



4 Wakeley Street  
Seymour, CT 06483  
(203) 888-8843  
Fax (203) 881-5018

Date: March 21, 2014  
To: Planning and Development Committee  
From: Scott Andrews, Executive Director  
Re: Raised House Bill 5580

Senator Osten, Representative Rojas and members of the Planning and Development Committee.

My name is Scott Andrews. I am the Executive Director of Seymour Ambulance Association. I have been in the emergency medical services field for 31 years having started as a volunteer with my community ambulance service. I have worked for large and small for-profit services and now lead a non-profit service.

I am here today to speak on *Raised House Bill 5580 An Act Concerning the Pesticide Advisor Council, the Recommendations of the Connecticut Emergency Medical Services Primary Service Area Task Force and the Elimination of a Municipal Mandate.*

I will specifically speak on the Recommendations of the Connecticut Emergency Medical Services Primary Service Area Task Force. I believe that Recommendations No. 1 through 4 were well thought out and provide every opportunity for each municipality to develop their EMS plans along with their EMS providers and to make changes where necessary. The processes are well-defined and make good sense for EMS in our State. I don't believe anyone will argue this fact. The recommendations provide the requirement that municipalities be engaged with their EMS providers in developing an EMS plan for their communities. They also provide a clear pathway for obtaining technical assistance from the State in the development of, as well as assistance in, resolving disagreements in the provisions of the EMS plan.

It further provides a requirement that the Department of Public Health review each municipality's plan along with the performance of the PSA provider in accordance with the provisions of the plan. If a provider falls below acceptable performance standards then this bill provides a clear process for the Commissioner of Public Health to develop an improvement plan for the provider. This due process is important to give providers and municipalities the opportunity to improve patient care within their respective communities. If an emergency situation arises as defined in the language of the bill, the Commissioner has

*The Seymour Ambulance Association is dedicated to helping to improve the quality of life for the residents and guests of the Town of Seymour.*

Visit our web site at  
[www.seymouremts.org](http://www.seymouremts.org)

authority to intervene and take action up to and including designating a temporary provider while investigating the emergency situation.

Provisions are also provided for a municipality to petition the Commissioner of Public Health in the event that an agreement cannot be reached between the PSA Responder and the municipality or if the PSA Responder fails to perform in accordance with the EMS Plan. Again, this provides for due process in making changes to an EMS provider within a municipality.

I do have concern with Recommendation No. 5 which is shown as Section 8 in Raised House Bill 5580. My concern is that the purposes stated for requesting change are subjective. The wording of "(2) delivering efficient emergency medical services; (3) allocating resources more efficiently; (4) aligning with a new emergency medical services provider better suited to meet the community's current needs" are not measurable and subject to a wide range of interpretation.

I do not necessarily disagree that a municipal leader should have the right to choose their EMS provider. My concern remains that the provider may not be chosen for the right reasons. A PSA Responder should not be chosen based upon a political leader's personal preference but should be based upon a service provider's ability to provide the level of service required for that particular geographic area in a cost-effective and high quality manner.

Additionally, there is the potential that non-profit and municipal EMS services could be placed at a significant disadvantage with respect to the cost of providing service to a community. These certified EMS services cannot charge for non-emergency transportation services. The majority of revenue of for-profit commercial services comes from this revenue stream. Therefore, for-profit services can often provide emergency coverage within a community for greatly reduced fees. This does not provide for a level playing field for all EMS providers which could in essence put the non-profit and municipal services "out of business."

It is imperative that the EMS response system across the State remain stable and not become fragmented because individual communities want to make changes that may not be in the best interest of the whole system.

In closing, I am requesting that you vote in favor of Recommendations No. 1 through 4 as presented but remove Section 8 from the bill which includes Recommendation No. 5 until further research can be done to get a better understanding of its' impact on the whole EMS System.

Respectfully Submitted,



Scott Andrews