**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** |
| NV |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Title** | **Organization** |
| Melissa Friend | Mission Support Manager | Nevada Division of Emergency Management |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section A** |
|  8 of 17 Counties responded not including one partial county--identified as Clark/Boulder City throughout report.Counties Reporting are: Consolidated Municipality of Carson City Nevada (Carson City); Churchill County; Clark/Boulder City; Douglas County; Esmeralda County; Humboldt County; Lincoln County; Lyon county; and Storey County |

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 | 6 |
| Secondary | 0 |
| **Total** | 6 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section B1** |
| Storey County reported 1 Primary PSAP with NO funding. Not included in number above. |

**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 | 44 |
| Part Time | 6 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section B2** |
| 17 F/T Telecommunicators not funded through collection of 911/E911 fees |

**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 ($)** | 3,506,190.00 |

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

|  |
| --- |
| Storey County did not report as the county is self-funded. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section B3** |
| 9780 |

**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 | 8,679 |
| Wireless  | 61,701 |
| VoIP | 5,729 |
| Other (report 911 texts separately below in B.4a) | 70,276 |
| **Total** | 174,468 |

**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 | 101 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section B4** |
| Carson City was unable to report by service type and provided a total only of 28,083 calls; Storey County did not break down wireline and VoIP call--they were reported in "other" altogether. These numbers were reflected in the Total for B4 |

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.**

|  |
| --- |
| NRS 244A.7641 through NRS 244A.7678; Carson city Municipal code 4.05 Inclusive; Douglas County Ordinance 2018-1517; Humboldt County Code Ch 8.44; Lyon County uses sales taxes, property taxes, and federal PILT for the majority of the 911 funding. In addition to these funding sources, Lyon County imposes a telephone surcharge on phone lines in the County pursuant to NRS 244A.7641-244A.7647  |

**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 ……………………….… [x]
* A hybrid approach where two or more governing bodies

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

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

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

|  |
| --- |
| Carson City--Funds are remitted to the local jurisdiction from the individual phone carriers.;  Churchill County--The local phone company collects fees from all phone companies and it is transferred to the County Comptroller. Comptroller deposits the money into the 911 account; Douglas--Deposited via the County Treasures into the 911 Surcharge Account, directly from the providers; Humboldt County--Telecommunications provider submits funds collected monthly to the Humboldt County Treasurer; Lincoln County--County funds 911 services through property taxes and not thru collected funds;  Lyon County--A telphone surcharge is placed on each phone and the phone companies pay the county on a monthly basis.  |

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

**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.).**

|  |
| --- |
| Carson City--Expenditures are approved by the 911 Surcharge Advisory Committee pursuant to Carson City Municipal Code 4.05. Expenditures are processed pursuant to Carson City purchasing policy and procedures; Churchill County--Limited to amount collected.; Douglas County--Limited to 911 service delivery only; Humboldt County--Limited to fees collected. 911 Surcharge Committee approves the expense, the County Commission is the final approval of the actual expenditure; Lyon--The telephone surcharge is limited in amount and revenue and in expenditure purposes by NevadaRevised Statute 244A; Storey County--We are self-funded. The Storey County Board of Commissioners has elected not to collect 911 fees or surcharges |

|  |
| --- |
| **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.**

|  |
| --- |
| NRS 244A.7641 through NRS 244A.7647, specifically NRS 244A.7645 and NRS 244A.7646 Surcharge for Enhancement of Telephone System; Humboldt County Code Ch8.44 and the 5 Year Master Plan  |

**D2b.** **If you checked NO, describe how your state or jurisdiction decides how collected funds can be used.**

|  |
| --- |
| Esmeralda County does not collect funds. |

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.**

|  |
| --- |
| Carson City--AT&T 911 System monthly chargesphone system upgradesfirewall upgradescomputer aided dispatch maintenance and upgradelaw enforcement body cameraslaw enforcement vehicle camerasreplacement of critical recording 911 system recording equipmentelectrical assessment for communications centerChurchill County--Pays for 911 trunk lines, updates to ALI/ANI ioncluding GPS details and body camsClark/Boulder City--We do not receive any funds from the county or the stateDouglas County--Prior to Jan 2019, we were not able to provide any NG911 services and had to supplement the 911 budget with general communications funds. With the surcharge increase starting Jan 2019, we have moved well into the 7.5 NG arena, starting with Text-2-911. We are currently exploring video capability. The ability to have the 911 system operating in the black frees funds for the genral operations of the center.Lyon County--Lyon County has expended telephone surcharge funds for leasing a dispatch phone system, phone lines into dispatch mobile data computers and associated hotspots to communicater with the CAD syustem, and mobile radios to cvommunicate with DispatchLincoln and Storey County-- do not collect 911 fees and/or are self-funded. |

|  |
| --- |
| **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 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| 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 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **Grant programs** |  | **[ ]** **If YES, see E2a.** | **[x]**  |
| **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 ($)** | $      | **[ ]**  | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **Wireless – monthly fee ($)** | $      | **[ ]**  | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **Prepaid Wireless – provide *either* flat fee ($) or percentage (%) per retail transaction** *(leave inapplicable cell blank)* | $      | **[ ]**  | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
|      % |
| **Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) – monthly fee ($)** | $      | **[ ]**  | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **Other – monthly fee ($)** | $      | **[ ]**  | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section F1** |
| County Fees vary at $1.00 / $.75 / $.25 per month for each: Wireline, Wireless , Prepaid Wireless and VOIP. Under "Other", rates varied at $2.50/$7.50/$10.00 per trunk line/mo. |

**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 |       |
| Wireless |       |
| Prepaid Wireless |       |
| Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) |       |
| Other |       |
| **Total** | $710,374.22 |

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

|  |
| --- |
|       |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section F2** |
| The majority of counties do not or are unable to track by service type, therefore provided a Total only; Clark/Boulder City reported it does not receive money from city/state; Storey County reported it does not collect fees. |

**F3. Please identify any other sources of 911/E911 funding.**

|  |
| --- |
| Counties reported General Funds, City and County Budgets,  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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.** |
| Carson City reported Yes to 4F: 911 Surcharge funds are held separately in a Special Revenue Fund, and are not comingled with City funds. Carson City general funds are also used to support 911 services.Lyon County reported Yes to 4F: General Fund revenues of $1,454,112.26 were used towards the operation of 911 dispatch.Other Counties reported No to 4F.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **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 | 0 |
| Local 911 Fees | 25% |
| General Fund - State |       |
| General Fund - County | 75% |
| Federal Grants |       |
| State Grants |       |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section F5** |
| Average of reporting Counties responses. |

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** |
| Esmeralda County reported No to G1 without identification (G1A).Storey County reported No to G1 due to no funds collected. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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*. | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **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.**  | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **G2a(i). If NO to G2a, please explain.** |
| Carson City-- |
| **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.*)** |
| 114,380 | Computer Aided Dispatch Maintenance |
| 51,000 | System Assessment--PK Electrical |
| 78,579 | Expansion of Fiber for Communicaton |
| 34,456 | Replace of Dispatch 911 Recording System |
| 6,175 | Software Purchase |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section G2** |
| G2b Continued:43,766--Watchguard PUrchase48,602--Lenslock Contract annual renewal408,915--Mobile radios for first responders4 Counties reported No to 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.**  | NRS 244A.7641-NRS244A7648; CCMC 4.05 |
| **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.)* | $      |
| 100% |
| **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.* | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **G3b(i). Cite to the authority by which the state or taxing jurisdiction segregates such fees.** |
| NRS 244A 7645 |
| **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.* | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **G3c(i). If NO to G3c, please explain.** |
| Esmeralda County reported No to G3c with no explanation |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section G3** |
| Carson City reported Y to G3a ad G3b. All other counties reported No or did not answer G3a. |

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.)* |
| Outside audit at the end of the year; NRS 179.425;  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section H1** |
| Carson City response: 911 Surcharge Advisory Committee reviews expenditures pursuant to Carson City Municipal Code 4.05 Carson City Board of Supervisors approves the budget for the Surcharge Special Revenue Fund.All expenditures are subject to review and audit by Carson City outside auditors, pursuant to NRS 244A.7648  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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.)* |
|       |

|  |
| --- |
| **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:** |
| NRS 244A.7641 - NRS 244A.7647 surcharge for Enhancements of Telephone Systems; Carson City Municipal Code 4.05 inclusive;  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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****($)** | 4375 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section I2** |
| Carson City reported Yes to I2 in Amount of $4375 noting RaveSmart 911. |

|  |
| --- |
| **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]**  |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| I3b. Local (*e.g.*, county) ESInet(s) | **[ ]**  | **[x]**  |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| 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:AT&T Hosted Solutions |       | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| 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** |
|       |

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

|  |
| --- |
| Lyon County is updating out recording system to the NICE recording 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** | **[ ]**  |
| **Planning or Consulting Services** | **[ ]**  |
| **ESInet Construction** | **[ ]**  |
| **NG911 Core Services** | **[ ]**  |
| **Hardware or Software Purchases or Upgrades** | **[x]**  |
| **GIS** | **[ ]**  |
| **NG911 Security Planning** | **[ ]**  |
| **Training** | **[ ]**  |

**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** | 1 |

|  |
| --- |
| **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** | 2 |

|  |
| --- |
| **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**[ ]**  | 23,954 |

|  |
| --- |
| **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?** |       |

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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** |
| 2 counties reported Y to J3 with the remaining counties reporting No and Unknown |

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.**

|  |
| --- |
| Carson City--Defer to the NV Division of Emergency Management Statewide Interoperability CoordinatorDouglas County--Annual masterplan update to show services and expendituresEsmeralda County and Storey County--does not charge for any 911 fees  |

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.**

|  |
| --- |
| Storey County reported Staff Shortage |

**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.*

|  |
| --- |
|       |

**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)