

on the Commission's website at <http://www.ferc.gov> using the eLibrary link. Enter the docket number, excluding the

last three digits, in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance, please contact FERC Online

Support at FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov or toll free at (866) 208-3676, or for TTY, contact (202) 502-8659.

Docket Nos.	File date	Presenter or requester
Prohibited:		
1. P-15230-002	8-26-2026	FERC Staff. ¹
2. P-15230/002	08-26-2026	FERC Staff. ²
Exempt:		
1. P-77-332	08-28-2026	FERC Staff. ³
2. EC26-131-000	09-02-2026	U.S. Senator Richard Blumenthal.
3. P-14787-004	09-03-2026	FERC Staff. ⁴
4. P-2197-000	09-08-2026	U.S. Representative Pat Harrigan.

¹ Email communication dated 08/12/26 forwarding comments from Renee C. Heromin -U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

² Email communication dated 08/26/26 forwarding comments from Victor Elam—Ohio River Islands National Wildlife Refuge.

³ Memorandum dated 08/28/26 forwarding comments from John Rich of Special Envoy for American Landowners.

⁴ Memorandum dated 09/3/26 forwarding comments from Wyoming State Legislature's Joint Travel, Recreation, Wildlife, and Cultural Resources Committee.

Dated: September 9, 2026.

Debbie-Anne A. Reese,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2026-18770 Filed 9-11-26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[EPA-HQ-OLEM-2026-7360; FRL-13555-01-OLEM]

Request for Information on Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste (SW-846), Waste Sampling and Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP) Testing

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice; request for information.

SUMMARY: EPA updates test methods and waste sampling guidance as part of routine updates according to the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). To aid in the implementation of these directives, the Office of Resource Conservation and Recovery (ORCR) within the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) requests information on SW-846 method experiences, needs, and requirements. ORCR is specifically interested in information on the Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP) Method 1311, including method challenges, and alternatives. Information is welcome from stakeholders involved in requesting, performing, and evaluating the results from SW-846 methods including, but not limited to, industry stakeholders, researchers, academia, state, Tribal, and local governments. This includes U.S. territories and the District of Columbia, other federal agencies, community groups, non-governmental organizations, the public,

and international organizations. The EPA will use the information received in response to this request for information (RFI) to inform what action, if any, it may take.

DATES: Comments and information must be received on or before November 13, 2026 to allow for consideration in any short-term updates to the methods. The EPA may consider comments received after the due date to the extent practicable.

ADDRESSES: EPA invites submission of the requested information, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OLEM-2026-7360, by any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to <https://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting your comments.
- *Hand Delivery or Courier:* EPA Docket Center, WJC West Building, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20004. The Docket Center's hours of operations are 8:30 a.m.–4:30 p.m., Monday–Friday (except Federal Holidays).

Instructions: All submissions received must include the Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OLEM-2026-7360 for this document. Comments received may be posted without change to <https://www.regulations.gov/>, including any personal information provided. For detailed instructions on sending comments see the “Public Participation” heading of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Troy Strock, Waste Identification, Notice, and Generators Division, Office of Resource Conservation and Recovery, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Mail Code 5304T, Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: (202) 566-0504; email address: strock.troy@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Public Participation

Written Comments

Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OLEM-2026-7360, at <https://www.regulations.gov> (our preferred method), or the other methods identified in the **ADDRESSES** section. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from the docket. The EPA may publish any comment received to its public docket. Do not submit to EPA's docket at <https://www.regulations.gov> any information you consider to be Confidential Business Information (CBI), Proprietary Business Information (PBI), or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Multimedia submissions (audio, video, etc.) must be accompanied by a written comment. The written comment is considered the official comment and should include discussion of all points you wish to make. The EPA will generally not consider comments or comment contents located outside of the primary submission (*i.e.*, on the web, cloud, or other file sharing system). Please visit <https://www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets> for additional submission methods; the full EPA public comment policy; information about CBI, PBI, or multimedia submissions; and general guidance on making effective comments.

Comments containing references, studies, research, and other empirical data that are not widely published should include copies or electronic links of the referenced materials. No confidential and/or business proprietary information, copyrighted information, or personally identifiable information should be submitted in response to this RFI. *Privacy note:* All comments received from members of the public will be available for public viewing on

Regulations.gov. In accordance with FAR 15.202(3), responses to this document are not offers and cannot be accepted by the Federal Government to form a binding contract. Additionally, those submitting responses are solely responsible for all expenses associated with response preparation.

II. General Information

What is the purpose of this RFI?

The work supports the Agency's ability to: foster new technologies for managing waste, recovering resources and reducing environmental impact such as is covered under the Resources Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) section 8001; and conduct comprehensive studies on specific solid and hazardous waste streams as covered under RCRA section 8002. The work will be used to consider updates to EPA's Tests Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste (SW-846), which provides the official analytical methods for characterizing hazardous wastes under RCRA. RCRA section 2002 authorizes updates to test methods and waste sampling guidance.

III. Background

The SW-846 Compendium is the official collection of test methods for compliance with RCRA and includes more than 220 sampling and analytical methods for project planning, sample collection and quality control. SW-846 methods are used for RCRA hazardous waste identification and treatment and for contaminated site assessment and cleanup under RCRA and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), emergency response work, the Underground Storage Tanks program, and the Brownfields program.

SW-846 methods updates are necessary to keep up with scientific advances, new equipment, changing technology, and new analytical needs to remain useful. Analytical methods updates can also reduce costs for identification and/or treatment of hazardous waste or for cleanup of contaminated sites.

A few SW-846 methods are incorporated by reference in federal RCRA regulations—they are either required for RCRA compliance testing, or the results are definitive for determining the regulatory status of a waste (e.g., Method 1311 Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure for toxicity characteristic hazardous waste). Some methods are also incorporated by reference in other regulations: e.g., 40 CFR part 761 TSCA PCB cleanup and disposal and 40 CFR part 503 Biosolids.

Most SW-846 methods, however, are published as guidance (i.e., "non-regulatory methods").

The Agency uses the Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP) to estimate the potential for wastes to leach hazardous constituents to groundwater, where they may be transported to a drinking water well, which may in turn result in human exposure to the toxic constituent. TCLP is designed to reflect conditions likely to occur in a municipal solid waste (MSW) landfill, as the Agency identified industrial waste co-disposal in an MSW landfill as plausible management for unregulated waste.

In 1980, prior to development of the TCLP, the Agency adopted the Extraction Procedure (EP) to identify wastes likely to leach hazardous concentrations of particular toxic constituents into the groundwater under conditions of improper management (45 FR 33110 May 19, 1980). In 1986, the Agency proposed a modified leaching procedure, the TCLP, to replace the EP (51 FR 21648, June 13, 1986). The Agency promulgated the final rule on the application of the TCLP in 1990 (55 FR 11827, March 29, 1990).

In 1991 and 1999, the Science Advisory Board (SAB) reviewed the Agency's leaching evaluation methodology and expressed concern about the widespread non-regulatory use of TCLP, including for estimating leaching under conditions that are substantially different from the conditions built into TCLP (such as contaminated sites). The SAB recommended that EPA develop a new, flexible methodology that can more accurately estimate leaching under a broader range of conditions.

In 1998, the EPA proposed (63 FR 25430 May 8, 1998) that some of the required uses of SW-846 methods were not necessary. In addition, members of the regulated community requested the opportunity to use other reliable methods to comply with RCRA. The Methods Innovation Rule (70 FR 34538 June 14, 2005) removed most required uses of SW-846 methods and allowed more flexibility in test method selection. The rule allowed laboratories to use non-SW-846 methods, provided the facility or laboratory demonstrates the data are of appropriate quality to limit the risk of making decision errors and ensure that waste management decisions are protective of human health and the environment. All SW-846 methods were covered by this rule except for methods that involve determination of method-defined parameters (MDPs), such as TCLP,

which must be followed for regulatory compliance.

In 2016, EPA further streamlined the approval process for non-regulatory methods in SW-846 (81 FR 66276, September 27, 2016).

To address the SAB concerns, EPA initiated a program to identify and validate a next generation of leach testing approaches. The Leaching Environmental Assessment Framework (LEAF) analytical methods (SW-846 Methods 1313, 1314, 1315, 1316) were designed to consider the impact on leaching of waste forms and environmental conditions that are known to affect leaching, and which vary in value for different wastes and disposal conditions. The published LEAF methods have only been validated for inorganic chemicals. EPA is currently conducting research and development to adapt the leaching methods to address organic constituents as well.

LEAF is intended for situations where an assessment tailored to site conditions is needed where the conditions differ from the disposal scenario addressed by TCLP, and TCLP is *not* required by RCRA regulations (that is, the waste is not subject to land disposal restrictions (LDR) treatment requirements that rely on TCLP or is not RCRA hazardous waste). These uses include delisting, beneficial use assessments, and treatment effectiveness evaluations.

IV. Request for Information

EPA has identified some key information categories on which stakeholder insights would be most helpful:

- Waste Sampling
- TCLP
- LEAF
- Other SW-846 Method Needs, Uses, and Issues

Following each information category, EPA has included a list of suggested questions as a helpful guide for consideration in preparing comments. EPA provides these questions simply to guide the type of comments the Agency would find useful to help inform development, updates, and prioritization of methods and guidance. EPA also requests that commenters include, wherever possible, supporting data or other qualitative information such as information about the barriers and challenges to performing the methods, successful guidance and use of methods, and details on measurable benefits for industry, government, or consumers.

A. Waste Sampling Challenges, Best Practices and EPA Guidance

The suggested questions below provide an opportunity for all commenters to provide input on sampling guidance challenges and best practices. EPA is particularly interested in collecting information on sampling and testing of heterogeneous wastes, such as discarded solar panels, that may be particularly challenging for making hazardous waste determinations. EPA is also interested in any existing studies or reports with background information on updated waste sampling procedures. Suggested questions to consider for comment submission include:

- What challenges or barriers does your organization face regarding waste sampling?
- Which types of wastes or waste properties present the biggest challenges related to sampling, and why?
- Does your organization currently manage heterogeneous wastes such as debris, multi-component electronic devices, solar panels or other wastes that present a particular challenge with regard to sampling for the purpose of compliance with RCRA Subtitle C regulations? If so, how does your organization currently address these types of wastes?
- What information resources, tools or guidance would help your organization address the challenges or barriers you've identified related to waste sampling?
- Is EPA's existing guidance on waste analysis plans and waste sampling¹ useful for your organization? Are there any information or data gaps that would improve the usefulness of this guidance? Would it benefit your organization for EPA to update this guidance to include examples or case studies that address the challenges or barriers you've identified?
- What references, other than those published by EPA, does your organization rely on for waste sampling (e.g., standards issued by voluntary consensus standard bodies such as ASTM International, guidance issued by state or local government agencies or other federal agencies, or other policies, regulations or guidance)?

B. TCLP Challenges and Opportunities for Improvement

The Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP), SW-846 Method 1311, is used for toxicity characteristic

hazardous waste determinations under the characteristic hazardous waste regulations at 40 CFR 261.24 and for compliance with numeric standards for nonwastewaters under the LDR regulations at 40 CFR 268.48. TCLP is designed to simulate leaching under mildly acidic conditions that might exist in an early stage municipal solid waste landfill.

Several technical and practical issues have been raised by the regulated community and others regarding the applicability of the TCLP for identifying hazardous waste. A number of comments were submitted to the Agency in response to the June 13, 1986 proposal to replace the EP with the TCLP. The Agency responded to the comments in the final rule but also decided to further evaluate modifications to the TCLP. The Agency stated that further improvements in the TCLP will be proposed as they are developed. Additional concerns have been raised by commenters during later rulemakings (e.g., by the SAB and rules addressing newly listed or identified wastes). The identified concerns included:

- TCLP can underestimate leaching of contaminants from some highly alkaline wastes or exposure to alkaline environments.
- TCLP can underestimate leaching of contaminants from oily wastes and some paint wastes.
- TCLP may not accurately mimic conditions commonly found in non-hazardous industrial waste landfills.
- TCLP may underestimate the chelation-facilitated mobility of some waste constituents.
- TCLP does not account for the oxidation/reduction reactions occurring in landfills.
- TCLP may not accurately predict long-term mobility of organic contaminants in some treated wastes.
- TCLP may not be appropriate for some contaminated soils.
- TCLP does not predict releases to non-groundwater pathways.

EPA is requesting information from the public on the current state of TCLP use and of compliance with TCLP numerical standards. Suggested questions to consider for comment submission include:

- What challenges or barriers does your organization face when using Method 1311 for RCRA regulatory compliance testing?²

- Which types of wastes or waste properties present the biggest challenges for TCLP testing, and why?

- Are there specific process steps in Method 1311 that are particularly challenging or ambiguous?

- What kinds of benefits or costs would your organization experience if EPA updated the method or issued interpretive guidance? For example, the following issues have been raised by previous method users:

- Method 1311 provides a maximum particle size, but not a minimum particle size.

- Method 1311 allows vacuum filtration to be used for liquid-solid separations, but the applicability is limited.³

- What additional information resources or tools would be most helpful for your organization to overcome challenges related to TCLP testing?

- Has your organization developed any additional training materials or handbooks to assist in performing Method 1311?

C. Leaching Environmental Assessment Framework (LEAF) as an Alternative to TCLP

The Leaching Environmental Assessment Framework (LEAF) analytical methods⁴ (SW-846 Methods 1313, 1314, 1315, 1316) developed for inorganics were designed to consider the impact on leaching of waste forms and environmental conditions that are known to affect leaching, and which vary in value for different wastes and disposal conditions. Therefore, LEAF considers the impact on leaching of varying pH of the leachate, varying the liquid-to-solid ratio (or the amount of liquid contacting the waste), and the waste form (e.g., granular materials such as soils or monolithic solids such as a concrete block). The LEAF tests include equilibrium tests on sieved or particle-size reduced solids (which can identify maximum plausible leaching) but also include dynamic leaching tests to estimate mass transfer rates and provide better estimates of constituent mass release and flux from granular or monolithic solid waste forms. The published LEAF methods have only been validated for inorganic chemicals, and EPA is currently conducting research and development to adapt the

³ Method 1311 section 4.3.2 states that "Vacuum filtration can only be used for wastes with low solids content (<10%) and for highly granular, liquid-containing wastes." <https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2015-12/documents/1311.pdf>.

⁴ <https://www.epa.gov/hw-sw846/leaching-environmental-assessment-framework-leaf-methods-and-guidance>.

¹ Draft Technical Guidance about Waste Sampling under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), found at: <https://www.epa.gov/hw-sw846/draft-technical-guidance-about-waste-sampling-under-resource-conservation-and-recovery-act>.

² RCRA regulations based on TCLP include toxicity characteristic hazardous waste determinations at 40 CFR 261.24 and treatment standards for hazardous non-wastewaters under the Land Disposal Restrictions regulations at 40 CFR 268.48.

leaching methods to address organic constituents as well.

The LEAF methods are intended for situations where an assessment tailored to site conditions is needed where the conditions differ from the disposal scenario addressed by TCLP, and TCLP is *not* required by RCRA regulations (that is, the waste is not subject to LDR treatment requirements that rely on TCLP or is not RCRA hazardous waste). Uses include delisting, beneficial use assessments, and treatment effectiveness evaluations.

EPA is considering providing a regulatory alternative to TCLP testing for wastes to evaluate leaching of chemicals from wastes disposed in lined landfills other than municipal solid waste landfills.⁵ Alternative aqueous leaching tests such as the LEAF methods could be used to evaluate leaching of regulated chemicals from wastes that considers the physical waste form and the range of conditions to which it would be exposed at a given disposal site, thereby ensuring disposal of the waste is protective of human health and the environment. EPA is still considering options for how best to define the range of conditions to be used for testing, including using measured leachate properties from a specific landfill site, or using leachate properties from landfills of similar types and/or geographic areas.

EPA is requesting information from the public on whether alternative leaching methods would be useful for evaluation of waste leaching under alternative conditions, such as those that exist in landfills other than municipal solid waste landfills regulated under RCRA subtitle D at 40 CFR part 258. Suggested questions to consider for comment submission include:

For Hazardous Waste Generators or Hazardous Waste Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities:

- What alternative leaching tests, if any, does your organization currently use to aid in hazardous waste identification and/or LDR compliance?
- What are the barriers and sources of demand for using LEAF for your organization?

○ Would your organization potentially benefit from having more flexibility to make site-specific evaluations of aqueous leaching from waste for disposal in a landfill other than a municipal solid waste landfill?

- Does your organization currently produce or manage a toxicity

characteristic hazardous waste stream that potentially would not exceed leaching-based RCRA regulatory thresholds under management conditions at a non-MSW landfill?

- What kinds of benefits or costs would your organization experience if EPA made regulatory updates consistent with this approach for waste disposal?

• What impacts would the cost of LEAF testing, relative to TCLP, have on your organization's likelihood of using this regulatory alternative compared to your current waste management practices?

For RCRA Subtitle C authorized States:

- What specific wastes or management situations does your organization encounter that would benefit most from using the LEAF approach?
- What challenges or barriers would your organization have to overcome to adopt RCRA regulatory updates to provide flexibility in complying with RCRA regulatory thresholds currently based on TCLP?

• How much additional cost would your organization incur to implement this regulatory alternative compared to your current practices, and could these additional costs be offset with an additional fee?

- What additional technical support or other resources would your organization need to support this regulatory flexibility?

• Does your organization have any suggestions for how EPA could facilitate state adoption of a more flexible regulatory approach for waste testing such as using the LEAF methods to ensure disposal of wastes will be protective of human health and the environment?

- Does your organization have any suggestions for how to define the range of conditions across which wastes would need to be tested to ensure disposal of wastes will be protective of human health and the environment?

D. Other SW-846 Method Needs, Uses, and Issues

The Methods Innovation Rule (70 FR 34538, June 14, 2005) removed certain required uses of SW-846 methods, and to allow more flexibility in test method selection. The rule allowed laboratories to modify SW-846 methods, provided the modified method meets the defined quality assurance parameters established in the method or defined for the project; and to use non-SW-846 methods, provided the method falls within EPA's parameter to protect human health and the environment. All SW-846 methods were covered by this

rule except for methods that involve determination of method-defined parameters (MDPs), such as TCLP, which must be followed to the letter for regulatory compliance.

In 2016, EPA further streamlined the approval process for non-regulatory methods in SW-846 (81 FR 66276, September 27, 2016). Some MDP were updated in the Modernizing Ignitable Liquids Determination Rule (85 FR 40594, July 7, 2020).

EPA is requesting information from the public on MDPs and SW-846 methods including how they are used, testing challenges, and needs for updates and new methods. Suggested questions to consider for comment submission include:

For Hazardous Waste Generators/ Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities:

- Which SW-846 methods are the most useful for your organization?
- Which SW-846 methods are most in need of revision due to equipment obsolescence, capacity constraints, quality limitations, or other challenges?
- What are the highest priority gaps in SW-846 methods for identifying hazardous waste characteristics?
- What are the highest priority gaps in SW-846 methods for demonstrating compliance with LDR requirements?
- Which aspects of waste management present the biggest hazardous waste identification challenges for your organization, *e.g.*, waste sampling, testing, transport, treatment, or disposal, and why?

• What additional challenges does your organization have with using current SW-846 methods? For example, what unmet methods-related needs, if any, does your organization have for RCRA regulatory compliance testing?

For RCRA-authorized States:

- What are the biggest uncertainties related to methods that your organization has for assuring compliance with hazardous waste characteristic regulations or compliance with numeric standards for treated hazardous wastes?

• What challenges does your organization have with using current SW-846 methods?

• What unmet methods-related needs does your organization have related to RCRA regulatory compliance?

• What opportunities and challenges does your organization face with adopting updated methods?

V. Disclaimer and Important Note

This RFI is issued solely for information, research and planning purposes and does not constitute a Request for Proposals (RFP) or a Request

⁵ 40 CFR part 258 provides criteria for municipal solid waste landfills regulated under RCRA subtitle D <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-40/chapter-I/subchapter-I/part-258>.

for Applications (RFA). Any information obtained as a result of this RFI is intended to be used by EPA on a non-attribution basis to support EPA's efforts to evaluate potential updates to SW-846 Methods, including Methods 1311 (TCLP), 1313–1316 (LEAF), and Waste Sampling Guidance. This RFI does not constitute a formal solicitation for proposals or abstracts. Your response to this document will be treated as information only. This RFI does not represent any award commitment on the part of EPA, nor does it obligate EPA to pay for costs incurred in the preparation and submission of any responses.

Steven Cook,

*Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator,
Office of Land and Emergency Management.*

[FR Doc. 2026–18754 Filed 9–11–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[OMB 3060–1280; FR ID 366459]

Information Collection Being Reviewed by the Federal Communications Commission

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice; request for comments.

SUMMARY: As part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burdens, and as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC or the Commission) invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the following information collection. Comments are requested concerning: whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information shall have practical utility; the accuracy of the Commission's burden estimate; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology; and ways to further reduce the information collection burden on small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees.

DATES: Written PRA comments should be submitted on or before November 13, 2026. If you anticipate that you will be submitting comments, but find it difficult to do so within the period of time allowed by this notice, you should

advise the contact listed below as soon as possible.

ADDRESSES: Direct all PRA comments to Nicole Ongele, FCC, via email PRA@fcc.gov and to nicole.ongele@fcc.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information about the information collection, contact Nicole Ongele, (202) 418–2991.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Control Number: 3060–1280.

Title: E911 Compliance for Fixed Telephony and Multi-line Telephone Systems.

Form Number: N/A.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit entities, Not-for-profit institutions, and State, local, and tribal governments.

Number of Respondents and Responses: 1,423,960 respondents; 47,526,905 responses.

Estimated Time per Response: 0.016 hours (one minute).

Frequency of Response: One-time, on occasion, third party disclosure requirement, and recordkeeping requirement.

Obligation to Respond: Mandatory. Statutory authority for this information collection is contained in 47 U.S.C. 151–154, 152(a), 155(c), 157, 160, 201, 202, 208, 210, 214, 218, 219, 222, 225, 251(e), 255, 301, 302, 303, 307, 308, 309, 310, 316, 319, 332, 403, 405, 605, 610, 615, 615 note, 615a, 615b, 615c, 615a–1, 616, 620, 621, 623, 623 note, 721, and 1471.

Total Annual Burden: 792,576 hours.

Total Annual Cost: \$2,057,691.

Needs and Uses: The Commission is obligated by statute to promote “safety of life and property” and to “encourage and facilitate the prompt deployment throughout the United States of a seamless, ubiquitous, and reliable end-to-end infrastructure” for public safety. Congress has established 911 as the national emergency number to enable all citizens to reach emergency services directly and efficiently, irrespective of whether a citizen uses wireline or wireless technology when calling for help by dialing 911.

Efforts by federal, state, and local government, along with the significant efforts of wireline and wireless service providers, have resulted in the nearly ubiquitous deployment of this life-saving service.

Section 506 of RAY BAUM'S Act requires the Commission to “consider adopting rules to ensure that the dispatchable location is conveyed with a 9–1–1 call, regardless of the technological platform used and

including with calls from multi-line telephone system.” RAY BAUM'S Act also states that, “[i]n conducting the proceeding . . . the Commission may consider information and conclusions from other Commission proceedings regarding the accuracy of the dispatchable location for a 9–1–1 call” RAY BAUM'S Act defines a “9–1–1 call” as a voice call that is placed, or a message that is sent by other means of communication, to a Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) for the purpose of requesting emergency services.

As part of implementing Section 506 of RAY BAUM'S Act, on August 1, 2019, the Commission adopted a *Report and Order (2019 Order)* that set forth rules requiring Fixed Telephony providers and MLTS providers to ensure that dispatchable location is conveyed with 911 calls.

The Commission's 2019 Order adopted §§ 9.8(a) and 9.16(b)(3)(i), (ii), and (iii) to facilitate the provision of automated dispatchable location. For Fixed Telephony and in fixed Multi-line Telephone Systems (MLTS) environments, providers must provide automated dispatchable location with 911 calls. For on-premises, non-fixed devices associated with an MLTS, the MLTS operator or manager must provide automated dispatchable location to the appropriate PSAP when technically feasible; otherwise they must provide either dispatchable location based on end-user manual update, or alternative location information. For off-premises MLTS calls to 911, the MLTS operator or manager must provide automatic dispatchable location if it is technically feasible to do so. If this is not technically feasible, the MLTS operator or manager must provide either dispatchable location based on end user manual update or enhanced location information. Enhanced location information may be coordinate-based and shall consist of the best available location that can be obtained from any available technology or combination of technologies at reasonable cost. The requirements adopted in the 2019 Order account for variance in the feasibility of providing dispatchable location for non-fixed MLTS 911 calls and the means available to provide it.

The information collection requirements associated with these rules will ensure that Fixed Telephony and MLTS providers have the means to provide 911 callers' locations to PSAPs, thus reducing response times for emergency services.