

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STAFF ANALYSIS

BILL #: HB 1057 E911 Systems
SPONSOR(S): DuBose and others
TIED BILLS: IDEN./SIM. **BILLS:** SB 190

REFERENCE	ACTION	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR or BUDGET/POLICY CHIEF
1) Energy & Utilities Subcommittee	9 Y, 0 N	Keating	Keating
2) Government Operations & Technology Appropriations Subcommittee			
3) Commerce Committee			

SUMMARY ANALYSIS

Within the E911 system, public safety answering points (PSAPs) are the public safety agencies that receive incoming 911 requests for assistance and dispatch appropriate public safety agencies to respond to the requests in accordance with the state E911 plan. According to the Department of Management Services, some counties are currently able to implement call routing between PSAPs within their county jurisdiction, but most, if not all, cannot route calls outside of their county.

The bill creates s. 365.176, F.S., to require the office to develop and implement a plan by January 1, 2019, to require that all 911 public safety telecommunicators, when prudent and requested by a caller or when necessary, be able to transfer an emergency call from one local, multijurisdictional, or regional E911 system to another local, multijurisdictional, or regional E911 system in the state. In developing and implementing this plan, the office is required to:

- Coordinate with public agencies to identify and resolve any technological or logistical issues in implementing the plan.
- Identify or establish a system or clearinghouse for maintaining contact information for all E911 systems in the state.
- Establish a date, considering any technological, logistical, financial, or other identified issues, by which all E911 systems in the state must be able to transfer emergency calls as described above.

The bill does not appear to impact state or local government revenues. The bill appears to have an indeterminate negative impact on state government expenditures and may have an indeterminate impact on local government expenditures.

The bill provides an effective date of July 1, 2018.

FULL ANALYSIS

I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

A. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

Present Situation

The Technology Program (office) within the Department of Management Services (DMS) oversees the E911 system in Florida.¹ The office is required by law to develop, maintain, and implement the statewide emergency communications E911 system plan. The plan must provide for:

- The public agency emergency communications requirements for each entity of local government² in the state.
- A system to meet specific local government requirements, which must include law enforcement, firefighting, and emergency medical services, and may include other emergency services such as poison control, suicide prevention, and emergency management services.
- Identification of the mutual aid agreements necessary to obtain an effective E911 system.
- A funding provision that identifies the cost to implement the E911 system.

The office is responsible for implementing and coordinating the plan, and must adopt any necessary rules and schedules related to public agencies³ implementing and coordinating the plan. The secretary of DMS, or his or her designee, is the director of the statewide emergency communications number E911 system and is authorized to coordinate the activities of the system with state, county, local, and private agencies. The director must consult, cooperate, and coordinate with local law enforcement agencies.

Florida law permits the formation of multijurisdictional or regional E911 systems. Any system established pursuant to this law may include the jurisdiction, or any portion thereof, of more than one public agency.⁴

Within the E911 system, public safety answering points (PSAPs) are the public safety agencies⁵ that receive incoming 911 requests for assistance and dispatch appropriate public safety agencies to respond to the requests in accordance with the state E911 plan.⁶ There are 256 primary, secondary, and backup PSAPs in Florida.⁷ According to DMS, some counties are currently able to implement call routing between PSAPs within their county jurisdiction, but most, if not all, cannot route calls outside of their county without using an Emergency Service Internet Protocol Network (ESInet).⁸ Currently, there is not a statewide ESInet established.⁹

¹ s. 365.171, F.S.

² “Local government” is defined as any city, county, or political subdivision of the state and its agencies. s. 365.171(3)(b), F.S.

³ “Public agency” is defined as the state and any city, county, city and county, municipal corporation, chartered organization, public district, or public authority located in whole or in part within this state which provides, or has authority to provide, firefighting, law enforcement, ambulance, medical, or other emergency services. s. 365.171(3)(c), F.S.

⁴ s. 365.175(6), F.S.

⁵ “Public safety agency” means a functional division of a public agency which provides firefighting, law enforcement, medical, or other emergency services. s. 365.172(3)(x), F.S.

⁶ s. 365.172((3)(y), F.S.

⁷ Florida Department of Management Services, Agency Analysis of 2018 HB 1057, p. 2 (Jan. 23, 2018).

⁸ *Id.*

⁹ *Id.*

Effect of Proposed Changes

The bill creates s. 365.176, F.S., to require the office to develop and implement a plan by January 1, 2019, to require that all 911 public safety telecommunicators,¹⁰ when prudent and requested by a caller or when necessary, be able to transfer an emergency call from one local, multijurisdictional, or regional E911 system to another local, multijurisdictional, or regional E911 system in the state. In developing and implementing this plan, the office is required to:

- Coordinate with public agencies to identify and resolve any technological or logistical issues in implementing the plan.
- Identify or establish a system or clearinghouse for maintaining contact information for all E911 systems in the state.
- Establish a date, considering any technological, logistical, financial, or other identified issues, by which all E911 systems in the state must be able to transfer emergency calls as described above.

The bill provides an effective date of July 1, 2018.

B. SECTION DIRECTORY:

Section 1. Amends s. 365.172, F.S., providing a definition.

Section 2. Creates s. 365.176, F.S., relating to the transfer of E911 calls between systems.

Section 3. Provides an effective date of July 1, 2018.

II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

1. Revenues:

None.

2. Expenditures:

The bill appears to have an indeterminate negative impact on state government expenditures. The bill requires DMS to develop and implement a plan that allows for the transfer of calls between E911 systems within Florida. DMS indicates that the costs to implement these requirements are unknown but are expected to be significant.¹¹

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues:

None.

¹⁰ “911 public safety telecommunicator” is defined as a public safety dispatcher or 911 operator whose duties and responsibilities include the answering, receiving, transferring, and dispatching functions related to 911 calls; dispatching law enforcement officers, fire rescue services, emergency medical services, and other public safety services to the scene of an emergency; providing real-time information from federal, state, and local crime databases; or supervising or serving as the command officer to a person or persons having such duties and responsibilities. However, the term does not include administrative support personnel, including, but not limited to, those whose primary duties and responsibilities are in accounting, purchasing, legal, and personnel. s. 401.465(1)(a), F.S.

¹¹ *Supra* note 7, at p. 4.

2. Expenditures:

The bill may have an indeterminate impact on local government expenditures. DMS indicates that many of the 911 call centers in Florida are not equipped to implement the transfer service required by the bill and will require equipment upgrades.¹² However, some or all of the costs may be eligible under s. 365.172(10), F.S., for funding through the state's E911 Fund.

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

The bill does not appear to have a direct economic impact on the private sector.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

None.

III. COMMENTS

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

1. Applicability of Municipality/County Mandates Provision:

Not applicable. The bill does not appear to: require counties or municipalities to spend funds or take action requiring the expenditures of funds; reduce the authority that counties or municipalities have to raise revenues in the aggregate; or reduce the percentage of state tax shared with counties or municipalities.

2. Other:

None.

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

The bill does not provide any new rule-making authority.

C. DRAFTING ISSUES OR OTHER COMMENTS:

None.

IV. AMENDMENTS/ COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES

Not applicable.

¹² *Supra* note 7, at p. 4.