

February 21, 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, February 28, 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 January 31, 2012 Meeting Minutes

4. Agency Call Center Update

Alex Deshuk from City of Mesa 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 Technical Ratings

An update on the technical ratings for the 3-1-1 Models will be provided. The MAG Technology Advisory Group is scheduled to take action on this item on Thursday, February 23, 2012. An update on any action taken will be forwarded to the Committee prior to the meeting.

6. 3-1-1 Models Evaluation Matrix

A draft decision matrix for the implementation of possible 3-1-1 models will be reviewed and discussed by committee members. Members will be encouraged to provide input into the creation of the matrix.

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 January 31, 2012 meeting.

4. For information and discussion.

5. For information, discussion and possible action.

6. For information, discussion, and possible action.

7. For information and discussion.

Agenda Item #3

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
3-1-1 Business Plan Committee
January 31st, 2012
MAG Offices, Ironwood Room
302 N. 1st Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- | | |
|--|---|
| Jane Morris, City of Phoenix, Chair | Shelley Hearn, City of Tempe |
| * David Stevens, Maricopa County, Vice Chair | * Paul Luizzi, City of Goodyear |
| Brenda Buren, 9-1-1 Oversight Team | * Carmen Martinez, City of Avondale |
| * Michael Celaya, City of Surprise | Patrick McDermott, City of Chandler |
| # Michael Ciccarone, Town of Fountain Hills | * Gary Neiss, Town of Carefree |
| # Alex Deshuk, City of Mesa | * Vicky Scott, City of Peoria Police Department |
| Melanie Dykstra, Town of Gilbert | Brent Stockwell, City of Scottsdale |
| Jenna Goad for Diane Goke, City of Glendale | Pat Timlin, City of El Mirage |
| * Dee Hathaway, Town of Buckeye | * 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 Morris at 10:10 a.m. Chair Morris 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 Morris 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 Morris noted that no public comment cards had been received.

3. Approval of November 29th, 2011 Minutes

Chair Morris asked the committee for any comments on the November 29th, 2011 minutes. Pat Timlin motioned for the approval of the minutes with Shelley Hearn seconding the motion. The November 29th, 2011 minutes were approved unanimously.

4. Agency Call Center Update

Judy Melton from City of Scottsdale provided an update on the City's efforts. Ms. Melton noted that Scottsdale has a ten digit number for a call center that was created in 2003 by combining two existing positions and utilizing an existing knowledge base, call routing system, and automated call distribution system. Ms. Melton mentioned gains in efficiency including lower queue times, lower abandon rates, and higher first call resolution. Ms. Melton also noted that 65 percent of calls received are non-emergency police calls and that police non-emergency are prioritized over other calls. Ms. Melton noted that service calls are not taken in the call center due to low queue times in the departments as well as lack of software and staffing in the call center. Ms. Melton noted there is no immediate drive to change the current model. Ms Melton noted City of Scottsdale has explored Customer Relationship Management (CRM) systems and a 3-1-1 call center in the past, but there were cost and support concerns that prohibited implementation.

Brenda Buren asked what the communication was like between the call center operator and the City staff the call is being transferred to. Ms. Melton noted that some departments are blind transferred while others have an announced transfer depending on what is requested by the staff member.

Patrick McDermott asked if all calls coming into the city are routed through the call center during business hours. Ms. Melton stated that there are certain departments with a prearranged agreement to come through the call center, but not all departments are routed through the call center.

Melanie Dykstra asked how many shifts per day did the call center have. Ms. Melton noted there was just one shift Monday through Friday 8am to 5pm. Ms. Melton also stated that another quarter employee is needed to cover sick, training, and vacation time for the two full time employees. Ms. Dykstra asked if the main function of the call center was answering frequently asked questions and routing all other calls to departments. Ms. Melton stated that is accurate. Ms. Dykstra asked if the reason for not taking service orders was because of the cost of implementation and software at the time. Ms. Melton stated that it was.

Ms. Melton noted that knowledge base being used is a database that can sort by sections. Ms. Melton noted that data for the knowledge base is gathered from each department through emails and Human Resources is set up to automatically update staff changes. Ms. Melton also mentioned that topical data is entered by the call center based on calls received being cross-checked with departments. Jenna Goad asked if the knowledge base accessible by external users. Ms. Melton noted it is only available internally to the call center. Cory Fleming asked if other departments could access the data in the knowledge base. Ms. Melton noted the knowledge base software is licensed per user.

Chair Morris thanks Ms. Melton for her presentation and welcomed other cities to provide updates to show their best practices to assist the committee.

5. 3-1-1 Model Status Update

Audrey Skidmore provided an update on the technical rating process for the 3-1-1 Models. Ms. Skidmore stated that the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) created a task force with subject matter experts from member agencies. Ms. Skidmore noted the task force has met twice and will meet twice more before forwarding on their findings to TAG. Ms. Skidmore stated that TAG meets Thursday, February 23rd before the Tuesday, February 28th 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee meeting. Ms. Skidmore stated that the results from TAG will be presented at the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee. Ms. Skidmore stated the results will be purely technical without value judgement in the consideration. Ms. Skidmore anticipated that the results would be discussed in the February and March 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee and an update will be provided to Management Committee at their April 11th Meeting.

Melanie Dykstra asked if the information provided by the members, including answer time and call volume, was provided to the task force. Ms. Skidmore stated that the information has been passed to TAG and the task force.

6. Developing a Regional Readiness Checklist

Cory Fleming of ICMA provided a presentation on preliminary information on key points for a Regional Readiness checklist. Ms. Fleming discussed the “as is” scenario and the “to be” scenario. Ms. Fleming stated that each community should do their own assessment and those should be rolled into a regional assessment. Ms. Fleming also discussed the financial impact by communication method.

Chair Morris stated that the 3-1-1 committee was asking what does the region need to do to get ready, and what is the checklist for the region. Chair Morris agreed with Ms. Fleming that the member agencies must do a readiness assessment as well. Chair Morris also noted that the 3-1-1 is tasked with is finding out if there is a regional problem to be solved, what is the technical way of solving the problem, and what does each city want from 3-1-1.

Shelley Hearn asked how 3-1-1 benefits economic development. Ms. Fleming stated that Minneapolis uses 3-1-1 to deliver foreclosure information, including how families can avoid foreclosures. Ms. Fleming continued that some 3-1-1 call centers are starting to answer questions about community features.

Alex Deshuk stated the readiness checklist prepared by Audrey Skidmore represents the fourth most important item of the “as is” scenario. Mr. Deshuk asked Ms. Fleming how the 3-1-1 committee would get back to the top of the list. Mr. Deshuk stated that the committee has jumped over governance, processes and operations, and people, and moved into technology. Ms. Fleming stated that in terms of the “as is” scenario the processes and operations is there to encourage individual communities to do readiness assessments as part of moving into a regional assessment. Ms. Fleming also stated that these are the five areas of a individual community assessment. Ms. Fleming stated there are many different ways to do a community assessment and each agency must determine how best to accomplish the assessment. Ms. Fleming stated she has seen a CRM put into place without an assessment and the systems are struggling to return the results expected. Mr. Deshuk asked if the readiness assessment is something typically a community would hire a

consultant to perform. Ms. Fleming stated that it depends on the level of assessment, but the consultants are there to help when needed.

Chair Morris asked if the “as is” scenario was in priority order. Ms. Fleming stated the list was roughly in priority, but governance and processes and operations could be swapped. Ms. Fleming stated the culture of the organization is important, if people are bought into 3-1-1 and CRM they will make it a success.

Patrick McDermott asked Ms. Fleming if she knew of any 3-1-1 systems with an extensive amount of municipalities. Mr. McDermott noted that examples given in presentations seem to be led by a single large municipality. Ms. Fleming stated that in many respects the 3-1-1 committee is breaking into new territory. Ms. Fleming noted that 13 counties in North Carolina had considered attempting 3-1-1, but due to economic reasons they decided not to pursue 3-1-1. Ms. Fleming noted there are city-county 3-1-1 systems such as San Francisco, Denver, and Miami-Dade, but those are not truly regional systems. Chair Morris noted that an example is Evanston, a city just north of Chicago. Chair Morris stated that both Evanston and Chicago have 3-1-1 systems based on area codes. Chair Morris noted that governance is not an issue since the geography provides a boundary and she hopes the TAG committee will help with the geography of the MAG region. Ms. Fleming stated that Washington, D.C. is an area the 3-1-1 committee should make contact with due to proximity with other 3-1-1 systems in Maryland. Ms. Fleming noted that the 3-1-1 systems in Maryland are all separate 3-1-1 systems. Chair Morris noted that there is no group out there as diverse, with three area codes, and big as ours, with 28 jurisdictions, trying to implement 3-1-1.

Brent Stockwell stated that something that would be helpful in making a recommendation is a decision making matrix. Mr. Stockwell stated there are two perspectives to think about, the citizen and the government. Mr. Stockwell noted if there were three columns; status-quo, centralized, and decentralized, then from each perspective the 3-1-1 committee could determine what is the problem we are trying to solve. Mr. Stockwell continued that once the problem was identified, then the 3-1-1 committee could determine how to solve it and how the government interactions would work with each scenario. Mr. Stockwell stated that the information is an important piece when updating MAG committees throughout the process. Mr. Stockwell noted that choosing a model is about trying to solve a problem, and it is still unclear what the exact problem is that the 3-1-1 committee is trying to solve. Mr. Stockwell stated that once the problem is clear a model can be chosen and a business plan would form out of that model. Mr. Stockwell stated that if one model is chosen over another, the 3-1-1 committee would know exactly what they are foregoing in choosing that option. Chair Morris suggested the five models be on the wall at the next meeting with Mr. Stockwell’s categorizing of them above the models. Mr. Stockwell stated he would sketch the matrix and get it to Audrey Skidmore to be able to populate the pros and cons of each model. Chair Morris noted that it would be good if at the next meeting if each member could state their challenges and what a 3-1-1 system would do for their community. Chair Morris noted the group should try to state the top three reasons for needing a regional system. Ms. Fleming stated that each member should also look at what opportunities a 3-1-1 system could provide for their community.

Chair Morris stated is the goal to give a status update to the Management Committee meeting in April, which gives the committee two more meetings. Chair Morris also noted that the input from the TAG committee will be presented at the February 28th meeting, making it an important meeting to attend.

7. Future Agenda Items

Chair Morris indicated that the 3-1-1 Models Evaluation Matrix would be brought forward at the next meeting. Brent Stockwell noted another advantage of the matrix would be to calculate some preliminary costs. Mr. Stockwell noted that while a model may be doable, but the communities may not be willing to make the investment in that model. Shelly Hearn noted that a staging type of model was possible, to allow participation at different levels.

Adjournment

Chair Morris adjourned the meeting.

		CENTRALIZED			DECENTRALIZED	
		Option 1: IVR or Switchboard	Option 2: Regional Call Center	Option 3: 2-1-1/3-1-1 Combination/Cooperation	Option 4: Status Quo	Option 5: Go It Alone
Citizen Experience	Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single, easy to remember phone number to connect to government from anywhere Unified directory experience from anywhere in the County Direct connection to a person is possible in switchboard scenario 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single, easy to remember phone number to connect to government from anywhere Unified call experience from anywhere in the County Appropriate agency accurately identified by operator Direct connection to a person is possible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single, easy to remember phone number to connect to government from anywhere Unified call experience from anywhere in the County Seamless integration with 2-1-1 Direct connection to a person is possible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Established and published phone numbers Direct connection to a person is possible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single, easy to remember phone number to connect to government in participating jurisdictions
	Cons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Without a human operator, may have trouble identifying the appropriate agency Potential for an extra step in arriving at the appropriate destination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Numerous phone numbers can make locating the correct department or person challenging Phone number familiarity may be limited to home community May receive calls unrelated to agency services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to be aware of 10-digit numbers to access an agency from outside its borders Citizen confusion about where 3-1-1 is supported
Government Perspective	Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimal upfront investment Can grow a call center as needed Increased citizen access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential cost savings as informational questions are siphoned off by the call center Increased citizen access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential cost savings as informational questions are siphoned off by the call center Increased citizen access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No additional investment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete agency control of when and how the system becomes active
	Cons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased call volume before supporting member agency processes and infrastructure in place Differences in call handling standards between agencies could cause public dissatisfaction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agencies must monitor and update the knowledge base regularly Increased upfront costs Loss of 'identity' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agencies must monitor and update the knowledge base regularly Increased upfront costs Loss of 'identity' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher call times and lost productivity as citizens are directed to the correct location 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No unified citizen experience Citizens in boarder areas may not be directed to the appropriate call center