

# Agenda Item #3

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
3-1-1 Business Plan Committee  
November 27, 2012  
MAG Offices, Saguaro Room  
302 N. 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona

## MEMBERS ATTENDING

- |                                                        |                                        |
|--------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| David Stevens, Maricopa County, Chair                  | * Diane Goke, City of Glendale         |
| Shelley Hearn, City of Tempe, Vice Chair               | * Dee Hathaway, Town of Buckeye        |
| Karen Peters, City of Phoenix                          | * Jeff Fiegenschuh, City of Goodyear   |
| * Brenda Buren, 9-1-1 Oversight Team                   | Carmen Martinez, City of Avondale      |
| # Jessica Blazina for Janeen Gaskins, City of Surprise | * Patrick McDermott, City of Chandler  |
| # Michael Ciccarone, Town of Fountain Hills            | * Gary Neiss, Town of Carefree         |
| * Alex Deshuk, City of Mesa                            | # John Imig, City of Peoria            |
| # Melanie Dykstra for Gabe England, Town of Gilbert    | # Brent Stockwell, City of Scottsdale  |
|                                                        | # Pat Timlin, City of El Mirage        |
|                                                        | * Gino Turrubiarres, 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 Chair Stevens 10:33 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 September 25, 2012 Minutes

Chair Stevens asked the committee for any comments on the September 25, 2012 minutes. Karen Peters moved for the approval of the minutes with Shelley Hearn seconding the motion. The September 25, 2012 minutes were approved unanimously.

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

Audrey Skidmore gave an update on the IVR Request for Information (RFI). Ms. Skidmore noted that Shelly Hearn, Pat Timlin, and Alex Deshuk were part of the RFI working group and welcomed their comments during the update. Ms. Skidmore stated the RFI responses were for both hosted and on-premise solutions. Ms. Skidmore noted the cost range was large therefore the group chose the most reasonably priced representation of each solution. Ms. Skidmore stated that these solutions were list price and that a negotiated price may be possible during any possible future request for proposal (RFP). Ms. Skidmore stated the costs were broken out in the memo attached to the agenda. Ms. Skidmore stated the costs were based on 1.5 million calls per year with all agencies participating. Ms. Skidmore noted that other assumptions were made including 10% of calls being routed to the operator and that each caller would stay in the IVR for 1 minute. Ms. Skidmore stated the cost numbers presented represent the worst case numbers for cost and indicated how the costs might scale under each option or with a member agency acting as the host.

Shelly Hearn added that the costs seem high and noted that the costs assume all agencies are participating. Ms. Hearn stated that based on number of calls Tempe currently takes their estimated costs would be \$56,000 for startup and \$48,000 for ongoing costs. Ms. Hearn stated these costs were based on the scaled back version. Ms. Hearn stated that if a couple cities were willing to be participants in a test of the 3-1-1 solution it would shrink the costs of the agencies participating in the 3-1-1 IVR solution. Ms. Hearn stated Tempe has a tracking system that would allow Tempe to track the call volume increase from the 3-1-1 solution. Ms. Hearn stated she does not want anyone to be scared of the costs presented as they are a worst case scenario.

Chair Stevens asked if there was a sense of if the working group was leaning toward an on-premise or hosted solution. Ms. Skidmore stated there was interest in both, but the majority of the group was leaning toward hosted solution. Shelly Hearn commented that the equipment maintenance and care costs would be the responsibility of the participating agencies with an on-premise solution, but the costs would be the responsibility of the vendor with a hosted solution. Ms. Hearn stated there is some concern based on experience in Tempe with ongoing software and maintenance costs with an on-premise solution. Pat Timlin clarified that one hosting option was to have a member agency potentially host the solution through their existing IVR. Karen Peters mentioned that the Information Technology (IT) department in charge of cyber-security for the City of Phoenix is worried about where the hosted solution and the security associated with hosted solution. Ms. Peters asked if the RFI looked at the location of the servers for the hosted solution. Ms. Skidmore stated the RFI responses did include location information and that there were options hosted in the United States.

Carmen Martinez asked how many responses to the RFI were received. Ms. Skidmore stated that 11 solutions were received from 8 different vendors. Ms. Martinez asked if all vendors submitted

solutions for both hosted and on-premise. Ms. Skidmore stated that only 3 vendors responded with both hosted and on-premise solutions.

Chair Stevens stated in order to move forward and make a decision there are a couple options, hosted and on-premise. Chair Stevens stated the committee members should come to the next meeting with the goal of formulating a recommendation to Management Committee by March. Chair Stevens asked the committee for comments or recommendations based on the information provided. Karen Peters stated there was no preference between hosted and on-premise today and more analysis was needed by the City of Phoenix. Shelly Hearn asked if it necessary to actually make that decisions now. Ms. Hearn also stated that it may be necessary to consider stipulations from IT and more work will need to be done before a decision is made. Ms. Hearn also stated that if a request for proposal (RFP) was decided on, both hosted and on-premise solutions could be allowed to bid to provide information to help in the decision making process. Chair Stevens stated he believes the committee needs to be focused and drive toward concluding facts and options. Chair Stevens recommended taking the information provided from the RFI back to the member agencies and begin to think about what level of participation each agency would like to have with the 3-1-1 system so the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee can take some next steps.

Carmen Martinez asked for clarification on the assumptions that were taken into account in the IVR RFI. Ms. Skidmore stated the RFI assumed every agency was participating, the number of calls was based on a ratio of calls to population looking at the Los Angeles 3-1-1 system.

Shelly Hearn asked what type of action should the committee take at this point and what would be most helpful for moving the item forward to the Management Committee. Ms. Skidmore stated the committee was not required to take action today, but the option to action was given should the committee see fit. Ms. Skidmore stated that if the committee decides to recommend moving forward to the Management Committee, they will need to include cost sharing and governance in their recommendation. Ms. Skidmore restated her understanding of the direction from Chair Stevens to go back to the agencies, take a look at the information provided by the RFI, and come back to the meeting in January with direction on the 3-1-1 system. Ms. Skidmore stated based on the recommendation at the January meeting a subgroup similar to the one that worked on the RFI could be created to work on the governance and cost sharing issues. Ms. Skidmore stated a presentation to the Management Committee could then be made by March or April. Chair Stevens agreed with Ms. Skidmore and stated the importance of everyone providing input into the process.

Chair Stevens recognized Catherine Rae Dunning, CEO of Community Information and Referral which administers Arizona 211. Ms. Dunning stated that 211 could not have been activated without the IVR and that the IVR handles 30% of calls coming into the system. She further stated that simply activating the 211 number had doubled call volume. Ms. Dunning also offered her assistance in moving the process forward.

Shelley Hearn asked if there was any data available on how many calls were transferred to an operator. Ms. Dunning sited a number of statistics that are tracked and further indicated that the IVR is adjusted periodically based on the type and number of service requests received. Chair Stevens thanked Ms. Dunning for her remarks and offer.

Shelly Hearn suggested having a formula for agencies to estimate what the system might cost them based on population. Ms. Hearn also suggested researching white papers on governance issues to give a subcommittee, if formed, some basis as to what the issues could be. Ms. Skidmore stated that the committee has access to the Regional Wireless Cooperative (RWC) and the Topaz Regional Wireless Cooperative (TRWC) governance agreements as provided by Mesa and Phoenix. Ms. Skidmore stated these agreements could be used as a starting point for the subgroup. Ms. Skidmore stated that with cost distribution there will be discussion about how to split the costs but it could be possible to come up with an estimate on call volume usage costs.

5. Agency Call Center Update

Karen Peters stated that the City of Phoenix is working on gathering information on internal call handling to help provide information to evaluate the questions the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee will be discussing in January. Ms. Peters stated that the City of Phoenix initiated a study to figure out where calls come from and where they are answered to provide good information to help the City of Phoenix evaluate 3-1-1 issues. Ms. Peters stated the data collection was just completed in November and preliminary results should be available by December.

6. Request for Future Agenda Items

There were no requests for future agenda items from the committee.

7. Adjournment

David Stevens requested a motion to adjourn the meeting. Karen Peters motioned to adjourn with Shelly Hearn seconding. The 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee meeting was adjourned at 11:05am.