

Transportation Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No.: SB-66

AN ACT CONCERNING THE NONEMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION OF
ELDERLY PERSONS AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES CONFINED TO A

Title: STRETCHER.

Vote Date: 3/20/2019

Vote Action: Joint Favorable Substitute

PH Date: 2/13/2019

File No.:

***Disclaimer:** The following JOINT FAVORABLE Report is prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and does not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose.*

SPONSORS OF BILL:

Sen. Osten

REASONS FOR BILL:

This bill allows non-emergency transportation of those who are elderly and/or disabled that are confined to a stretcher. The purpose of this is for some to have options outside of the costly ambulance service. Medicare will pay for needed ambulance transportation, but Medicaid does not cover ambulance transportation. The livery permitted service can be used as long as the individual's physician has given written consent, the driver is trained in stretcher transportation equivalent to EMS, and there is a trained attendant accompanying the person.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

Richard Andreski, Bureau Chief of Public Transportation, Department of

Transportation: "The Department of Transportation is opposed to this bill as medical livery is currently licensed and inspected by the Department of Public Health. Currently, the DPH Office of Emergency Medical Services inspects and regulates the full spectrum of stretcher vans as well as traditional ambulances, and handles all compliance issues and complaints." There is also added costs to this as they would have to create regulations and standards for compliance and safety and possibly introduce inspection specifications from DOT (DPH inspects currently). Another cost would be personnel to help take on the increase in inspections, licensing, and application analysts. They do not see the any reason for livery services to take on stretcher transportation.

Raul Pino, Commissioner, Connecticut Department of Public Health: Is opposed to the bill due to concerns about health and safety. The training that EMTs receive is in the transportation and monitoring of the individuals. It is imperative that the “attendants” are properly trained in use of the equipment that is used during transportation.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

Kathleen McCarty, State Representative, Connecticut House of Representatives: Is in support of this bill because it opens up transportation options that will otherwise occupy ambulance services that are more expensive. This legislation could improve the effected individual’s quality of life and lowering their health expenses.

Jay Case, State Representative, Connecticut House of Representatives: Testified in support because of the money savings measure that would result from passing this bill in concurrence with livery services being the preferred method of transportation by the affected individuals.

Joseph Miller, General Manager, Curtin Transportation Group: Is in support because this bill “will improve an individual who utilizes a stretcher’s quality of life by removing the stigma of constantly needing ambulance transportation for everyday activities. It also makes fiscal sense to Connecticut during these challenging fiscal times.”

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

Catherine Abercrombie, State Representative, Connecticut House of Representatives: Objects to livery services to participate in non-emergency stretcher transportation because the vehicles are lacking the appropriate safety measures needed. Also they are not trained to be able to respond to any medical issue that might arise during transport.

Gregory Allard, Vice President, American Ambulance Service: Is opposed to this bill because of safety concerns. They feel that there should be no alternative to transporting these individuals without a trained medical professional, because even though they are not considered patients by the definition, they are still vulnerable and fragile making so that there should be a medically trained person in case of an emergency.

Michael Loiz, Director of EMS & 911, Town of Stratford: Is in opposition due to their concerns about passenger safety because of staffing and equipment not being sufficient. There are states that have outright banned these services and the ones that have allowed it included strict regulations, and they are unsure of how strong it will be regulated in Connecticut.

David Lowell, President, Association of Connecticut Ambulance Providers: Objects to this bill as a matter of public safety. The differences between the ambulance and livery vans is not the same and will put those being transported in danger due to the lack of training and proper equipment.

Robert Mara, EMT Field Training Supervisor, Aetna ambulance Service, Inc.: is in opposition to SB 66 because of safety concerns for vulnerable and frail patients. They feel that there is no equivalent training that can be administered to replace a trained EMT in the

transportation of elderly and or disabled individuals confined to a stretcher. Another concern is that there is a lack of supervision of the rider as during the transport. There are “rules of thumb” that the ambulance services follow that the livery vans might not.

Michelle Cook, State Representative, Connecticut House of Representatives: “I am strongly opposed to this proposal as it will increase the risk for dangerous medical situations, increase personal patient costs for medically-necessary transportation, and increase state expenditures.” The drivers are unable to monitor the rider creating a dangerous situation should a medical emergency occur. This concern was addressed by requiring a second person to accompany the driver and attend to the passenger.

Robert Shea, Attorney, International Association of EMT’s & Paramedics: Opposes SB 66 due to the training that livery permit holders receive does not require them to be tested, certified, or experienced. This inequivalent training creates a dangerous situation for both the “attendants” and the passengers.

Reported by: Brittney Hedges

Date: April 4, 2019