TACIR Committee Meeting – December 6, 2017 TN Emergency Number Association Comments Presented by Jamison Peevyhouse, ENP

Good Morning,

My name is Jamison Peevyhouse and I am the Director of Weakley County (TN) 9-1-1 District. Today I have the opportunity to represent the Tennessee Emergency Number Association (TENA), of which the panelists are all members.

TACIR was given 9 questions regarding 9-1-1 services within Tennessee. Today, I want to focus on three of those questions.

Question 1 is in regards to the cost of services, equipment, maintenance, and improvements to 9-1-1. For us to be able to define the cost of services, equipment, maintenance, and improvements, we must first define what the \$1.16 rate covers, how far we are stretching that \$1.16, and are we planning for future growth. Laid before you is a list of things we must do to provide 9-1-1 service as well as things we are allowed to do to supplement that service.

In a recent survey, two-thirds of our membership reported that the equipment required by the TECB's policies for 9-1-1 services is either at or beyond end of life (5 to 7+ years in service). For us to move forward, we need to (1) define an equipment schedule for Districts to adopt and ensures that mandatory equipment has an upgrade or replacement schedule, and (2) that adequate reserved fund balances are specifically set aside for such locally.

Question 3 is regarding the need or benefit to consolidate ECDs or PSAPs. Since 9-1-1's inception, we looked for ways for 9-1-1 to be more economical for local response organizations. It was determined that the most economical and the best level of service implementation was to place 9-1-1 services into communications centers *that already existed within the local jurisdictions*. By doing so, we saved money for the tax payers locally.

Communications centers are still required in any model of PSAP consolidation at the regional or state 9-1-1 level. If we move forward with a consolidation of 9-1-1 services at a regional or statewide level, it will result in a duplication of services.

The FCC issued a report in January 2016, entitled "Taskforce on Optimal PSAP Architecture" that echoes this. It finds that if we had built NG9-1-1 from the ground up, then a consolidated model would have been the best option. However, there would still be a need for communications centers locally to dispatch emergency services. Instead of having two separate locations, one to answer only 9-1-1 and another to dispatch that call, Tennessee had the right approach 20 years ago, by integrating 9-1-1 services into the preexisting communications centers.

The National Emergency Number Association's CEO Brian Fontes has stated that cost savings via NG9-1-1 should come through the sharing of services, networks, data, training, common technology and policies under a single form of governance. This is the current model in Tennessee under the TECB's policies and direction. The consolidation of any current 9-1-1 Districts or PSAPs into a 9-1-1 only PSAP model would result in increased costs, duplication of services and efforts, delayed response times, decrease redundancies and decreased operational efficiencies, as laid out in the FCC's report.

Question 4 is a very broad question: Is the current rate generating more revenue than needed to cover 9-1-1 services. The 2014 funding law was based upon FY2012 revenues, which totaled \$112 Million. In the past year, the TN Emergency Communications Board distributed \$5.3 million in excess revenue, meaning excess revenue based upon 2012 receipts. That basically represents a nominal growth rate of 4.6% in the last 5 years.

Per the FCC, an appropriate 9-1-1 surcharge should be "designed to ensure fair and equitable allocations of funds collected to *provide service to those that pay the fee.*" 9-1-1 is the only public safety entity that doesn't collect from the person to which the service is provided based upon singular billing. In contrast, EMS, Fire and Law Enforcement (via fines and fees) collect monies after services are rendered. 9-1-1 services are intended to be provided on a pay before you receive basis through the tariff.

We have identified the services and equipment that the fee MUST cover. These are a statewide 9-1-1 system, any mandated costs via TECB policies, any operational needs to provide 9-1-1 services, and *by definition of the FCC* must benefit the caller who is paying the fee.

In some instances, local 9-1-1 funds are used to fund non-PSAP communications infrastructure and equipment at the detriment to the caller. *Before we equip the responder, we must equip the caller* for the highest level of service in the worst moment of their life. This should be our primary focus moving forward.

In closing, we in 9-1-1 stand on a precipice of new technologies, new challenges and new opportunities.

We must remember that 9-1-1 is the first, and far too often the last, voice of help that many Tennesseans hear.

During their time of need, it is therefore imperative that we have the equipment in place, the training in place, and the people in place to provide the caller the highest level of service possible.

I appreciate the committee's commitment to that mission.

Thank you.

JP.

Link to spoken comments on behalf of TENA: https://youtu.be/ulXqE2h9cN4?t=9m45s

