacement NG911 ESInet. After building out the network, interconnecting the old 911 network with the new ESInet, migrating (transitioning) the PSAPs and migrating the ALI/MSAG database, migrating of the Originating Network Service Providers began in January 2019. By the end of December 2019, 85% of the OSPs had completed their transitions with the remainder to be completed in early to mid 2020. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Total PSAPs****Accepting Texts** |
| 1. **During the annual period ending December 31, 2019, how many PSAPs within your state implemented text-to-911 and are accepting texts?**
 | 28 |
| **Question** | **Estimated Number of PSAPs****that will Become Text Capable** |
| 1. **In the next annual period ending December 31, 2020, how many PSAPs do you anticipate will become text capable?**
 | 15 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section I5** |
|       |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section I6** |
| This will bring the total to 43 of the 49 Primary PSAPs operating in the state. |

1. **Description of Cybersecurity Expenditures**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Check the appropriate box** | **If Yes,****Amount Expended ($)** |
| 1. **During the annual period ending December 31, 2019, did your state expend funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs?**
 | Yes**[x]**  | No**[ ]**  | Amount is encompassed in overall contract for NG911 ESInet  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section J1** |
|       |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Total PSAPs** |
| 1. **During the annual period ending December 31, 2019, how many PSAPs in your state either implemented a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program?**
 | 65 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section J2** |
|       |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** | **Unknown** |
| 1. **Does your state or jurisdiction adhere to the National Institute of Standards and Technology *Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity* (February 2014) for networks supporting one or more PSAPs in your state or jurisdiction?**
 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section J3** |
|       |

1. **Measuring Effective Utilization of 911/E911 Fees**
2. **Please provide an assessment of the effects achieved from the expenditure of state 911/E911 or NG911 funds, including any criteria your state or jurisdiction uses to measure the effectiveness of the use of 911/E911 fees and charges.**  **If your state conducts annual or other periodic assessments, please provide an electronic copy (*e.g.*, Word, PDF) of the latest such report upon submission of this questionnaire to the FCC or provide links to online versions of such reports in the space below.**

|  |
| --- |
| Washington State strives to be a national leader at the forefront of the 911 evolution. Since 1998, Washington State has dedicated hundreds of millions of state taxpayer dollars for the provision and enhancement of a statewide 911 system. In the period from 2012 through 2019, Washington State alone expended over $100M on NG911 modernization – including the first-ever statewide NG911 Emergency Services Internet Protocol Network (ESInet) and NG911 modernization in the Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) – all from state 911 funds. This is in addition to the millions of dollars of county/local 911 funds dedicated to NG911 modernization.Washington State views 911 as a statewide enterprise, developed in a collaborative effort with the Counties, the PSAPs, the State 911 Coordination Office, the commercial 911 service providers, and a dedicated community of stakeholder representatives, to ensure 911 access from the call-maker to the call-taker.The State has recently completed the transition to a statewide NENA i3 standards-based NG911 ESInet. The new ESInet will allow for multi-media (i.e. Voice, Text, Data, etc.) 911 access and will provide an even faster, more reliable, resilient, geo-diverse and scalable system, with cyber-security planned into the design. With the completion of the new ESInet, the Washington State NG911 enterprise will have the capabilities and tools needed to provide a more efficient and effective 911 service, while keeping pace with the ever-evolving communications technologies used by our citizens. In addition, due to the increased reliability, resilience and security, as well as the designed interoperability with other 911 centers – intrastate, interstate, and international (Canada) – the Washington State NG911 enterprise system will be able to be more effective at collecting and disseminating initial situational awareness during major emergencies and disasters.Finally, although we are well along the path of transitioning to the jurisdictional end-state of NG911, we still need strong federal support to completely realize and take full advantage of NG911 features and capabilities. In addition to legislative and regulatory support, additional support through continuing Federal Grants is needed to fully achieve the goal of the jurisdictional end-state of NG911. We strongly endorse continued support and further investment in 911 at the national level to assist all states as they move toward NG911.  |

**We have estimated that your response to this collection of information will take an average of 10 to 55 hours. Our estimate includes the time to read the instructions, look through existing records, gather and maintain required data, and actually complete and review the form or response. If you have any comments on this estimate, or on how we can improve the collection and reduce the burden it causes you, please write the Federal Communications Commission, Office of Managing Director, AMD‑PERM, Washington, DC 20554, Paperwork Reduction Act Project (3060‑1122). We will also accept your PRA comments via the Internet if you send an e-mail to** **PRA@fcc.gov****.**

**Please DO NOT SEND COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. You are not required to respond to a collection of information sponsored by the Federal government, and the government may not conduct or sponsor this collection, unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number and/or we fail to provide you with this notice. This collection has been assigned an OMB control number of 3060‑1122.**

**THIS NOTICE IS REQUIRED BY THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT OF 1995, PUBLIC LAW 104-13, OCTOBER 1, 1995, 44 U.S.C. SECTION 3507.**

1. A Primary PSAP is one to which 911 calls are routed directly from the 911 Control office. A secondary PSAP is one to which 911 calls are transferred from a Primary PSAP. *See* National Emergency Number Association, Master Glossary of 9-1-1 Terminology (*Master Glossary*), Apr. 13, 2018, at 162, available at <https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/standards/NENA-ADM-000.22-2018_FINAL_2.pdf>. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A telecommunicator, also known as a call taker or a dispatcher, is a person employed by a PSAP who is qualified to answer incoming emergency telephone calls and/or who provides for the appropriate emergency response either directly or through communication with the appropriate PSAP. *See* *Master Glossary* at 192. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)