

REVISED

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

RS29284 / H0499

In Idaho, emergency dispatchers are not eligible to retire until they've reached the Rule of 90 within PERSI, meaning their age plus years on the job equal 90. The position of a "Emergency Communications Officer" requires for them to be certified in Idaho's Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) pursuant to IDAPA rule 11.11.01. The role of a dispatcher is often misunderstood by the general public. Idaho's dispatchers are the lifeline to every emergency that occurs in our communities. They work the same hours as patrolmen and take on similar stress and trauma from taking emergency calls from the public. Dispatchers need the ability to multi-task and think critically, while working long hours, in order to be respond effectively for the Idaho public. The purpose of this legislation is to include Idaho's dispatchers into the PERSI's Rule of 80 system to retain and incentivize our law enforcement's front line workers. This piece of legislation amends Idaho Code, 59-1303, to add "Emergency Communications Officers" into police officer membership status for Idaho State Police, county law enforcement and city law enforcement.

FISCAL NOTE

For reference, there are roughly 580 budgeted (Dispatch) positions in Idaho, with wages ranging from \$12.00 to \$23.00. The ongoing cost to the PERSI system would be roughly 5.2% of total dispatcher payroll in Idaho. However, there is no cost to the General Fund because this legislation will increase the contribution rate for both the employee and the employer (city, county and state). Determining an accurate dollar figure related to this increase based on the total number of dispatchers employed in Idaho is difficult as it has to factor in city, county and state payrolls but the majority of the increase is covered by increased employee contributions.

Contact:

Representative Greg Chaney
(208) 332-1000

DISCLAIMER: This statement of purpose and fiscal note are a mere attachment to this bill and prepared by a proponent of the bill. It is neither intended as an expression of legislative intent nor intended for any use outside of the legislative process, including judicial review (Joint Rule 18).