**Approved by OMB**

**3060-1122**

**Expires: March 31, 2025**

**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 (the Bureau) seeks the following specific information in order to fulfill the Commission’s obligations under Section 6(f)(2) of the NET 911 Act, as amended by Section 902.[[1]](#footnote-2)

**Instructions for Filling Out the Questionnaire**

**Please read and follow these general instructions:**

* Please complete all sections of this form.
* Please enter only numeric responses where requested.
	+ Dollar or percentage signs, decimal points, and thousands separator commas are acceptable.
	+ Blank responses, “None”, “Unknown”, or “N/A” are also acceptable.
	+ To facilitate the Bureau’s calculations for the Annual Fee Report, please avoid stray characters such as: \*, ~, (), or [] in numeric responses.
* Use the associated Addendum fields to enter other information, such as footnotes, qualifiers, text, descriptions, and/or explanations.
* All responses should pertain to calendar year (January 1 – December 31), not fiscal year.
* Unless otherwise directed, please provide requested information directly on this form, rather than submit, refer to, and/or rely on supplemental materials.
* Please consolidate separate response forms (and/or responses to individual questions) completed by counties, municipalities, or other local jurisdictions into one response form for the entire state, using sums and averages as appropriate.
1. **Filing Information**

**A1. Name of State or Jurisdiction**

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

**A2. Name, Title and Organization of Individual Filing Report**

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

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

1. **Overview of State or Jurisdiction 911 System**

**B1. Please provide the total number of active primary and secondary Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) in your state or jurisdiction that received funding derived from the collection of 911/E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2021. PSAPs that did not receive funding derived from the collection of 911/E911 fees need not be included in the response boxes, but may be reported in Addendum Section B1.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PSAP Type[[2]](#footnote-3)** | **Number of PSAPs** |
| Primary | 48 |
| Secondary | 9 |
| **Total** | 57 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section B1** |
| In addition to the number shown above, there are an additional three (3) active Primary PSAPs (all DoD) and 17 Secondary PSAPs (including two DoI, one DoE, and four Tribal PSAPs) operating in the state which are not funded by State or County 911 Excise taxes. |

**B2. Please provide the total number of active telecommunicators[[3]](#footnote-4) in your state or jurisdiction that were funded through the collection of 911 and E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2021. Telecommunicators that were not funded through the collection of 911 and E911 fees need not be included in the response boxes, but may be reported in Addendum Section B2.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Telecommunicator Type** | **Number of Active Telecommunicators Funded by 911/E911 Fees** |
| Full Time | 1388 |
| Part Time | 49 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section B2** |
| In addition to the number shown above, there are an additional three (3) active Primary PSAPs (all DoD) and 17 Secondary PSAPs (including two DoI, one DoE, and four Tribal PSAPs) operating in the state for which we do not have a number of telecommunicators. |

**B3. For the annual period ending December 31, 2021, please provide an estimate of the total cost to provide 911/E911 service in your state or jurisdiction.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Amount ($)** | $ 373,517,745.00 |

**B3a. If an amount cannot be provided, please explain why.**

|  |
| --- |
|       |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section B3** |
|  |

**B4. Please provide the total number of 911 voice calls that your state or jurisdiction received during the period January 1, 2021 to December 31, 2021.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of Service** | **Total 911 Voice Calls** |
| Wireline |  404,921  |
| Wireless  |  4,670,887  |
| VoIP |  369,812  |
| Other (report 911 texts separately below in B.4a) | 0 |
| **Total** |  5,445,620  |

**B4a. Please provide the total number of 911 texts that your state or jurisdiction received during the period January 1, 2021 to December 31, 2021.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Texts to 911 |  15,745  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section B4** |
| These numbers include emergency or emergent calls/session that utilized some other access to the PSAPs - such as a local 10-digit number.Calls made by dialing only the digits 9 - 1 - 1 are:Wireline = 345,088Wireless = 4,068,359VoIP = 342,908Total = 4,758,103  |

1. **Description of Authority Enabling Establishment of 911/E911 Funding Mechanisms**

**C1. 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 ………………..….. [ ]

**C1a. 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 |

**C1b. If YES to C1, during the annual period January 1, 2021 to December 31, 2021, did your state or jurisdiction amend, enlarge, or in any way alter the funding mechanism?** *Check one (leave blank if NO to C1).*

* Yes ………………….. [ ]
* No ………………..….. [x]
* Unknown ………..….. [ ]

**C1c. If YES to C1b., provide a description of amendments, enlargements, or alterations to the funding mechanism, if applicable.**

|  |
| --- |
|       |

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

**C2. 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** |
| State and county fees are collected by the carriers and submitted to the state Department of Revenue who then deposits them into the state's and respective county's 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 911 in Washington State. The remaining support comes from other local government revenue sources.  |

**C3. Describe how the funds collected are made available to localities.**

|  |
| --- |
| A portion of the fees collected are deposited into each county's 911 accounts. County assistance is provided from the remaining portion.  |

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

**D1. Indicate which entities in your state have the authority to approve the expenditure of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes.** *Check one*.

* The State has authority to approve the expenditure of funds ………………….….. [ ]
* One or more local authorities has authority to approve the expenditure of funds… [ ]
* A hybrid approach where two or more governing bodies (e.g., state or local authority) have authority to approve the expenditure of funds ………………………………. [x]

**D1a. 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 911 Program, for the use of county funds before being eligible for state assistance, developed by the State 911 Advisory Committee and recommended to the State 911 Program, provide 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 911 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 911 activities exceeds the local excise tax collection.  |

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

**D2. Has your state established a funding mechanism that mandates *how* collected funds can be used? *Check one*.**

* Yes ………………….. [x]
* No ………………..….. [ ]

**D2a.** **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  |

**D2b.** **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**

**E1. 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 911 Coordination Office. These duties include: Coordinating and facilitating the implementation and operation of 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 911 funding may be expended, efforts to modernize their (counties) existing 911 emergency communications systems; and 911 operational costs. RCW 38.52.540 further specifies that “Moneys in the (state 911 fund) account must be used only to support the statewide coordination and management of the 911 system, for the implementation of wireless 911 statewide, for the modernization of 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 911 service and reimbursement of radio communications service companies for costs incurred in providing wireless 911 service pursuant to negotiated contracts between the counties or their agents and the radio communications service companies”. Additionally, “the state 911 coordinator, with the advice and assistance of the 911 advisory committee, is authorized to enter into statewide agreements to improve the efficiency of 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 2021, the State of Washington expended funds to maintain the current statewide NG911 Emergency Services IP Network (ESInet) and Next Generation 911 Core Services (NGCS), county 911 operational and equipment replacement/modernization costs, statewide training programs for telecommunicators, as well as statewide 911 planning and collaboration. 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), Pupblic Safety Communications Center Supervisor (PSCCS), Telecommunicator Emergency Response Team (TERT), and Communications training officer (CTO) program; Funding to counties to support local telecommunicator training programs, county 911 coordinator training and national conference participation, and CTO trainer salary reimbursement. |

|  |
| --- |
| **E2. Please identify the uses of the collected funds.[[4]](#footnote-5) *Check all that apply*.** |
| **Type of Cost** | **Yes** | **No** |
| **PSAP operating costs, including technological innovation that supports 911** | Lease, purchase, maintenance, replacement, and upgrade of customer premises equipment (CPE) (hardware and software) | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Lease, purchase, maintenance, replacement, and upgrade of computer aided dispatch (CAD) equipment (hardware and software) | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Lease, purchase, maintenance, replacement, and upgrade of PSAP building/facility | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| NG911, cybersecurity, pre-arrival instructions, and emergency notification systems (ENS) | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **PSAP personnel costs** | Telecommunicators’ Salaries | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Training of Telecommunicators | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **PSAP administrative costs** | Program Administration | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Travel Expenses | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **Costs for integration and interoperability of 911 systems and public safety/first responder radio systems** | Integrating public safety/first responder dispatch and 911 systems, including lease, purchase, maintenance, and upgrade of CAD hardware and software to support integrated 911 and public safety dispatch operations | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Providing for the interoperability of 911 systems with one another and with public safety/first responder radio systems | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **Grant programs** |  | **[ ]** **If YES, see E2a.** | **[ ]**  |
| **E2a. During the annual period ending December 31, 2021, describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of such grants.** |
|   |

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

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

|  |
| --- |
| **F1. Please describe the amount of 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***Check one for each Service Type.* |
| **State** | **County or Local Authority** | **Combination of State and County/Local** |
| **Wireline – monthly fee ($)** | $ $.25 state / $.70 county per month  | **[x]**  | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **Wireless – monthly fee ($)** | $ $.25 state / $.70 county per month  | **[x]**  | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **Prepaid Wireless – provide *either* flat fee ($) or percentage (%) per retail transaction** *(leave inapplicable cell blank)* | $ $.25 state / $.70 county per month  | **[x]**  | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
|      % |
| **Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) – monthly fee ($)** | $ $.25 state / $.70 county per month  | **[x]**  | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **Other – monthly fee ($)** | $      | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |

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

**F2. For the annual period ending December 31, 2021, please report the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees or charges described in Question F1.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Service Type** | **Total Amount Collected ($)** |
| Wireline | STATE = $ 2,372,011COUNTY = $ 6,270,500 |
| Wireless | STSTATE = $ 18,899,909COUNTY = $ 52,974,055  |
| Prepaid Wireless | STATE = $ 3,190,946COUNTY = $ 8,586,283  |
| Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) | STATE = $ 3,705,516COUNTY = $ 10,419,643  |
| Other |       |
| **Total** | STATE = $ 28,168,382COUNTY = $ 78,250,481COMBINED TOTAL = $106,418,863  |

**F2a. If an amount cannot be provided, please explain why.**

|  |
| --- |
|       |

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

**F3. 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 eight PSAPs out of their general fund operating budget.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| **F4. For the annual period ending December 31, 2021, 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]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **F4a.** **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 911 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 three Primary and five 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. Funds from this grant were used to fund NG911 implementation projects throughout the state.  |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **F5. 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 | 9% |
| Local 911 Fees | 23% |
| General Fund - State |       |
| General Fund - County | ~34% user agency fees~34% other funds (other taxes, general fund) |
| Federal Grants | <1% |
| State Grants |       |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section F5** |
| All local jurisdictions contribute additional local funds to augment State and County 911 excise taxes in covering the costs of 911 statewide. On average statewide, it is estimated that approximately 68% 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**

For the purposes of this questionnaire, diversion is the obligation or expenditure of a 911 fee or charge for a purpose or function other than the purposes and functions identified in 47 CFR § 9.23 of the Commission’s rules as acceptable.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| **G1. In the annual period ending December 31, 2021, were funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes in your state or jurisdiction obligated or expended solely for acceptable purposes and functions as provided under 47 CFR § 9.23?** *Check one*. | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **G1a.** **If NO, please identify what amount of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes were obligated or expended for purposes or functions other than those designated as acceptable under 47 CFR § 9.23, 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 purposes or functions for such funds.** |
| **Amount of Funds ($)** | **Identify the purposes or functions other than those designated as acceptable by the Commission for which the 911/E911 funds were obligated or expended. (*If you need more rows for your response, please enter the information in Addendum Section G1.*)** |
|       |       |
|       |       |
|       |       |
|       |       |
|       |       |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section G1** |
| A county within Washington used county 911 funds for access to an emergency communications system that was not the ESInet and the county determined this to be an authorized use of county 911 funds. Currently the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) does not adequately define an emergency communications system as it relates to 911. The county is addressing the local issue and the state is proposing a revision to the RCW to be more clear. In lieu of the FCC's recent release of final rules on 911 fund usage; this appears to be an ambiguous area that the FCC is having the Fee Diversion Strike Force look into. We are awaiting the final determination.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| **G2. In the annual period ending December 31, 2021, were funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes in your state or jurisdiction obligated or expended for the purchase, maintenance, replacement, or upgrade of public safety radios, networks, equipment, or related infrastructure?** *Check one*. | **[ ]**  | **[x]**  |
| **G2a. If YES to G2, are all of the public safety radios, networks, equipment, or related infrastructure on which funds were obligated or expended used to deliver 911-originated information to emergency responders? For the purposes of this questionnaire, 911-originated information includes all data and information delivered between the 911 request for assistance and the emergency responders.**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **G2a(i). If NO to G2a, please explain.** |
|  |
| **G2b.** **If YES to G2, please itemize the amounts that were obligated or expended and include descriptions of the public safety radios, networks, equipment, or related infrastructure.**  |
| **Amount of Funds ($)** | **Description of such obligations or expenditures. (*If you need more rows for your response, please enter the information in Addendum Section G2.*)** |
|       |       |
|       |       |
|       |       |
|       |       |
|       |       |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section G2** |
|       |

**Safe Harbor for Multi-Purpose Fees**. Section 9.23(d) of the rules provides an elective safe harbor for states and taxing jurisdictions that designate multi-purpose fees or charges for “public safety,” “emergency services,” or other similar purposes where a portion of those fees or charges supports 911 services. *See* 47 CFR § 9.23(d). The rule provides that the obligation or expenditure of such a fee or charge will not constitute diversion if the state or taxing jurisdiction (i) specifies the amount or percentage of such fees or charges that is dedicated to 911 services; (ii) ensures that the 911 portion of such fees or charges is segregated and not commingled with any other funds; and (iii) obligates or expends the 911 portion of such fees or charges for acceptable purposes and functions as defined under the Commission’s rules.

**G3. Does your state or taxing jurisdiction collect fees or charges designated for “public safety,” “emergency services,” or other similar purposes where a portion of those fees or charges supports 911 services?** *Check one.*

* Yes ………………….. [x]
* No ………………..….. [ ]

**If YES to G3, please answer Questions G3a – G3c below.** *(If NO to G3, leave blank.)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question**  | **Yes** | **No** |
| **G3a. Does the state or taxing jurisdiction specify the amount or percentage of such fees or charges that is dedicated to 911 services?** *Check one.* | **[ ]**  | **[x]**  |
| **Question** | **Response** |
| **G3a(i). Cite to the authority by which the state or taxing jurisdiction specifies the amount or percentage.**  |       |
| **G3a(ii). Indicate the amount or percentage of such a fee dedicated to 911 services. Provide *either* dollar amount or percentage.** *(Leave inapplicable cell blank.)* | $      |
|      % |
| **Question**  | **Yes** | **No** |
| **G3b. Does the state or taxing jurisdiction ensure that the 911 portion of such fees or charges is segregated and not commingled with any other funds?** *Check one.* | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **G3b(i). Cite to the authority by which the state or taxing jurisdiction segregates such fees.** |
|       |
| **Question**  | **Yes** | **No** |
| **G3c. Does the state or taxing jurisdiction obligate or expend the 911 portion of such fees or charges only for the purposes and functions designated by the Commission as acceptable pursuant to 47 CFR § 9.23?** *Check one.* | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **G3c(i). If NO to G3c, please explain.** |
|       |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section G3** |
|       |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| **H1. Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures to determine whether collected funds have been obligated or expended for acceptable purposes and functions as designated under the Commission’s rules?** *Check one.* | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **H1a.** **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, 2021.** *(Enter “None” if no actions were taken.)* |
| The State 911 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.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section H1** |
|       |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| **H2. 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]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** | **N/A** |
| **H2a. Did your state conduct an audit of service providers in connection with such auditing authority during the annual period ending December 31, 2021?** *Check one; check N/A if Question H2 response above is NO*.  | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **H2b. If YES to H2 and H2a, 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, 2021.** *(Leave blank if not applicable / 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.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section H2** |
|       |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| **I1. Does your state or jurisdiction classify expenditures on Next Generation 911 (NG911) as within the scope of acceptable purposes and functions for the obligation or expenditure of 911 fees or charges?** *Check one.* | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **I1a. If YES, 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** |
| **I2. In the annual period ending December 31, 2021, has your state or jurisdiction expended funds on NG911 programs?** *Check one.* | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **I2a. If YES, please enter the dollar amount that has been expended during the annual period.** |
| **Amount****($)** | Approximately $12M |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section I2** |
| This amount is based on the cost to operate our statewide NG911 ESInet/NGCS plus an estimated amount which the counties spent. This amount is likely higher depending upon how county operating costs are categorized. This total includes the 911 Federal grant and the Non-Federal (local and state) match. |

|  |
| --- |
| **I3. For the annual period ending December 31, 2021, please provide the number of PSAPs that operated on each type 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** |
| I3a. A single, state-wide ESInet | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  | 66 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| I3b. Local (*e.g.*, county) ESInet(s) | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| I3c. Regional ESInets | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  | [If one Regional ESInet is in operation, provide the total PSAPs on the first line below. If more than one Regional ESInet is in operation, provide the total PSAPs operating on each ESInet.] |  |  |
| Name of Regional ESInet 1:US Navy | 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:      |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **If more Regional ESInets operate in your state or taxing jurisdiction, please list the names of Regional ESInets 8 and higher, and numbers of associated PSAPs, in the space below:** |
|       |

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

**I4. Please provide a description of any NG911 projects completed or underway during the annual period ending December 31, 2021.**

|  |
| --- |
| King County, the 14th largest county in the US and home to the City of Seattle, has entered in to a contract with Intrado to provide a three-host, 12-remote Call Handling System riding on a county-wide ESInet. The statewide ESInet/NGCS will deliver 911 sessions, bound for King County PSAPs, to one of the three hosts in an active/active configuration. The hosts will then deliver those sessions over the county ESInet. The county ESInet willnot have any NGCS. The project is scheduled to be completed in CY 2023.A new cross-state Host/Remote Call Handling System project was started in late 2021 with initial completion in early 2022. The project will consist of two host call handling systems located in a county PSAP on each side of the Cascade Range and each of the four remote PSAPs will be connected to each of the Host through geographically diverse connections utilizing the statewide ESInet for transport. There are currently as many as three additional counties/PSAPs interested in joining this Host/Remote system.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **I4a. Based on your response to I4, please indicate which categories of NG911 expenditures from this non-exhaustive list apply.** | ***Check all that apply*.** |
| **General Project or Not Specified** | **[x]**  |
| **Planning or Consulting Services** | **[ ]**  |
| **ESInet Construction** | **[x]**  |
| **NG911 Core Services** | **[x]**  |
| **Hardware or Software Purchases or Upgrades** | **[x]**  |
| **GIS** | **[x]**  |
| **NG911 Security Planning** | **[x]**  |
| **Training** | **[x]**  |

**I5. As of December 31, 2021, how many PSAPs within your state have implemented text-to-911 and are accepting texts? Please refrain from non-numeric responses such as “all PSAPs.” Enter any text in Addendum Section I5.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Total Number of PSAPs Accepting Texts as of December 31, 2021** | 39 |

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

**I6. By the end of the *next* annual period ending December 31, 2022, how many *total* PSAPs do you anticipate will have implemented text-to-911 and will be accepting texts?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Estimated Total Number of PSAPs Accepting Texts as of December 31, 2022** | 47 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section I6** |
|       |

1. **Cybersecurity Expenditures**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Check the appropriate box** | **If Yes,****Amount Expended ($)** |
| **J1. During the annual period ending December 31, 2021, 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** |
| **J2. During the annual period ending December 31, 2021, how many PSAPs in your state either implemented a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program?** | 66 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section J2** |
| All PSAPs connecting to the statewide ESInet are required to meet specific cybersecurity standards in order to physically connect to the ESInet. The US Navy RDC/ESInet is included in this count because of cybersecurity requirements for their ESInet to be connected to the State's ESInet. Of the 66 PSAPs receiving calls from the State's ESInet/NGCS, six (6) are virtual connections - two (2) Primary PSAPs and two (2) Secondary PSAPs receive calls from "Host" call handling systems but have ESInet/NGCS URIs, while one (1) Primary PSAP and one (1) Secondary PSAP receive calls directly from the ESInet/NGCS via 10-digit number due to CPE or governance issues. These last two are included in the total number connected to the ESInet/NGCS.  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** | **Unknown** |
| **J3. Does your state or jurisdiction adhere to the National Institute of Standards and Technology *Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity* (April 2018) for networks supporting one or more PSAPs in your state or jurisdiction?**[[5]](#footnote-6) *Check one.* | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |

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

1. **Measuring Effective Utilization of 911/E911 Fees**

**K1. 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 2021, Washington State alone expended well over $100M on NG911 modernization – including the first-ever statewide ESInet, a replacement of this ESInet with a NENA i3 standards-based ESInet which includes NGCS, and NG911 modernization of the Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) – 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 completion of the NENA i3 standards-based ESInet/NGCS allows for multi-media (i.e. Voice, Text, Data, etc.) 911 access and provides an even faster, more reliable, resilient, geo-diverse and scalable system, with cyber-security planned into the design. The Washington State NG911 enterprise has 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  |

1. **Underfunding of 911**

For the purposes of this questionnaire, underfunding occurs when funding levels are below the levels required for optimal performance of 911 operations.

**L1. Describe the impact of any underfunding of 911 services in your state or taxing jurisdiction during the annual period ending December 31, 2021.**

|  |
| --- |
| We estimate that only a third of the true, total end-to-end cost to operate 911 in the State of Washington comes from the 911 tax; the remainder has to be made up through agency user fees, other tax bases (sales, property, etc) and other general funding. There are PSAPs who have had to delay replacement and/or maintenance of key equipment due to underfunding. Another area where underfunding has impacted 911 services is the inability in some areas to compensate telecommunicators to a level that will keep them in the job. Salary level is not the only cause of the current telecommunicator shortage, but it does play a factor in some of our PSAPs and Counties.  |

**L2. Describe how any fee diversion affected 911 underfunding in your state or taxing jurisdiction during the annual period ending December 31, 2021.** *Indicate N/A if your state or taxing jurisdiction did not divert.*

|  |
| --- |
| N/A |

**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. *See* Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021, Public Law 116-260, Division FF, Title IX, section 902. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. 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 (NENA), Master Glossary of 9-1-1 Terminology at 174 (June 22, 2021), <https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/standards/nena-adm-000.24-2021_final_2.pdf>. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. For the purposes of this questionnaire, 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* https://nenawiki.org/wiki/Telecommunicator. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. *See* 47 CFR § 9.23(b)(1)–(5). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. National Institute of Standards and Technology, Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity (2018), <https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/cswp/nist.cswp.04162018.pdf>. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)