



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

Date: March 19, 2014
To: Public Health Committee
From: Scott Andrews, Executive Director
Re: Raised House Bill 5542

Senator Gerratana, Representative Johnson and members of the Public Health 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. During that time, I have seen a lot of high points and lot of low points for EMS in our State. I believe that what you have before you in *Raised House Bill 5542 AN ACT CONCERNING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CONNECTICUT EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES PRIMARY SERVICE AREA TASK FORCE* is a high point for EMS in our State.

I am in favor of this bill as presented. It will improve EMS at its most basic levels. The bill provides the requirement that municipalities be engaged with their EMS providers in developing an EMS plan for their communities. It also provides 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 and then apply a rating to that provider. 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 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. A PSA Responder should not be chosen based upon a political leader's personal preference but should be based upon an ambulance provider's ability to provide the level of service required for that particular geographic area in a cost-effective and high quality manner.

The PSA Task Force did a great job at identifying the issues and presenting their findings. Recommendations No. 1 through 4 were well thought out and provide every opportunity for each municipality to review their EMS plans along with their service providers and to make changes where necessary. The processes are well-defined and make good sense.

Recommendation No. 5 however, does not offer a well-defined process for the removal or a change in the designated PSA Responder. As written, it allows for the removal of a PSA Responder without cause or due process. Inclusion of this recommendation would only add to an already confusing process. Without defining the procedures to be utilized in Recommendation No. 5, political exploitation could certainly become a primary factor in making changes.

In closing, I encourage you to pass this bill as it is written. It will help to define the PSA process along with giving municipalities the guidance they need in defining their EMS systems.