

September 18, 2012

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

FROM: David Stevens, Maricopa County, Chair

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

Tuesday, September 25, 2012, 10:30 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.
MAG Office, Suite 200 - Saguaro 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 June 26, 2012 Meeting Minutes

4. Presentation on Pinal County Call Center

Jerry Keely, Information Technology Operations Manager for Pinal County, will present on the implementation and operation of the Pinal County Call Center.

5. Update on Interactive Voice Response(IVR) Request for Information

The group will receive an update on the Request for Information under development.

6. Agency Call Center Update

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.

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 June 26, 2012 meeting.

4. For information and discussion.

5. For information and discussion.

6. For information and discussion.

7. For information and discussion.

Agenda Item #3

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
3-1-1 Business Plan Committee
June 26th, 2012
MAG Offices, Ironwood Room
302 N. 1st Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

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

* 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 Chair Stevens 10:36 a.m. 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

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. Chair Stevens noted that no public comment cards had been received.

3. Approval of April 24, 2012 Minutes

Chair Stevens asked the committee for any comments on the January 31, 2012 minutes. Diane Goke moved for the approval of the minutes with Paul Luizzi seconding the motion. The April 24th, 2012 minutes were approved unanimously.

4. Solicitation of Letters of Interest for the Vice Chair Position

Chair Stevens thanked Jane Morris for her service and leadership as the previous chair of the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee. Chair Stevens noted that the vice chair position he vacated to become the chair is now open.

Nathan Pryor gave an update on the process for selecting a new vice chair for the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee. Mr. Pryor noted that a letter had been sent out to the committee members to solicit letters of interest from members. Mr. Pryor noted that a decision in terms of appointing a vice chair could be made at the July 16th Executive Committee meeting.

5. Discussion of the Draft Interactive Voice Response (IVR) Business Requirements Document

Chair Stevens noted the Business Requirements Document was created by a subgroup of the 3-1-1 committee comprising of members from Tempe, Mesa, Phoenix, and Maricopa County. Chair Stevens asked the committee for comments on the draft IVR Business Requirements Document.

Patrick McDermott noted that the ability to vary before and after hours timing, messaging, and routing by agency should be required instead of a preferred option on the document. Mr. McDermott stated that agencies have live bodies during the day but at night there are not. Chair Stevens noted that some agencies such as Mesa are working four ten hour days and the ability to vary hours on the IVR system would be important.

Chair Stevens noted that the Business Requirements Document would eventually be part of an RFP that would be given to MAG Technology Advisory Group to ask for assistance in preparing the technical aspects of the system. Chair Stevens noted that comments and highlights of the document are beneficial as they begin their work. Chair Stevens noted that at the previous 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee meeting there was a feeling that there needed to be a definition about the IVR option that was selected and the Business Requirements Document is an attempt to bring clarity and understanding to what the IVR option is.

Brent Stockwell noted that some callers to 3-1-1 may not know what community they are calling from or what community they are calling about. Mr. Stockwell noted that according to the procedure on page one they call and are asked to speak the name of the agency with which they desire to contact. Mr. Stockwell noted that if the citizen has no idea what agency they are calling about, they are going to guess. Mr. Stockwell stated the proposed 3-1-1 system is for people who know what agency they want to call but may not work for citizens who do not know what agency they are trying call. Mr. Stockwell noted that citizens may call about a service for which the city is not responsible. Mr. Stockwell stated he is worried that the solution does not actually solve the problem the 3-1-1 system is meant to solve.

Janeen Gaskins asked if there was a way to geo-code locations of callers to the 3-1-1 system. Chair Stevens noted that the committee had discussed geo-coding in previous meetings similar to the 9-1-1 system. Chair Stevens noted due to the cost and complexity of the system it was not a viable option up-front. Brenda Buren stated that there were many discussions on geo-coding but it was decided against due to the cost.

Chair Stevens noted that Mr. Stockwell brought up a good point. Chair Stevens noted that the premise the committee started with was that citizens are going to be calling for a particular city, but that is not always the case and what is the long term strategy for dealing with this subset of users. Mr. Stockwell noted that if the list of agencies had the County and Phoenix first they would get the majority of users that did not know where to go. Mr. Stockwell noted that the agencies listed first would have to understand that they would be taking calls from people that do not know which jurisdiction they are in. Mr. Stockwell also noted that some citizens also identify themselves with sub-city levels, particularly in Phoenix. Mr. Stockwell stated that the sub-levels may need to be included to route the citizens to the correct jurisdiction.

Chair Stevens noted that section 2.7 under assumptions stated that call volume would be similar to another region of similar size with room for 20% growth. Chair Stevens noted that in previous presentations jurisdictions experienced a substantial increase in calls. Patrick McDermott stated that he remembered there was an increase in calls for information, but not necessarily an increase in service requests. Mr. McDermott stated that citizens with service requests are finding who to call now, but information requests may increase with 3-1-1. David Worley stated that the anecdotal evidence from the ICMA presentation stated a 50% increase in calls and that 70% of calls were informational calls. Mr. Worley stated that the assumption in 2.7 was a similar 3-1-1 system such as Los Angeles would be used to determine call volume and allow for 20% increase in calls.

Chair Stevens stated that the goal is to have the Technology Advisory Group create a sub-committee to flush out the technical requirements of the document. Chair Stevens noted that the group would start looking into the costing of the system and the anticipated growth rate of the system. Nathan Pryor stated that members of the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee will be needed to serve on the subcommittee to review any potential RFP.

Chair Stevens stated the next action for the committee was to send the document to the Technology Advisory Group and have the Technology Advisory Group create a subcommittee with members from the 3-1-1 committee to create a statement of work for an RFP.

Brent stockwell stated the question is there any value in refining the initial contact on the IVR system any further. Mr. Stockwell noted that IVR systems have the ability to go into more detail. Mr. Stockwell noted the IVR system has one number per city and the city may have a switchboard which the citizen has to go through. Mr. Stockwell noted the IVR could have branches underneath the initial IVR to get the citizen to the correct department. Mr. Stockwell noted that either MAG or the County have a database of intersections. Mr. Stockwell stated with this database citizens could speak their cross streets and get connect to the correct jurisdiction. Mr. Stockwell noted knowing in advance the depth of the IVR will help determine the cost of the system.

Chair Stevens stated that the subgroup should probably take another look at the document and take into consideration the comments and concerns shared in the meeting. Mr. Stevens also noted that a group should be formed to put together a scope of work which could include what the IVR tree could look like. Chair Stevens stated that if there were no objections he would recommend sending the Business Requirements document to the Technical Advisory Group and ask them to start thinking through the statement of work process that would ultimately go to an RFP. Chair Stevens stated that a review committee consisting of members of both the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee and the Technology Advisory Group would be formed. Chair Stevens also stated that the Technology Advisory Group would consider some of the questions brought up by the 3-1-1 Committee including the level of detail in the decision trees of the IVR.

6. Working Session

Chair Stevens stated the purpose of this item was governance and how would 3-1-1 come together and particularly with the opt-out clause. Chair Stevens stated that a governance structure needs to be worked on in parallel with the business requirements document. Mr. Stevens stated that Audrey Skidmore provided a governance structure from the Topaz Wireless Co-operative for the committee to review. Chair Stevens stated there are issues with defining what a participation and an exit strategy look like within this model of 3-1-1. Chair Stevens noted that the cost allocation model will hopefully be provided through the RFP process. Chair Stevens also stated the term, is it yearly and how is the agreement reviewed , should be considered.

Brent Stockwell stated that if MAG is to be the lead agency and is a service that MAG provide then it is rolled into the yearly payments made to MAG. Mr. Stockwell stated that member agencies could choose to participate similar to providing a representative to a committee and that if the member agency chooses not to participate it would still keep going. Mr. Stockwell stated the option should be explored and that it would be a service provided by MAG and have an oversight committee. Chair Stevens asked MAG staff if the option presented by Mr. Stockwell was a possibility. Nathan Pryor stated that if a subcommittee was formed the issues could be worked through such as cost sharing through population size, call volume, robustness of the system requested by a member agency, and other cost variables. Mr. Pryor noted there are programs run by MAG where the cost is broken out by agency. Mr. Stockwell noted that it is important to make the process as easy as possible to ensure maximum participation.

Paul Luizzi agreed with Mr. Stockwell and noted that the Regional Wireless Co-operative (RWC) already has a governance structure in place that work well and the 3-1-1 system could possibly follow it as an example. Mr. Stevens noted that a sample governance structure was included from the TRWC for the committee to review in the meeting materials.

Karen Peters agreed with Mr. Pryor about the need to identify and understand the variables of the cost of 3-1-1. Ms. Peters stated she is familiar with the RWC governance structure and that it is based on usage and she is unsure how the agreement would work with 3-1-1.

Chair Stevens asked MAG staff if the governance structure is something that could be worked on with MAG to determine the role of MAG in the structure. Chair Stevens noted if there is opportunity there then a subgroup could be formed to think through the governance structure more. Nathan Pryor stated that Audrey Skidmore has noted to him about the possibility of creating

a subgroup from the 3-1-1 committee to start considering some of the governance issues. Chair Stevens asked the committee if there was interest in creating a subgroup to.

Patrick McDermott stated if MAG is going to be an oversight agency for 3-1-1, what is going to be the cost. Mr. McDermott stated if an agency chooses to opt out will there be a cost to the agency for the committee being created. Mr. McDermott stated that 3-1-1 will be needed eventually, but Chandler was not there yet. Mr. McDermott stated there are other priorities Chandler needs to spend money on before 3-1-1. Chair Stevens stated that cost allocation is important and there are two parallel tracks with reference to governance and cost. Chair Stevens stated that the committee needs to start considering what the governance structure might be including cost allocation.

Brent Stockwell noted the cost allocation depends on the scope of the project and the total cost of the project. Mr. Stockwell noted that the cost is unknown and the more customization that is added the higher the costs will be. Mr. Stockwell noted that the size of the scope of work could affect the governance structure as well. Mr. Stockwell stated that if the scope is small a jurisdiction could take the lead informally, but if the scope is large then a regional governance structure would be likely. Mr. Stockwell also noted that it must be decided whether the cost allocation would be based on population or call volume. Mr. Stockwell noted that before the governance subcommittee meets it would be helpful to have a better understanding of cost and scope of the 3-1-1 system to size the governance structure to the system. Chair Stevens suggested that the governance subcommittee be discussed at a future meeting after more discussion on project scope and cost.

Carmen Martinez agreed with Mr. Stockwell about needing a better understanding of cost and added that a better understanding of how many communities would be involved was important. Paul Luizzi inquired about the possibility of MAG conducting a survey about interest in the 3-1-1 system from member agencies. Chair Stevens stated it could be a good opportunity to get a straw poll of potential interest. Patrick McDermott stated it was a good idea but may not be affective to go outside the committee members due to knowledge base of information collected by the members and the number of questions that would need to be answered. Mr. McDermott also stated everyone will want to know the cost as well before making a decision on 3-1-1 participation. Mr. Stockwell agreed and stated it would be difficult to make a decision without knowing a price range.

Chair Stevens stated that there is great potential to what this could be, but the committee needs to figure out what the 3-1-1 system can be on day one. Chair Stevens noted that the committee should think about how can a 3-1-1 system be developed for low risk and low cost, but be developed over time if the utility and return on investment demonstrates value. Chair Stevens stated that it would be a great idea to bring the potential costs back to the committee. Mr. Stockwell stated that the cost is most likely going to be lower than thought due to people who already know how to contact the appropriate agency. Mr. Stockwell noted the committee has to avoid the danger over overbuilding and over governing the 3-1-1 system to avoid over paying. Chair Stevens stated based on the discussion today the committee would like to see costs of the 3-1-1 system in order to start the governance structure and educate other communities and determine the interest level in a 3-1-1 system.

Karen Peters stated that if outreach to member agencies not represented on the committee was to be done it is important to understand where the agencies are in terms of their internal processes. Ms. Peters stated she would like to know the readiness of other agencies on the back-end of the 3-1-1 system. Chair Stevens stated that would be a great tool to have in the survey when the committee is ready to survey other communities.

7. Agency Call Center Update

Chair Stevens stated there were no updates scheduled for this meeting and asked the committee if anyone would like to present at the next meeting. Chair Stevens informed the committee to let MAG staff or himself know before the next meeting if anyone would like to present about 3-1-1 proceedings in their jurisdiction.

8. Request for Future Agenda Items

Chair Stevens asked the committee for suggestions on future agenda items. Brent Stockwell confirmed that the committee will be discussing governance at the next meeting. Chair Stevens agreed the committee should discuss it further in a future meeting.

Brent Stockwell noted that examples of 3-1-1 have been presented, but no example of an active 3-1-1 system has been given. Mr. Stockwell noted that having an agency with a best practice IVR system give a customer experience demonstration could be helpful. Chair Stevens stated that Maricopa County has several IVR systems and could potentially give a demo.

The 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee meeting was adjourned at 11:34am.