

January 25, 2012

TO: Members of the MAG 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee

FROM: Jane Morris, City of Phoenix, Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA OF THE
MAG 3-1-1 BUSINESS PLAN COMMITTEE

Tuesday, January 31, 2012 , 10:30 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.
MAG Office, Suite 200 - Ironwood Room
302 North 1st Avenue, Phoenix

A meeting of the MAG 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee has been scheduled for the time and place noted above. Members of the Committee may attend the meeting either in person or by telephone conference. For those using transit, the Regional Public Transportation Authority will provide transit tickets for your trip.

Please be advised that under procedures approved by the MAG Regional Council on June 26, 1996, all MAG committees need to have a quorum in order to conduct business. A quorum is a simple majority of the membership, or 10 people for the MAG 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee. If you are unable to attend the meeting, please make arrangements for a proxy from your jurisdiction to represent you.

If you have any questions regarding the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee agenda items, please contact Audrey Skidmore at (602) 254-6300.

3-1-1 BUSINESS PLAN COMMITTEE TENTATIVE AGENDA

COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED

1. Call to Order

The meeting of the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee will be called to order.

2. Call to the Audience

An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address the MAG 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG, or on items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. Members of the public will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes will be provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless the MAG 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee requests an exception to this limit. Please note that those wishing to comment on action agenda items will be given an opportunity at the time the item is heard.

3. Approval of the November 29, 2011 Meeting Minutes

4. Agency Call Center Update

Judy Melton from City of Scottsdale will provide an update on the City's efforts. Other members of the committee will be given a opportunity to discuss what they have determined about their internal call handling as it relates to 3-1-1.

5. 3-1-1 Models Status Update

An update on the technical rating process for the 3-1-1 Models will be provided. The Committee will also be briefed on an anticipated schedule for review.

6. Developing a Regional Readiness Checklist

Cory Fleming of ICMA will provide some preliminary information on key points for a Regional Readiness Checklist. The Committee will further discuss the item in an effort to develop such a checklist.

7. Request for Future Agenda Items

Topics or issues of interest that the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee would like to have considered for discussion at a future meeting will be requested.

Adjournment

2. Information and discussion.

3. Review and approve the minutes of the November 29, 2011 meeting.

4. For information and discussion.

5. For information and discussion.

6. For information and discussion.

7. For information and discussion.

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
3-1-1 Business Plan Committee
November 29th, 2011
MAG Offices, Ironwood Room
302 N. 1st Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- | | |
|---|---|
| Jane Morris, City of Phoenix, Chair
David Stevens, Maricopa County, Vice
Chair
Brenda Buren, 9-1-1 Oversight Team
* Michael Celaya, City of Surprise
Michael Ciccarone, Town of Fountain Hills
Alex Deshuk, City of Mesa
Melanie Dykstra, Town of Gilbert
Diane Goke, City of Glendale
Dee Hathaway, Town of Buckeye | Shelley Hearn, City of Tempe
Paul Luizzi, City of Goodyear
Carmen Martinez, City of Avondale
Patrick McDermott, City of Chandler
* Gary Neiss, Town of Carefree
Vicky Scott, City of Peoria Police
Department
Brent Stockwell, City of Scottsdale
Pat Timlin, City of El Mirage
* Gino Turrubiartes, Town of Guadalupe |
|---|---|

- * Not present
- # Participated by video or telephone conference call

1. Call to Order

The 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Stevens at 10:05 a.m. Vice Chair Stevens stated that public comment cards were available for those members of the public who wish to comment. Transit tickets were available from Valley Metro for those using transit to come to the meeting. Parking validation was available from MAG staff for those who parked in the parking garage.

2. Call to the Audience

Vice Chair Stevens noted that, according to the MAG public comment process, members of the audience who wish to speak are requested to fill out the public comment cards and stated that there is a three-minute time limit. Public comment is provided at the beginning of the meeting for items that are not on the agenda that are within the jurisdiction of MAG, or non-action agenda items that are on the agenda for discussion or information only. Vice Chair Stevens noted that no public comment cards had been received.

3. Approval of October 25th, 2011 Minutes

Vice Chair Stevens asked the committee for any comments on the October 25th, 2011 minutes. Melanie Dykstra motioned for the approval of the minutes with Paul Luizzi seconding the motion. The October 25th, 2011 minutes were approved unanimously.

4. ICMA Presentation on 3-1-1

Cory Fleming of ICMA provided a presentation regarding information on the benefits and challenges of 3-1-1 along with guidance on discussion points that should be considered.

Brent Stockwell suggested that since there is no regional 3-1-1 model, the next best example would be a large city with independent groups or departments that have established call centers. He asked if there is a situation similar to this and how did they approach integrating into one model. Ms. Fleming stated that Durham, North Carolina, has a public utility system that was pulled into their call center. Durham set up a small sub call center within the larger call center. Ms. Fleming also noted that Fort Worth's Department of Environmental Services (DES) set up a call center and had a request from Animal Control to join the call center followed by two other departments. The city manager at Fort Worth saw the system and wanted all departments to join within two years.

Chair Morris asked Ms. Fleming if the ICMA database excludes mayor form of government such as those seen in cities such as New York, Chicago, or Los Angeles. Ms. Fleming noted there is no database and the information gathering is done informally. Ms. Fleming noted ICMA has looked at both council/manager and mayoral/strong mayor forms of government. Chair Morris asked if the big city models were helpful to the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee. Ms. Fleming noted it is worth looking at New York City which is an outlier because of the co-location with 2-1-1 and 3-1-1 within their system. Ms. Fleming noted that talking to city-county systems such as Miami-Dade, Denver, and San Francisco would be a good idea.

David Stevens asked what type of governance did city-county systems such as Miami-Dade and San Francisco put in place and is there a model they settled on. Ms. Fleming thought that in Miami-Dade the county had already allocated 3-1-1 when the city decided it wanted to implement a 3-1-1 system so both were forced to work together. Chair Morris asked if the governance document for Miami-Dade is available. Ms. Fleming stated she could get the document and provide contact information for an appropriate source of information from Miami-Dade. Ms. Fleming also noted there are GIS consortiums around the country that have governance agreements that may assist the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee.

Vicky Scott asked about the processes of 3-1-1 and how data is entered back into the system after the service request is fixed, such as in the pothole example. Ms. Fleming stated that if a CRM product is used it should be integrated into the work order systems. Ms. Scott stated that everyone could be on a different system. Ms. Fleming stated that a review of the work order systems should be part of the readiness assessment to determine what can and cannot be easily integrated. Chair Morris stated that this is part of the complicated system that we are trying to simplify. Chair Morris added each jurisdiction needs to look at their own system to determine if each model presented would work for them. Chair Morris noted that eventually the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee will be making a recommendation to the Management Committee and the readiness tool can help each jurisdiction decide what they will do. Vicky Scott stated that GIS information is fed to a centralized database through Maricopa 911 but it is unknown if accessing that database for other systems is easy. Ms. Fleming stated that would also need to be part of the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee readiness assessment.

Brent Stockwell stated the readiness assessment is an acceptable tool for a local government. Mr. Stockwell stated the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee will probably need to develop a tool for a regional readiness assessment. Mr. Stockwell noted that it may take some time to develop the survey and collect the data. Mr. Stockwell noted the most important thing to note is whether there are somewhat standardized processes between jurisdictions. Mr. Stockwell stated he believes that each community has developed their own ways and standards and it will be a fairly complicated process.

Shelley Hearn stated every community has a different approach to 3-1-1. Ms. Hearn asked if there are any cities using 3-1-1 without a CRM. Ms. Fleming stated that Virginia Beach and Charlotte have 3-1-1 systems with no CRM and the operators have multiple applications they work with. Ms. Fleming stated the systems are working without it, but would benefit from some type of CRM. Ms. Hearn stated in the model we are looking at sending the call directly to a community. Ms. Hearn stated that if the call is routed to a city that is not ready to handle the increased call volume, the group would need to help to develop standard practices to avoid a failure in the 3-1-1 system. Ms. Fleming stated that Los Alamos started with an Access Database to gather data on what types of calls they were receiving before investing in a CRM product. Ms. Fleming stated that knowing the frequently asked questions is important before choosing a CRM. Chair Morris stated that the range of cities in the region is tremendous in terms of the number of calls received. Chair Morris noted the industry expectations of 3-1-1 is increased call volume, but some jurisdictions could decide to handle calls the same as they do today.

Patrick McDermott asked is there data that 3-1-1 increases call volume. Ms. Fleming noted there is no universal system with all the information. Ms. Fleming stated that talking to Kansas city their call volume increased 50% and a range of 30-50% is not unrealistic. Mr. McDermott asked if those calls were not occurring previously and are they informational or service requests. Ms. Fleming stated it is not unusual for 60-70% of calls to be informational with a majority of the remaining being service request related. Chair Morris noted that call volume will increase due to 3-1-1 being easier to remember than a seven digit number.

Brent Stockwell noted the report on the website stated the two most common reasons for not implementing 3-1-1 are it is too expensive and too complicated. Mr. Stockwell noted that ICMA suggested staging in the 3-1-1 system. Mr. Stockwell stated that if he were to stage something that is less expensive and complicated he would start with a web self-service first. Mr. Stockwell stated rather than jumping to a live phone agent at \$4.50-\$5.30 per call or even an IVR at \$0.45-\$1.85 the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee should explore web self-service. Mr. Stockwell noted that web self-service was not captured in the 3-1-1 models presented. Ms. Fleming stated that smaller communities considering an online web system there is a case study targeting Saco, Maine on the ICMA website.

Chair Morris noted part of the benefit is to be able to have all communication vehicles captured in one place. Chair Morris noted that the charter of the group was 3-1-1 and asked Audrey Skidmore for clarification. Ms. Fleming stated that web and smart phone applications are in demand but often are not incorporated into work order systems, possibly creating another line of work in the service request and added costs. Ms. Skidmore stated that as long as the group is within the realm of 3-1-1 they can continue. Brent Stockwell clarified that he was not considering

going into the mobile application world, but having an online database that citizens could access and provide standards to make it easier for everyone involved. Mr. Stockwell noted that seemed to be a lower cost entry point to be able to stage going into a regional 3-1-1 system.

Chair Morris thank Ms. Fleming for her presentation.

5. Review of 3-1-1 Models

Chair Morris asked members of the committee to place stickers on the models presented to give the group a better understanding of which models members were considering. Ms. Skidmore gave an overview of the five models presented. Ms. Skidmore stated that every member received two dot stickers to place on the model or models they like. Ms. Skidmore stated they may put both dots on the same one if they wished.

Patrick McDermott asked how number five was technically feasible because it sounds like an issue that 9-1-1 is still dealing with on mobile phones and how do land lines work when someone is calling outside the jurisdiction they want to talk to. Ms. Skidmore stated there was a white paper done by ICMA printed out and provided that discusses the how-to with land lines. Ms. Skidmore stated she does not know the price associated with this option. Ms. Skidmore noted that using zip codes and databases, the land lines are possible, the cell phones would require some sort of location tagging with an associated cost. Ms. Skidmore also noted to contact a 3-1-1 center outside of the current jurisdiction, the caller would have to use a ten digit number. Chair Morris suggested calling model number five a philosophical sheet with no governance, no brand emphasis, it is individual cities pursuing 3-1-1 on their own. Alex Deshuk suggested the term autonomy, jurisdictions doing what they want to do, when they are ready to do it. Mr. Deshuk stated he believes model number five is how 3-1-1 is typically done. Mr. Deshuk noted Cory Fleming stated that no one has pursued 3-1-1 as a regional model and stated he would call model number five the typical implementation.

Chair Morris asked the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee if they were prepared to participate in a straw poll on models today. Through a show of hands it was decided to proceed.

Brent Stockwell asked if model number two encompassed both situation where the County would develop their own call center and forward calls to jurisdictions. Ms. Skidmore stated that if the County would like to do that from a customer service perspective they could possibly give out the jurisdictions ten digit number. Mr. Stockwell asked if number two could also represent a truly regional call center which is independent of the County. Ms. Skidmore stated the model represented one call center and what that call center looks like is still up for discussion. Mr. Stockwell asked for clarification between number four and five. Ms. Skidmore stated that in number five the jurisdictions are letting Maricopa County know the jurisdictions would like control of 3-1-1 in their geographical area. Alex Deshuk stated when the city is ready for 3-1-1 it would get the allocation by petitioning the Corporation Commission and asking it be built out according to the regulations.

Shelley Hearn stated that during discussions with the County, the central offices for the land lines are located such that they are not within city boundaries. Mr. Hearn stated she is not clear on a way Tempe could take 3-1-1 and operate it on their own without dealing from many calls outside of

their jurisdiction. Mr. Deshuk stated that while the physical central offices switch boundaries it is incumbent for the carriers to route the calls to the right jurisdiction based on their licensing with the state. Mr. Deshuk noted it is not entirely based on the central offices and it was in an attachment provided by Ms. Skidmore on the website from Qwest that outlines the procedures for getting 3-1-1. Ms. Skidmore stated that she posted a white paper about methods about how to do that and how the state tariffs are written which prevent your ability to do that. Ms. Skidmore stated she was not comfortable discussing the Arizona tariff but there are ways to do that may generate some expense. Vicky Scott reminded the group that 9-1-1 uses an ESN number for every house and that is how the number is connected to the right agency. Ms. Scott stated it is a very large database that is expensive and cumbersome to do. Ms. Skidmore stated that more calls will come from cell phones and that will be the larger issue. Ms. Scott stated that approximately 70% of 9-1-1 calls originate from cell phones, and the boundary issues with cell phone towers will be a tougher issue.

Patrick McDermott stated what he is hearing is the difference between four and five is that five has a large cost associated with it. Mr. McDermott stated four is continuing what you do without the 3-1-1 component whereas five is incorporating the 3-1-1 into your own handling of calls. Mr. Deshuk stated the point of this exercise was to give direction so that costing of the options can be done. Ms. Skidmore stated she cannot speculate on the cost of number five and that number five was communicating the desire for autonomy.

The 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee indicated their preferences on the five models presented. The results of the straw poll were 11 for model one (Call Handling with IVR), 7 for model two (Regional Call Center), 5 for model three (Co-Location with 2-1-1 Call Center), 2 for model four (Do Nothing), and 4 for model five (Jurisdictional Control).

Chair Morris summarized the results and indicated that committee members were still gaining an understanding of 3-1-1 and its customer service and cost implications.

Brent Stockwell stated his observation on the vote is that nothing can be excluded yet. Mr. Stockwell noted that more information is needed on each model and that he put his votes on model two due to an aversion to using an IVR system as the main customer service tool. Mr. Stockwell noted that he is not adverse to exploring model one or model three, but that more information is needed.

6. Agency Call Center Update

Chair Morris asked Brent Stockwell and Judy Melton, from Scottsdale, if item number six could be moved to the next meeting in order to adjourn on time. Mr. Stockwell and Ms. Melton confirmed the ability to move to the next scheduled meeting.

7. Request for Future Agenda Items

Chair Morris asked the committee to request future agenda items.

Brent Stockwell requested an agenda item on the readiness assessment on a regional level in support of the regional call center model. Chair Morris agreed and added that finding models closest to the region would be helpful.

Ms. Skidmore asked if the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee would like to hear from some agencies mentioned by Ms. Fleming during her presentation such as Miami-Dade, Denver, or San Francisco. The committee agreed that hearing from other agencies would be a good agenda item. Chair Morris suggested finding the best example of the three to present.

Shelley Hearn mentioned there should be a plan being developed to explore some of the cost associated with the models, and the viability of the systems. Ms. Hearn also suggested creating a list of questions prior to a presentation by another agency that the committee could review and add questions to.

Pat Timlin asked how the Technology Advisory Group (TAG) assist in the 3-1-1 process. Ms. Skidmore stated since all models were on the table, it may be good to ask the group to look into how calls would be directed under model number five and what the costing may look like. Ms. Skidmore stated that TAG may also be able to provide information on other technologies that could be used with or in lieu of IVR. Mr. Timlin stated TAG could look at this at their next meeting and were asking for more direction. Chair Morris stated that the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee is still working on it by first determining philosophically where the committee was and then determining the technology after. Ms. Hearn asked if TAG could look at number five and see if it was even feasible and what would be required to make it work.

Shelley Hearn ask about the possibility of replacing the IVR with a person. Ms. Hearn stated that instead of model two where the phone agent is trying to answer informational questions, the agent passes the call to the appropriate city. Chair Morris stated that would be a good costing issue on the difference between an IVR and a switchboard. Ms. Hearn stated the person could direct callers to a website if preferred by the city, the County for animal control, or the appropriate number. Ms. Skidmore stated that she had preliminary costing on an IVR solution, but it was not shared due to needing more information on call volume. Ms. Skidmore requested the agencies assist in giving information on the call volume, such as calls per minute or calls per day, to help understand the needed size of the IVR or how many live answer agents would be needed. Chair Morris stated that each jurisdiction could provide if they use technology and what does that cost, or do you use people and what is that cost. Judy Melton of Scottsdale stated that acceptable cue time should be determined as well. Chair Morris requested MAG staff send out an email to the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee requesting information from the committee members to be used for modeling. Ms. Skidmore stated that the request is for a rough number to allow for a reasonable guess. Pat Timlin also reminded the committee during the presentation by Ms. Fleming there was a slide presenting the cost difference between IVR and walk-ins as well as a per call cost. Chair Morris noted the cue time as being important and that a 5 minute time as stated before is too long of a wait time for a call to be answered. Ms. Skidmore asked the committee if the volume is in calls per day, give the hours of operation.

Brenda Buren noted from experience with 9-1-1 that while cost is great to collect, she would hate for it to become the forefront of the decision process instead of what is needed by the region. Chair

Morris stated there is complexity that will take years, but balance of detail and philosophical approach is needed to take it to our own individual management structures. Chair Morris noted when she asked Shelley Hearn in the first meeting where the data was for Tempe's call center, Ms. Hearn replied it was something the City Manger wanted to do. Chair Morris stated there is some information that you will know going in and some you cannot learn until after the decision is made. Patrick McDermott stated that the difference between the 9-1-1 and the 3-1-1 system is that funds will flow easier to 9-1-1 than 3-1-1 and cost must be taken into account early no matter what a agency wants to do. Mr. McDermott agreed it should not drive everything, but a cost benefit must be done on the front end. Ms. Buren agreed there must be some balance between cost and the philosophical approach to choosing a model. Vicky Scott noted that 9-1-1 has lost over \$52 million over last several years due to the State sweeping the funds. Mr. McDermott noted that officials would give all extra funding to 9-1-1 before giving any to 3-1-1.

8. Adjournment

Chair Morris adjourned the meeting.