**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** |
| State of Nevada |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Title** | **Organization** |
| Bill Ferguson  Clara Bundy  Wendy Lotman  Becky Parsons  Scott Henriod  Josh Foli  Ashley Catillo  Jenn Stoffer  Brent Finster  Ruby Perkins | Sheriff  Communications Support Fire  Communications Chief  Sheriff  Comptroller  Dispatch Manager  911 Dispatch Manager  Emergency Communications Manager  Police Support Services Manager | Mineral Co/Eureka Co Sheriff's Office  Las Vegas Fire and Rescue Storey  County Communications  White Pine Co Sheriff's Office  Lyon County  Nye County Sheriff's Office  Carson City Sheriff's Office  Douglas County 911 Emergency Services  BCPD |

|  |
| --- |
| **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, 2022. 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 | 5 |
| Secondary | 1 |
| **Total** | 6 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section B1** |
| Storey County - 1 PSAP - No Funding  Eureka County - 856 confirmed through CAD doesn't reflect calls that didn't import from E911 or vesta system; 1 psasp in County.  White Pine County - 1 funded by General Fund Dispatch Department |

**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, 2022. 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 | 25 |
| Part Time | 2 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section B2** |
| NV-8  Douglas County - 18 Full Time and 1 Part time telecommunicators funded through General Fund (property tax).  Storey County - 9 Full Time Telecommunicators - No Funding.  White Pine County - 5 dispatch employees paid with General Fund Dispatch.  Eureka County - 4 dispatchers normally 6 at full staff. |

**B3. For the annual period ending December 31, 2022, please provide an estimate of the total cost to provide 911/E911 service in your state or jurisdiction.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Amount ($)** | 25,207,281.90 |

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

|  |
| --- |
| Storey County - Self-funded. The Storey County Board of Commissioners have elected not to collect 911 fees or surcharges.  White Pine County - 911 Surcharge account pays for small protion of IT salaries for maintaining systems.  Eureka County - Unknown paid in full 2017 for 6 year contract. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section B3** |
| Douglas County - Does not include personnel or admin costs.  White Pine County - Cost related to General Fund Dispatch Department is $535,469.07. |

**B4. Please provide the total number of 911 voice calls that your state or jurisdiction received during the period January 1, 2022 to December 31, 2022.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of Service** | **Total 911 Voice Calls** |
| Wireline | 294,254 |
| Wireless | 294,505 |
| VoIP | 37,008 |
| Other (report 911 texts separately below in B.4a) | 105,623 |
| **Total** | 734,014 |

**B4a. Please provide the total number of 911 texts that your state or jurisdiction received during the period January 1, 2022 to December 31, 2022.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Texts to 911 | 162 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section B4** |
| Mineral County - Does not have ability to distinguish how many calls come in on 911 through wireless/wirelines/VoIP.  Clark County - Listed as unknown origin.  Consolidated Municipality of Carson City NV- Unable to report by service/line type-included the total combined for all 911 calls received in "Other". |

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 …………………..
* No ………………..…..

**C1a. If YES, provide a citation to the legal authority for such a mechanism.**

|  |
| --- |
| Consolidated Municipality of Carson City, NV - NRS 244A.7641 - NRS 244A.7678. Carson City Municipal Code 4.05 Inclusive.  Douglas County - Douglas County Ordinance 2018-1517.  Nye County- Nevada County Code Chapter 3.20 9-1-1 Taxing District. Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 244A.7643.  White Pine County - Bill No. 01-28-2015 Ordinance No. 459.  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 Nevada Revised Statutes 244A.7641-244A.7647. |

**C1b. If YES to C1, during the annual period January 1, 2022 to December 31, 2022, 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 ………………..…..
* Unknown ………..…..

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section C1** |
| White Pine County - Cost related to General Fund Dispatch Department is $535,469.07. |

**C2. Which of the following best describes the type of authority arrangement for the collection of 911/E911 fees**? *Check one*. *If both State and local authorities collect fees, please check the “hybrid approach” box only.*

* 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 ……………..

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section C2** |
| White Pine County - Cost related to General Fund Dispatch Department is $535,469.07.  Storey County - We are self-funded. The Storey County Board of Commissioners have elected not to collect 911 fees or surcharges. |

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

|  |
| --- |
| Mineral County - Funds are mailed to Clerk/Treasurer's Office.  Lyon County - Telephone surcharge is placed on each phone and the phone companies pay the County on a monthly basis.  White Pine County - Payments are sent to the treasurers by each vendor.  Nye County - Revenue from the current 911 surcharge is placed into a fund ("9-1-1 Fund") administered by Nye County. Upon recommendation by Nye County's 9-1-1 Advisory Committee, the 9-1-1 surcharge fund is currently used to cover cost associated with 9-1-1 telecommunication services as outlined in NRS.  Douglas County - Collected fees are distributed to Douglas County by the ILEC and wireless providers.  Consolidated Municipality of Carson City NV- Funds are remitted to the local jurisdiction from the individual phone carriers. |

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 ……………………………….

**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.).**

|  |
| --- |
| Mineral County - Limited to fees collected by the entity.  Consolidated Municipality of Carson City NV - 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.  Douglas County - No limitations  Nye County - The Nye County 9-1-1 Advisory Committee provides a 5 -year master plan to the Nye County Board of County Commissioners relating to their recommendation to how funds collected through property taxes, wireless, wireline, VoIP and Trunk line 9-1-1 surcharge fee's are utilized.  Lyon County - The Telephone surcharge is limited in amount and revenue and in expenditure purposes by Nevada Revised Statue 244A.  Storey County - Self-funded. Storey County Board of Commissioners have elected not to collect 911 fees or surcharges.  White Pine County - Telephone Emergency Reporting (911) Advisory Committee. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section D1** |
| White Pine County - Cost related to General Fund Dispatch Department is $535,469.07. |

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

* Yes …………………..
* No ………………..…..

**D2a.** **If you checked YES, provide a legal citation to the funding mechanism of any such criteria.**

|  |
| --- |
| Consolidated Municipality of Carson City NV - NRS 244a.7645.  Douglas County - Nevada Revised Statutes 244a.7645.  Nye County - Nevada Revised Statues 244a.7643.  Storey County - NRS 244A.7641-244A.7646 Surcharge for Enhancement of Telephone System.  Lyon County - Telephone surcharge is limited in expenditure purposes by Nevada Revised Statute 244A. |

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

|  |
| --- |
| White Pine County - Telephone Emergency Reporting (911) Advisory Committee. |

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.**

|  |
| --- |
| Mineral County - Use E911 funds to upgrade 911 equipment. Also use funds for officers body worn cameras, and pay monthly 911 phone bills.  Consolidated Municipality of Carson City NV- AT&T 911 System monthly charges, Smart 911 Services, Computer Aided dispatch maintenance and upgrades, law enforcement body cameras, law enforcement vehicle cameras, electrical upgrade for 911 communications center, Bryx fire toning system implementation and replacement, fire RMS implementation and replacement.  Douglas County - The Douglas County 9-1-1 Emergency Services Department has collected all revenue from the 75 cent per month surcharge on wireless and wireline telephones. All funds that were collected have been used to support the provision of E9-1-1 call takiong and dispatching services to the public safety agencies (including law enforcement, fire, and Emergency Medical Services) based in Douglas County, NV.  Lyon County - Has expended surcharge funds for leasing a dispatch phone system, phone lines into dispatch, mobile data computers and associated hotspots to communicate with the CAD system, and mobile radios to communicate with Dispatch.  White Pine County - Current plan is to obtain upgrades and maintenance of system. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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) |  |  |
| Lease, purchase, maintenance, replacement, and upgrade of computer aided dispatch (CAD) equipment (hardware and software) |  |  |
| Lease, purchase, maintenance, replacement, and upgrade of PSAP building/facility |  |  |
| NG911, cybersecurity, pre-arrival instructions, and emergency notification systems (ENS) |  |  |
| **PSAP personnel costs** | Telecommunicators’ Salaries |  |  |
| Training of Telecommunicators |  |  |
| **PSAP administrative costs** | Program Administration |  |  |
| Travel Expenses |  |  |
| **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 |  |  |
| 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, 2022, 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** |
| White Pine County - Cost related to General Fund Dispatch Department.  Storey County - No grants received from the State through the use of collected 911/E911 fees. |

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 – provide *either* fee ($) or percentage (%)** *(leave inapplicable cell blank for each type)* | **Fee/Charge Imposed** | **Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance**  *Check one for each Service Type. If both State and County/Local Authorities receive remittances, please check the “Combination” box only.* | | |
| **State** | **County or Local Authority** | **Combination of State and County/Local** |
| **Wireline – monthly fee ($) or percentage (%)** | $0.75-1.00 |  |  |  |
| % |
| **Wireless – monthly fee ($) or percentage (%)** | $0.75-1.00 |  |  |  |
| % |
| **Prepaid Wireless –flat fee ($) or percentage (%) per retail transaction** | $1.00 |  |  |  |
| % |
| **Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) – monthly fee ($) or percentage (%)** | $1.00-2.50 |  |  |  |
| % |
| **Other – monthly fee ($) or percentage (%)** | $10.00 |  |  |  |
| % |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section F1** |
| White Pine County - Cost related to General fund Dispatch Department is $535,469.07. |

**F2. For the annual period ending December 31, 2022, please report the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees or charges described in Question F1.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Service Type** | **Total Amount Collected ($)** |
| Wireline | 40,921.09 |
| Wireless | 510,952.25 |
| Prepaid Wireless |  |
| Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) | 35,858.67 |
| Other | 87,710.81 |
| **Total** | 2,891,425.85 |

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

|  |
| --- |
| Nye County - Prepaid wireless cannot be provided due to the Nye County Finance Department not receiving payments from carriers specifying if they are prepaid or contract account payments.  Clark County - We do not charge a 911 fee in Clark County.  Lyon County - A total is provided, but we don't get the information in the detail requested.  White Pine County - This is an average, based on one months wireline, wireless and VoIP information.  Storey County - We are self-funded. Storey County Board of Commissioners have elected not to collect 911 fees or surcharges. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section F2** |
| Consolidated Municipality of Carson City NV - Unable to report by serivce type. |

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

|  |
| --- |
| Consolidated Municipality of Carson City NV- General Fund.  Douglas County - Ad volarum proerty tax and user agency fees pays for all Emergency Communications Center expenditures not covered by 9-1-1 surcharge revenue.  Nye County - Nye County Property Tax initiative, Nye County General Fund.  Lyon County - County General Fund Revenue.  Storey County - Self-funded. Storey County Board of Commissioners have elected not to collect 911 fees per surcharges.  Clark County - Local agency general funds.  White Pine County - Cost related to General Fund dispatch Department $535,469.07. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| **F4. For the annual period ending December 31, 2022, 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.* |  |  |
| **F4a.** **If YES, please describe the federal, state or local funds and amounts that were combined with 911/E911 fees.** | | |
| Consolidated Municipality of Carson City NV - 911 surcharge funds are held separately in a Special Revenue Fund and are not co-mingled with City funds, Carson City general funds also used to support 911 services.  Nye County - 9-1-1 fee's from county property tax initiative and funds from the Nye County General Fund.  Lyon County - General Fund revenues were used to pay for salaries, benefits, and services and supplises cost for Dispatch. Telephone Surcharge fundes were used for: mobile data, mobile computers, and radios for first responders; a recording system for call; and 911 phone lines into Dispatch. | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section F4** |
| White Pine County - Cost related to General Fund dispatch Department $535,469.07. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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 |  |
| Local 911 Fees | 37% - 100% dependent on County |
| General Fund - State |  |
| General Fund - County | 44% - 100% dependent on County |
| Federal Grants |  |
| State Grants |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section F5** |
| White Pine County - Cost related to General Fund dispatch Department $535,469.07.  Storey County - Self-funded. Storey County Board of Commissioners have elected not to collect 911 fees or surcharges. |

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, 2022, 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*. | |  |  |
| **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.*)** | | |
| 327,961 | Carson City - NICE Maintenance.  White Pine County - Upgrades and maintenance to systems. | | |
| 250,000 | White Pine County - GIS system necessary to enhance 911 system. | | |
| 500,000 | White Pine County - Replace current emergency repeated system. | | |
|  |  | | |
|  |  | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section G1** |
| White Pine County - Cost related to General Fund Dispatch $535,469.07, road funding, assessor tech funding & recorders mining map funding expected to help fund above list.  Storey County - NO funds were collected |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | | **Yes** | **No** |
| **G2. In the annual period ending December 31, 2022, 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.** | |  |  |
| **G2a(i). If NO to G2a, please explain.** | | | |
| White Pine County - Working on updates, upgrades and maintenance for systems through other funding.  Clark County - No fees were collected. Agencies pay for their own portion of radio equipment and related infrastructure. It does not come out of the communications division budget.  Eureka County - No funds collected. | | | |
| **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.*)** | | |
| 514,357 | Carson City - CAD Maintenance.  Lyon County - Mobile radios for first responders. | | |
| 4,500 | Carson City - Fiber install. | | |
| 66,487 | Carson City - UPS Replacement | | |
| 27,961 CARC | Carson City - NICE Maintenance | | |
|  |  | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section G2** |
| White Pine County - Cost related to General Fund Dispatch Department is $55,469.07.  Storey County - No Funds were collected. |

**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 multi-purpose fees or charges designated for “public safety,” “emergency services,” or other similar purposes where a portion of those fees or charges supports 911 services?**[[5]](#footnote-6) *Check one.*

* Yes …………………..
* No ………………..…..

**If YES to G3, please answer Questions G3a – G3c below. If NO to G3 above, leave Questions G3a – G3c below 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.* |  |  |
| **Question** | **Response** | |
| **G3a(i). Cite to the authority by which the state or taxing jurisdiction specifies the amount or percentage.** | Carson City - NRS 244A.7641, NRS 244A.7648, CCMC 4.05  Storey County | |
| **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.* |  |  |
| **G3b(i). Cite to the authority by which the state or taxing jurisdiction segregates such fees.** | | |
| Storey County - Does not collect. | | |
| **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.** | | |
| Storey County - Does not collect. | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section G3** |
| Storey County - Does not collect. |

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.* |  |  |
| **H1a.** **If YES, provide a description of: (i) the mechanisms or procedures and (ii) any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2022.** *(Enter “None” if no actions were taken.)* | | |
| Storey County - Does not collect. | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section H1** |
| Consolidated Municipality of Carson City NV- 911 Surcharge Advisory Committee reviews expenditures pursuant to Carson City Municipal Code 4.05. Carson City Board of Supervisors approved 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.* |  | |  | |
| **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, 2022?** *Check one; check N/A if Question H2 response above is NO*. |  |  | |  |
| **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, 2022.** *(Leave blank if not applicable / no actions were taken.)* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section H2** |
| Storey County - Does Not Collect. |

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.* |  |  |
| **I1a. If YES, please cite any specific legal authority:** | | |
| Consolidated Municipality of Carson City NV - NRS 244A.7641. Carson City Municipal Code 4.05 inclusive.  Nye County - Nevada Revised Statute NRS 244A.7643.  Storey County - NRS 244A.7641-244A.7646 Surcharge for Enchancement of Telephone Systems.  Mineral County - Unknown. | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | | **Yes** | **No** |
| **I2. In the annual period ending December 31, 2022, has your state or jurisdiction expended funds on NG911 programs?** *Check one.* | |  |  |
| **I2a. If YES, please enter the dollar amount that has been expended during the annual period.** | | | |
| **Amount**  **($)** | 17,183 | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section I2** |
| Consolidated Municipality of Carson City NV - Rave Smart 911 Application - total for our agency/jurisdiction only.  Storey County - Does not collect. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **I3. For the annual period ending December 31, 2022, 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 |  |  |  |  |  |
| I3b. Local (*e.g.*, county) ESInet(s) |  |  |  |  |  |
| I3c. Regional ESInets |  |  | [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: | | |  |  |  |
| 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, 2022.**

|  |
| --- |
| Douglas County - Douglas County, NV Emergency Communications Center provides contracted dispatch service to Alpine County, California. California Office of Emergency Services or CALOES is in an implementation phase to bring NG9-1-1 to all of California including Alpine County. Douglas County will receive some benefit of upgraded CPE as a result of this arrangement.  Eureka County - Add text to 911 in the next fiscal year have quotes. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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** |  |
| **GIS** |  |
| **NG911 Security Planning** |  |
| **Training** |  |

**I5. As of December 31, 2022, 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, 2022** | 2 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section I5** |
| Consolidated Municipality of Carson City NV - Unknown.  Clark County - Don't have information for other PSAPs. Does not use text-to-911. |

**I6. By the end of the *next* annual period ending December 31, 2023, 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, 2023** | 3 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section I6** |
| Clark County - Don't have information for other PSAPs. Will not have implemented by 12/23. |

1. **Cybersecurity Expenditures**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Check the appropriate box** | | **If Yes,**  **Amount Expended ($)** |
| **J1. During the annual period ending December 31, 2022, did your state expend funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs?** | Yes | No | 24,000 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section J1** |
| Consolidated Municipality of Carson City NV- Service contract with mission critical partners.  Douglas County - Unknown.  Mineral County - Unknown. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Total PSAPs** |
| **J2. During the annual period ending December 31, 2022, how many PSAPs in your state either had a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program?** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Addendum Section J2** |
| Consolidated Municipality of Carson City NV - Unknown.  Douglas County - Unknown.  Clark County - Does not have information on other PSAPs. Ours did not. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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?**[[6]](#footnote-7) *Check one.* |  |  |  |

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

|  |
| --- |
| Consolidated Municipality of Carson City NV - Defer to the Nevada Dvision of Emergency Management Statewide Interoperablity Coordinator.  Douglas County - Since there is no 9-1-1 program manager in Nevada, Douglas County is unaware of any such assessment.  Storey County - Does not collect fees.  Clark County - We do not charge a fee in Clark County so no ability to access.  Nye County - Has an established Emergency Systems Fund (911) where collected 911 surcharge fees are deposited. Fund is used for the purchase, lease, installation or maintenance of 911 equipment and any other expense outlined in NRS 244A.7643 which was amended by NV SB 176 (2017). This fund can support the cost of monthly phone bills to maintain phone service at the PSAP as well as very few strategically planned projects decided up by the Nye County 911 advisory committee. The fund is not effective in covering the cost of PSAP staffing, CAD equipment or maintenance fees, the BWC's as outlined in NRS, or any other allowed covered equipment that is needed by the PSAP. In addition, these funds cannot support any type of expansion or remodel of the PSAP currently. These costs have been paid by the County General Fund. |

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, 2022.** *Indicate N/A if your state or taxing jurisdiction did not experience underfunding*.

|  |
| --- |
| NV- Staffing shortages.  Consolidated Municipality of Carson City NV - None known.  Douglas County - N/A.  Storey County - Staff shortages.  White Pine County - Cost related to General Fund Dispatch Department is $535,469.07.  Lyon County - N/A.  Mineral County - N/A.  Eureka County - N/A.  Clark County - We are unable to move forward with interoperability such as a CAD to CAD connection within Clark County due to cost and each agency having to pay a portion for the project. We were unable to increase our staffing FTEs to a sufficient number to meet NFPA standards for call answer times since our funding is soleley by general funds of the fire departments.  Nye County - Underfunding 911 has had a huge impact on our jurisdiction. Funds that could be used for other emergency services are being diverted to cover the cost of maintaining 911 and the staff who provide services. This has an impact on the basic operations of the Sheriff's Office in our County because the additional costs come out of their budget. Insufficient funding for critical positions results in inadequate staffing. Our PSAP regularly has issues with low staffing and retension. There are inadequate funds to provide any additional training which could have a direct impact on the public. There is no funding available for updated workstations, chairs, etc. Underfunding has created an issue with space. There is no funding to build or remodel facilities. Underfunding makes it difficult to attain technology; if it is not free then it will probably not be implemented. In addition, the issue with funds makes it difficult to plan for any type of emergency or evacuation of the ccenter. There is no way to fund any type of community education, outreach or engagement to make sure that callers know how and when to utilize the system. |

**L2. Describe how any fee diversion affected 911 underfunding in your state or taxing jurisdiction during the annual period ending December 31, 2022.** *Indicate N/A if your state or taxing jurisdiction did not divert.*

|  |
| --- |
| NV - N/A  Mineral County - N/A  Storey County - N/A  Eureka County - N/A  White Pine County - Cost related to General Fund Dispatch Department is $535,469.07.  Douglas County - N/A.  Nye County - N/A.  Clark County - N/A.  Lyon County - 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**](mailto: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-archived/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 voice, text, and multi-media 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. For purposes of this question, please report only multi-purpose fees or charges “applicable to commercial mobile services, IP-enabled voice services, or other emergency communications services,” where a portion of those fees or charges supports 911 services. 47 CFR § 9.22. Please do not report multi-purpose fees or charges applicable to other types of items (e.g., do not report multi-purpose fees on real estate where a portion of those fees supports 911 services). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. 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-7)