

COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS FORM

This form is required for the Legislative Program Committee to consider taking an advocacy position on an issue or legislative item.

BILL NUMBER: AB 1564	AUTHOR: Assemblymember Das Williams
INTRO/AMEND DATE: 1/4/16	AUTHOR'S POLITICAL PARTY: Democratic
BILL STATUS: Awaiting a hearing in Asm. Utilities & Commerce	

1) BILL SUBJECT:

9-1-1 Emergency Response--Wireless Routing Optimization

2) FROM DEPARTMENT:

3) IS THIS ITEM SPECIFICALLY REFERENCED IN THE LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM?

Not specifically, but involves Efficient Service Delivery & Operations

4) WHICH POLICY-RELATED MATTER IS OF CONCERN WITH THIS BILL?

Public Safety and 9-1-1 Emergency Response

5) HOW WOULD THIS BILL IMPACT THE COUNTY? (Current practices, responsibility, authority, pros/cons, affected programs and/or services, etc.)

9-1-1 calls could be more appropriately routed to County or City public safety answering points instead of CHP dispatch in a neighboring county. This would mean faster response times for first responders, and would involve input from local law enforcement, fire and EMS leaders that they don't currently have the opportunity to give.

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| 6) IMPACT ON COUNTY PROGRAM: | <input type="checkbox"/> Major | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor | <input type="checkbox"/> None |
| SANTA BARBARA COUNTY IMPACT: | <input type="checkbox"/> Major | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor | <input type="checkbox"/> None |
| STATEWIDE IMPACT: | <input type="checkbox"/> Major | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor | <input type="checkbox"/> None |

Explanation of Impacts:

Ability for 9-1-1 call routing input from local jurisdictions, more efficient emergency response, and the impact would be the same around the state.

7) WOULD THIS BILL IMPACT:

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| a. Efficient service delivery and operations? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES | <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| b. Fiscal stability? | <input type="checkbox"/> YES | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO |
| c. Inter-agency cooperation? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES | <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| d. Local control? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES | <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| e. Protection of safety net services? | <input type="checkbox"/> YES | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO |
| f. Community sustainability/economic stability? | <input type="checkbox"/> YES | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO |

Additional Comments:



COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS FORM

8) FISCAL IMPACT ON THE COUNTY:

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Revenue Increase | <input type="checkbox"/> Revenue Decrease | <input type="checkbox"/> Unfunded Mandate |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cost Increase | <input type="checkbox"/> Cost Decrease | <input type="checkbox"/> Undetermined |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None | | |

Additional Comments:

9) OTHER AGENCIES THAT SHOULD REVIEW THIS BILL:

Please list other agencies below:

Fire, Sheriff

10) CSAC POSITION ON BILL:

- | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose | <input type="checkbox"/> Support if Amended |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose unless Amended | <input type="checkbox"/> Watch | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No position taken |

11) OTHER LOCAL OR STATEWIDE ORGANIZATIONS THAT HAVE TAKEN A POSITION ON THIS BILL:

(Indicate support or opposition for each)

Support from Fire Chiefs Association of Santa Barbara County and California League of Cities

12) PROPOSED AMENDMENTS: (Attach separate sheet)

13) RECOMMENDATION:

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Active Support* | <input type="checkbox"/> Passive Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Support if Amended* |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Active Opposition* | <input type="checkbox"/> Passive Opposition | <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose unless Amended* |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Watch | <input type="checkbox"/> Concerns (Why? Explain in #6) | <input type="checkbox"/> No Position (Why?) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No Change since Last Position | | |

* Indicates that the department believes that the Board of Supervisors should take a formal position on this bill

Additional Comments:

14) LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS FORM PREPARED BY:

Telephone extension:

E-mail address:



COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA
LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS FORM



AB 1564 (Williams)

9-1-1 Emergency Response – Wireless Routing Optimization

SUMMARY

AB 1564 requires the Office of Emergency Services (CAL OES) to work closely with the California Highway Patrol (CHP), local PSAPs (Public Safety Answering Point) and the wireless industry to take all the necessary actions to maximize the efficiency of the 9-1-1 system.

BACKGROUND

In January of 2014, a tragic and preventable accident occurred in Santa Barbara. A 23 year old woman was found by her brother to be unresponsive. He called 9-1-1 from his cell phone and his call was first routed to the CHP, delaying the response time. The City of Santa Barbara dispatched emergency response to a location on the other side of town, resulting in an additional 10 minutes from initial dispatch to arrive at the correct location. As a result of the delay, the young woman died.

Unfortunately, this is not an isolated incident as many non-freeway wireless 9-1-1 calls in California are routed to CHP and delays in response time can result in tragedy. It is essential that every effort be made to route wireless 9-1-1 calls to the most appropriate Public Safety Answering Points (PSAP). In some areas, CHP will be the PSAP and in other areas, it will be the local fire, emergency medical services or law enforcement PSAP.

An emergency response system should start with routing a 9-1-1 call to the public safety force that responds more often to the area. To have an intermediate step - sending the call somewhere else first for no function or purpose, only to be transferred - introduces delays and occasionally, when something else goes wrong, results in a tragedy.

In Santa Barbara, depending on your cell phone carrier, if you call 9-1-1 from the front steps of the local police department, which houses the dispatch center for local emergency response, the call may be routed to the Ventura CHP center, 30 miles south. This results in an average delay of over a minute (including busy signals, dropped calls, and long hold times). A landline call from the same location will go directly to the local police

department without delay. This process is counterintuitive, but very real, occurring frequently throughout the state.

Only about 13% of the state has been "optimized" to ensure calls are being routed appropriately. In a state dense with both freeways and cell phones, improving our state's emergency response system to save precious seconds and lives is imperative.

NEED FOR THE BILL

AB 1564 addresses routing delays by specifying that a call from a cell device may be routed to a local Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) other than the California Highway Patrol (CHP), if:

- The call originates from a location other than a freeway,
- The alternate routing is economically and technologically feasible,
- The alternate routing will benefit public safety, and
- It will result in 9-1-1 calls being routed to the responsible responding jurisdiction that covers the location of the call origination point.

By clarifying the process by which an alternate PSAP is selected, people in emergency situations will reach the most efficient emergency responders the first time, shaving minutes from response times. This will dramatically improve lifesaving outcomes for the public who call 9-1-1.

SUPPORT

- Fire Chiefs Association of Santa Barbara County
- California League of Cities

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Daisy Luna
Office of Assemblymember Das Williams
Phone: (916) 319-2037 Email: daisy.luna@asm.ca.gov

ASSEMBLY BILL**No. 1564**

Introduced by Assembly Member WilliamsJanuary 4, 2016

An act to add Sections 8592.8 and 8592.9 to the Government Code, and to repeal Section 2892 of the Public Utilities Code, relating to emergency services.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 1564, as introduced, Williams. Emergency services: wireless 911 calls: routing.

The Public Safety Communication Act of 2002, among other things, requires the Public Safety Radio Strategic Planning Committee to develop and implement a statewide integrated public safety communication system that facilitates interoperability among state public safety departments and other first response agencies and coordinate other shared uses of the public safety spectrum consistent with decisions and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission.

This bill would require that a provider of commercial mobile radio service, as defined, provide access for end users of that service to the local emergency telephone systems described in the Warren-911-Emergency Assistance Act, that "911" be the primary access number for those services, and that user validation not be required. The bill would prohibit a provider of commercial mobile radio service from charging any airtime, access, or similar usage charge for any "911" call placed from a commercial mobile radio service telecommunications device to a local emergency telephone system. The bill would authorize "911" calls from commercial mobile radio service

telecommunications devices to be routed to a public safety answering point other than the Department of the California Highway Patrol (CHP) only if the alternate routing meets specified requirements. The bill would repeal similar provisions regarding wireless “911” calls in the Public Utilities Code.

This bill would require the Office of Emergency Services to require the Public Safety Communications Division to work with wireless carriers to verify that all cell sector routing decisions for wireless “911” calls, made pursuant to these provisions, have been implemented. The bill would also require the Office of Emergency Services to maximize the efficiency of the wireless “911” emergency telephone system and to require the Public Safety Communications Division to work with the CHP to determine whether the most efficient routing of wireless “911” calls should be to a local public safety answering point or to a CHP center, using specified criteria, with a comprehensive statewide review and implementation to be completed no later than July 1, 2019. After completion of the comprehensive statewide review and implementation, the bill would authorize specified local entities to submit a written request for a review of a specific cell sector based on specified criteria to the Public Safety Communications Division.

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes.
State-mandated local program: no.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

1 SECTION 1. Section 8592.8 is added to the Government Code,
2 to read:
3 8592.8. (a) A provider of commercial mobile radio service,
4 as defined in Section 216.8 of the Public Utilities Code, shall
5 provide access for end users of that service to the local emergency
6 telephone systems described in the Warren-911-Emergency
7 Assistance Act (Article 6 (commencing with Section 53100) of
8 Chapter 1 of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 5). “911” shall be the
9 primary access number for those emergency systems. A provider
10 of commercial mobile radio service, in accordance with all
11 applicable Federal Communication Commission orders, shall
12 transmit all “911” calls from technologically compatible
13 commercial mobile radio service communication devices without
14 requiring user validation or any similar procedure. A provider of
15 commercial mobile radio service may not charge any airtime,

1 access, or similar usage charge for any “911” call placed from a
2 commercial mobile radio service telecommunications device to a
3 local emergency telephone system.

4 (b) A “911” call from a commercial mobile radio service
5 telecommunications device may be routed to a public safety
6 answering point other than the Department of the California
7 Highway Patrol only if the alternate routing meets all of the
8 following requirements:

9 (1) The “911” call originates from a location other than from a
10 freeway, as defined in Section 23.5 of the Streets and Highways
11 Code, under the jurisdiction of the Department of the California
12 Highway Patrol.

13 (2) The alternate routing is economically and technologically
14 feasible.

15 (3) The alternate routing will benefit public safety.

16 (4) The Department of the California Highway Patrol, the Office
17 of Emergency Services, and the current or proposed alternate public
18 safety answering point, in consultation with the wireless industry
19 and local law enforcement officials, determine that it is in the best
20 interest of the public, will provide more effective emergency
21 service to the public to route “911” calls that do not originate from
22 a freeway, as defined in Section 23.5 of the Streets and Highways
23 Code, or any other area in which the Department of the California
24 Highway Patrol has jurisdiction to respond, to another public safety
25 answering point, and will result in “911” calls being routed to the
26 responsible responding jurisdiction that covers the location of the
27 call origination point.

28 SEC. 2. Section 8592.9 is added to the Government Code, to
29 read:

30 8592.9. The Office of Emergency Services shall take all
31 necessary actions to maximize the efficiency of the “911” system.
32 The office shall require the Public Safety Communications Division
33 to work with the Department of the California Highway Patrol to
34 review call data on the routing of “911” cell phone traffic to assess
35 whether wireless “911” calls should be routed to a local public
36 safety answering point or a California Highway Patrol call center
37 in order to determine the most efficient routing for wireless “911”
38 calls, with a comprehensive statewide review and implementation
39 being completed no later than July 1, 2019. After completion of
40 the comprehensive statewide review and implementation, a local

1 fire, police, sheriff, or emergency medical services agency, or a
2 local public safety answering point, may submit a written request
3 for a review of a specific cell sector based on the criteria specified
4 in Section 8592.8 to the Public Safety Communications Division
5 within the Office of Emergency Services. The office shall also
6 require its Public Safety Communications Division to work with
7 the wireless carriers to verify that all cell sector routing decisions
8 made pursuant to paragraph (4) of subdivision (b) of Section 8592.8
9 have been implemented.

10 SEC. 3. Section 2892 of the Public Utilities Code is repealed.

11 ~~2892. (a) A provider of commercial mobile radio service, as~~
12 ~~defined in Section 216.8, shall provide access for end users of that~~
13 ~~service to the local emergency telephone systems described in the~~
14 ~~Warren-911-Emergency Assistance Act (Article 6 (commencing~~
15 ~~with Section 53100) of Chapter 1 of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title~~
16 ~~5 of the Government Code). "911" shall be the primary access~~
17 ~~number for those emergency systems. A provider of commercial~~
18 ~~mobile radio service, in accordance with all applicable Federal~~
19 ~~Communication Commission orders, shall transmit all "911" calls~~
20 ~~from technologically compatible commercial mobile radio service~~
21 ~~communication devices without requiring user validation or any~~
22 ~~similar procedure. A provider of commercial mobile radio service~~
23 ~~may not charge any airtime, access, or similar usage charge for~~
24 ~~any "911" call placed from a commercial mobile radio service~~
25 ~~telecommunications device to a local emergency telephone system.~~

26 ~~(b) A "911" call from a commercial mobile radio service~~
27 ~~telecommunications device may be routed to a public safety~~
28 ~~answering point other than the Department of the California~~
29 ~~Highway Patrol only if the alternate routing meets all of the~~
30 ~~following requirements:~~

31 ~~(1) The "911" call originates from a location other than from a~~
32 ~~freeway, as defined in Section 23.5 of the Streets and Highways~~
33 ~~Code, under the jurisdiction of the Department of the California~~
34 ~~Highway Patrol.~~

35 ~~(2) The alternate routing is economically and technologically~~
36 ~~feasible.~~

37 ~~(3) The alternate routing will benefit public safety and reduce~~
38 ~~burdens on dispatchers for the Department of the California~~
39 ~~Highway Patrol.~~

1 ~~(4) The Department of the California Highway Patrol, the Office~~
2 ~~of Emergency Services, and the proposed alternate public safety~~
3 ~~answering point, in consultation with the wireless industry,~~
4 ~~providers of “911” selective routing service, and local law~~
5 ~~enforcement officials, determine that it is in the best interest of the~~
6 ~~public and will provide more effective emergency service to the~~
7 ~~public to route “911” calls that do not originate from a freeway,~~
8 ~~as defined in Section 23.5 of the Streets and Highways Code, under~~
9 ~~the jurisdiction of the Department of the California Highway Patrol~~
10 ~~to another public safety answering point.~~

O