July 18, 2016

Utah Communications Authority Board
Attention: Tina Mathieu, Chairperson, Jake Hunt, Interim Director
5360 South Ridge Village Drive
West Valley City, Utah 84118-4100

Dear Board Members:

As legislators for our state, we are very much aware of the many positive steps you have implemented in the wake of the criminal actions of a UCA employee and accomplices. Thank you all for your efforts and the efforts of Board Chair Tina Mathieu and Interim Director Jake Hunt.

I have been asked by several individuals over the past two years about the legislative intent of the bills I have sponsored concerning the UCA, the restricted accounts, and the studies the statutes require.

In simple terms the intent is to enhance the public safety efforts of all who work so diligently each day to keep our communities safe. This statement does not need interpretation, but is clearly stated at 63H-7a-303(2) where it reads in reference to the creation of the Computer Aided Dispatch Account: *"The money in this restricted account shall be used exclusively for the following statewide public purposes: (a) enhancing public safety as provided in this chapter; and (b) creating a shared computer aided dispatch system including (i) an interoperable computer aided dispatch platform that will be selected, shared, or hosted on a statewide or regional basis; (ii) an interoperable computer aided dispatch platform selected by a county of the first class;..."*

At the time the legislation was being considered, we were aware of the long overdue efforts of Salt Lake County to attempt to place all eighteen police and fire entities together under one Computer Aided Dispatch system. That is the reason that paragraph (2)(b)(ii) was included.

I have been kept abreast of the efforts and agreements for these agencies to acquire a CAD in concert with the intent of this section of the Code, and fully support their project. The sharing of CAD information, dispatching first responders more quickly and sharing public safety records was and continues to be a priority for me and the legislature as we address ways that we can help enhance public safety.

Another question that I have been asked about regarding legislative intent is with regard to 63H-7a-206 Functional consolidation of PSAPs study. The question concerns the interpretation of the word "exigent" circumstance". The definition in the statute reads: ""*Exigent circumstance" means an unexpected or unforeseen circumstance that, if not addressed, will result in imminent injury or loss."* In discussions with telecommunications providers, PSAP managers and others, who have asked for further clarification, I have explained that it does not mean the "has to be a fire in the computer room". Critical needs must be addressed. We are in the injury and loss prevention business. It is all of our responsibility to manage

and anticipate the unforeseen events. If there is a piece of equipment that is at its end of life and/or maintenance is no longer supported, it is incumbent that the manager of a PSAP for example, justify the exigent circumstance, that if replace is not made, there is a potential for resulting injury or loss to those we work each day to protect. I also believe that even without this term in the law, it is incumbent upon all of us who spend and receive public funds to justify the expenditures we make on behalf of our constituents.

Again, thank you for all you do.

Senator Wayne Harper
Utah State Senate
District 6