MEMORANDUM

TO: TACIR Commission Members
FROM: Harry A. Green
Executive Director
DATE: February 7, 2011
SUBJECT: Research Plan for Non-affiliated Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) Study

Public Chapter 473 directs TACIR to:

- Perform a study of the impact on public safety of non-ECD affiliated PSAPs
- Review the emergency communications equipment capabilities of non-affiliated PSAPs
- Report its findings and recommendations, including any proposed legislation or interim reports, upon conclusion of its study. (Report delivered to each member of the House and Senate Government Ops Committee by December 1, 2011.)

PC 473 was passed in response to a 2009 Office of the Comptroller performance audit of the Department of Commerce and Insurance, which found that “there are weaknesses in emergency communication services in Tennessee, which could put residents in some areas at risk.” In particular, 17 Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) are not affiliated with Emergency Communication Districts (ECDs) and therefore not under the Tennessee Emergency Board of Communication’s (TECB’s) statutory authority and jurisdictional oversight. As a result, the TECB cannot ensure Phase II technology exists for all PSAPs throughout the state. Phase II of enhanced 911 service requires the necessary technology to receive a call-back number and the location of a person dialing 911 from a cell phone. In addition, the TECB is unable to enforce technical and operational standards for these 17 non-affiliated PSAPs.

The draft research plan follows.
Research Plan: Non-affiliated PSAPs Study

1. The study, to be delivered to each member of the Senate and House State and Local Government Committees by December 1, 2011, will consist of the following research components:

   a. Interviews
      • TECB staff member(s)
      • ECD officials
      • Emergency communication specialists
      • House and Senate sponsors of SB1006/HB0999
      • Subject matter experts and other interested parties
      • Other individuals as required

   b. Literature Review
      • Technical issues
      • Consolidation issues
      • Other states’ experiences
      • Industry standards
      • Federal and state regulations

   c. Review of the Comptroller’s 2009 Performance Audit of C&I
      • Documents and data reviewed
      • Interview notes

   d. Data Collection and Analysis
      • Other data as necessary

   e. Review of additional material, to include:
      • Site visit(s)
      • Information gathered by TECB during its public meetings
      • Stakeholder comments - invite non-affiliated PSAP directors and the officials of the corresponding ECD to submit comments

2. The final report will contain two main sections, each drawing upon the data collected in the above research components, as well as from guidance from the Commission:

   a. Non-affiliated PSAPs’ Impact on Public Safety
      • Operational standards
      • Equipment capabilities
      • Call volume
      • Dispatcher duties/multiple roles
      • Dispatcher training standards and compliances
b. Additional Factors
   • Next Generation 911 (NG-911)
   • Structural issues
     - Statutory authority/Jurisdictional oversight
     - Consolidation

3. Seventeen non-affiliate PSAPs:
   • Bedford County SD
   • Benton County SD
   • Camden (Benton County) PD
   • Crockett EMS
   • Greene County SD
   • Greenville PD
   • Hardeman County EMS
   • Hardeman County SD
   • Henry County SD
   • Lauderdale County SD
   • Ripley (Lauderdale County) PD
   • Livingston PD
   • Oneida (Scott County) PD
   • Carthage (Smith County) PD
   • Smith County SD
   • Jonesborough (Washington County) PD
   • ETSU (Washington County)

4. The study’s timeline is as follows:
   • June 2011 – Draft report presented at Commission Meeting
   • September 2011 – Complete report presented at Commission Meeting
   • December 1, 2011 – Final report delivered to each member of the Senate and House State and Local Government Committees.