

March 20, 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, March 27, 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 February 28, 2012 Meeting Minutes

4. Montgomery County 3-1-1 Overview

Joann Butler, former MC311/CRM Director for Montgomery County, Maryland, will provide information on Montgomery County's experience with 3-1-1.

5. Agency Call Center Update

Jane Morris from City of Phoenix and Diane Goke from City of Glendale will provide updates on their respective cities' 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.

6. Discussion of Management Committee Update

The group will discuss the update to be provided to the April Management Committee meeting.

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 February 28, 2012 meeting.

4. For information and discussion.

5. For information and discussion.

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
February 28th, 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
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 10:33 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 January 31, 2012 Minutes

Chair Morris asked the committee for any comments on the January 31, 2012 minutes. Pat Timlin moved for the approval of the minutes with David Stevens seconding the motion. The January 31, 2012 minutes were approved unanimously.

4. Agency Call Center Update

Chair Morris noted that she has recently toured three of eight City of Phoenix call centers as well as the RPTA call center. Chair Morris noted that she called 5-1-1 and used the Interactive Voice Response (IVR) option to connect to RPTA call center. Chair Morris noted that Scott Wisner from RPTA has offered tours of the call center to committee members that were interested.

Alex Deshuk provided an update on efforts at the City of Mesa. Mr. Deshuk stated that the City of Mesa does not currently have a call center and the philosophy to date has been to leave the expertise in the departments. Mr. Deshuk noted that part of the reason not to front-end or consolidate is budgetary and part is philosophical in where City of Mesa thinks call centers are going. Mr. Deshuk noted that presentations from ICMA show the future is not having to call anybody, it is using tools already out there in a cost-effective manner. Mr. Deshuk stated the most cost effective way to interact with citizens is through the Internet or other non person-to-person contact. Mr. Deshuk noted the City of Mesa is investing time and effort into researching how to improve their customer contacts without focusing on call centers. Mr. Deshuk noted that SeeClickFix had advertised through azcentral.com online that City of Mesa was part of their network and noted that this had happened to other major cities as well. Mr. Deshuk noted that through almost guerrilla marketing it forced Mesa to look at their products. Mr. Deshuk noted there is another opportunity called Public Stuff that City of Mesa is evaluating. Mr. Deshuk noted that Public Stuff is a company that has a call center application for mobile devices, smart phones, and web-based devices that can interface into whatever work order system you may have, or you can use the application as a rudimentary work order system if you don't have one. Mr. Deshuk noted Public Stuff does this for free for government based on an advertising model. Mr. Deshuk noted City of Mesa is pursuing methods to be more cost effective while improving outreach to citizens. Mr. Deshuk stated that with these options the citizen can control the interaction and how much they want to interact with the City and via which method, whether it be text message, email, or smart phone application. Mr. Deshuk noted that City of Mesa does not believe people are going away, that there will always be something citizens will need to call and talk about, but the best way to get the most for the limited funds right now is to get something for free that will give the most cost effective interaction for service delivery with citizens. Mr. Deshuk noted that many cities, including Mesa, are already dealing with graffiti by picking up the graffiti app from GPCI. Mr. Deshuk noted that the applications were hosted and very little assistance from Information Technology departments is needed. Patrick McDermott asked if Mesa was still inundated by the SeeClickFix application through the Arizona Republic. Mr. Deshuk stated the City of Mesa Manager's Office contacted them and had it taken off to avoid giving citizens the false impression that anything was being done with SeeClickFix.

5. 3-1-1 Models Technical Ratings

Audrey Skidmore gave a presentation of the technical ratings for the 3-1-1 models. Ms. Skidmore stated the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee had tasked the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) with

providing a technical and cost rating for the 3-1-1 models. Ms. Skidmore noted TAG created a task force consisting of subject matter experts who had several meetings, did research on the matter, and provided their recommendations to TAG. Ms. Skidmore continued that at the TAG meeting on February 23, 2012, TAG made minor adjustment to their findings and approved the findings unanimously. Ms. Skidmore presented the assumptions taken in the research and the findings approved by TAG.

Alex Deshuk asked if push back from telephone carriers about model number five was something they do not want to do or something they are required to do and do not want to do. Ms. Skidmore stated it is something they do not want to do and are not required to do without additional charge, and in some cases are not required to do. Mr. Deshuk stated that some tariffs require the phone carriers to do it. Ms. Skidmore stated that looking at the tariff they are not required to do it at a low level of geography, but they are allowed to recoup costs for higher levels. Ms. Skidmore stated that requirements for 3-1-1 are not the same as 9-1-1 in this area. Ms. Skidmore stated there were legal question about model number five that the group could not answer and would need to seek legal advice should the 3-1-1 business committee choose that option. Ms. Skidmore stated the task force looked at the called out items in the tariff such as zip code, area code, and prefix. Ms. Skidmore stated zip codes cross boundaries throughout the region and therefore is not a useful tool, area codes similarly do not work, and prefixes do not work with mobility of phone numbers. Mr. Deshuk stated he does not agree with classifying the feasibility of model five as low. Mr. Deshuk stated the accuracy would improve depending on the amount of money spent on the system, and that some carriers would be more accurate than others.

Chair Morris stated that option 5a and 5b are the black and white of 5a just looking at central offices, and 5b looking at a one hundred percent 9-1-1 option. Chair Morris noted there are most likely gradations between the two options and these options were given to provide clarity to the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee. Chair Morris continued that getting into the details of between the options would be done if the committee chooses to move ahead with model five.

Ms. Skidmore stated that four TAG members, Pat Timlin, David Stevens, Dee Hathaway, and Michael Ciccarone, serve on the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee and asked if they would like to comment on the presentation. Pat Timlin stated that he would like to thank the task force that came up with the options and put together the matrix for the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee.

Brent Stockwell stated that the dollar sign numbering was confusing due to a different denominator being used for each additional dollar sign and that \$200,000 could be used for each dollar sign. Mr. Stockwell also noted he was not sure anything could be done for under \$200,000 with the number of jurisdictions involved.

Shelley Hearn asked what was factored into the ongoing costs in the matrix for the IVR solution. Ms. Skidmore stated for the IVR, the cost is for running the IVR and phone lines, but not the nominal charge for anything routed through a Century-Link central office. Ms. Hearn stated there is no staff cost provided and was wondering why the ongoing costs were \$200,000 per year. Ms. Skidmore stated for the IVR there is no staffing. Mr Deshuk stated that in the other considerations on the IVR solution there is a “where do operator calls go”, so there is an operator at some point. Ms. Skidmore stated that is an issue that would have to be considered if the group decides to put

an operator at an agency and share costs, but the assumption was not made in the technical matrix. Mr. Deshuk stated that an IVR should have an operator out option and that should be a cost. Ms. Skidmore stated the assumption was not made, but that cost could be added depending on direction from the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee.

Chair Morris stated the direction that she has given to Audrey Skidmore is until we get a sense of where the group is going, that we need clarity on the options. Chair Morris noted that it would be appropriate for the group by the end of the meeting to decide if the group is ready to give an update to the Management Committee on April 11th, 2012. Chair Morris noted that Ms. Hearn and Mr. Deshuk bring up good questions about what is in each of the numbers in the matrix. Chair Morris also noted that she believes the IVR should have an operator out option. Chair Morris stated the group still has not found a similar 3-1-1 system deployed that is similar to the one being proposed.

Patrick McDermott stated that Brent Stockwell made a good comment at the last meeting of what are we trying to solve with the 3-1-1 system. Mr. McDermott stated that after looking at the materials provided for the meeting that he is still not convinced the group is solving a problem. Mr. McDermott stated that the issue is how does the city respond to the 3-1-1, because if they do not respond properly or the public does not get through easily it does not matter. Mr. McDermott stated the information provided was good to know, but that more clarity on the problem is required. Chair Morris responded that is a critical discussion and would be discussed further in the next agenda item.

David Stevens asked if there was any consensus among the technical task force or TAG for feasibility of the options presented. Ms. Skidmore stated that the groups gave a feasibility rating for each model, with IVR being the easiest to implement and the group was skeptical of option five and making it work with the configuration of the central offices and the regional geography.

Brent Stockwell stated the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee is very close to being ready to pass information to MAG Management Committee and the information should be passed to the Management Committee to get further direction.

Melanie Dykstra asked if the cost was per agency or a regional cost. Ms. Skidmore stated that it was a regional cost.

Carmen Martinez stated that she agreed with Patrick McDermott that the committee needs to identify if there is a problem, and can the group justify spending millions of dollars on a system that may not need to be established. Ms. Martinez noted there are good reasons to establish an IVR to connect citizens to the agency they need, but any other regional option would be complicated to implement.

Alex Deshuk noted that taking into account the comments about regionalization of the 3-1-1 system there are unintended consequences of some things being discussed such as the opt-out philosophy. Mr. Deshuk stated the opt-out creates a perception that an agency does not provide a service. Mr. Deshuk also noted that an IVR solution that routes calls sets up a false expectation that there will be a citizen relationship management system set up at each agency. Mr. Deshuk stated the handling of calls needs to be thought through end to end. Mr. Deshuk noted that if there was a funding source for a regional call center the group could go there.

6. 3-1-1 Models Evaluation Matrix

Chair Morris stated the Management Committee gave the committee the direction to look at a regional 3-1-1 system. Chair Morris noted the question to be solved is how does each committee member define to their management team what problem 3-1-1 will solve.

Brent Stockwell stated the challenge with the problem is that you do not know what you do not know. Mr. Stockwell noted that if people do not call because they do not know who to call, agencies will never know there was a problem. Mr. Stockwell stated that as a citizen of the region if he sees a problem but does not know who to contact, he is not going to contact them. Mr. Stockwell noted the problem is hard to get a handle on and that it is similarly difficult to get a handle on who will take the lead to solve the problem. Mr. Stockwell noted he appreciated Maricopa County's interest in the issue, but since the county is highly urbanized if the County took the lead on the call center there would be many issues coming the County's way that they have no direct involvement in resolving. Mr. Stockwell asked David Stevens why the County would want to expend a large amount of money on the behalf of the cities. Mr. Stockwell stated that in a regional co-operational model it would fall to MAG to take the lead to do something on behalf of all the member agencies. Mr. Stockwell noted that from a business perspective, such as electrical or mechanics, customers must find the correct number to call. Mr. Stockwell stated the development of the matrices will help define the problems and the pros and cons of the solutions may be as well as the cost ranges. Mr. Stockwell noted he met with the City of Tempe manager and fully understands and agree with the customer service orientation perspective of Tempe's stance, but when it comes down to how much money may have to be spent, and still have the possibility of responsiveness on the back end, it could frustrate citizens. Mr. Stockwell noted that everyone at the committee wants to provide good customer responsiveness, but the question is at what cost and how much would people be willing to spend to improve this area.

Diane Goke commented that she has been struggling with the question of what problem are we trying to solve. Ms. Goke also noted that the reason we are having problems finding another regional call center is due to them having the same issues we are in that each agency has its' own issues and it would be hard to have a call center that answered all the differing types of services and the different ways of doing things.

Shelley Hearn stated that the group should be looking at this as are we trying to solve a problem, or are we trying to create an opportunity for our public. Ms. Hearn stated the like Mr. Stockwell said citizens do not know how to report an issue so they do not call it in. Ms. Hearn stated she believes it is an opportunity that the group would be remiss if they do not explore it further because it can take customer service to a much higher level. Ms. Hearn stated she agree with Ms. Goke that a centralized regional approach does not make sense because all agencies have different processes within the communities. Ms. Hearn stated that the system can always be built upon, and it is an opportunity for agencies to provide a higher level of service.

Paul Luizzi stated in a survey to citizens a couple years ago, the citizens said the customer service provided to them was lacking. Mr. Luizzi stated the approach by the City of Goodyear was to retrain their customer service staff and there was a dramatic rise in satisfaction this year. Mr. Luizzi stated he agrees with Ms. Hearn that there is an opportunity to provide a higher level of

customer service, and that more research should be done with respect to the technological avenues available.

David Stevens stated that Maricopa County's perspective is how can we connect citizens to government in a simple way. Mr. Stevens noted that the idea is to create a customer service scenario for the citizens that is simple and easy and ultimately brings business realization. Mr. Stevens stated the initial vision was not a grand regional contact center per se, but the idea of coming into the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee was to see what options were available. Mr. Stevens stated that Maricopa County's perspective initially was an IVR. Mr. Stevens noted that through the committee it has been learned that the volume of calls will be significantly greater, and the unknown cost right now is how will that increased volume affect each agency. Mr. Stevens noted that the County's position is still is there an easier way to connect citizens to government, is there a way to move into a regional system that makes sense for everybody, and is there a crawl-walk-run approach to a regional 3-1-1 system. Mr. Stevens noted it is not Maricopa County's intention to create a new level of government or new level of burden, but rather to come together collaboratively with other agencies to figure out if there is something that can be provided. Mr. Stevens noted it is difficult to articulate what is the problem, but agreed with Ms. Hearn it is more about providing an opportunity to citizens to connect to government through a simplified mode.

Pat Timlin stated he agreed with the opportunity basis of the discussion because it is an opportunity to connect with citizens in the agency's jurisdictions. Mr. Timlin stated if you want to define a problem, the problem could be there is a communication issue with the residents. Mr. Timlin noted that the increase of calls when 3-1-1 is turned on shows improved communication with residents. Mr. Timlin noted with commuters traveling east-west or north-south to work will still only have to remember one number and not which jurisdiction they are in. Mr. Timlin noted that he agreed with Mr. Deshuk that texting, email, and social media need to be looked at in each jurisdiction.

Brent Stockwell noted that a con on the model evaluation matrix is an area all agencies probably need to improve as governments; agencies must update and monitor the knowledge base. Mr. Stockwell noted if there is no knowledge base each agency should create one. Mr. Stockwell noted that thinking about the 3-1-1 system if someone were to open a regional call center out of the goodness of their heart, Scottsdale would be supportive of that. Mr. Stockwell noted when Scottsdale started their call center they obtained information, such as solid waste, for surrounding communities such as Paradise Valley. Mr. Stockwell stated that knowing your business and knowledge transfer are the key, and the better agencies get at solving the problems with knowledge transfer the better things will get for our customers.

Audrey Skidmore gave an overview of the draft 3-1-1 model evaluation matrix.

Chair Morris noted that each member needs to go back to their management team and conveying their opinions and the groups opinion. Chair Morris noted the discussion is important for when the 3-1-1 Committee gives an informational review to the Management Committee each manager needs to have a sense of 3-1-1 so a dialogue can happen.

Patrick McDermott asked no matter what model was selected besides status quo, does the agency still need to have a centralized place where the calls can go, or is there a level of sophistication that

can direct the calls to particular division in the agency. Ms. Skidmore stated to an extent that is true, in the IVR there is the ability to add layers to the IVR, but it could increase the time a person is on a line and increase the amount of lines needed. Ms. Skidmore stated that ultimately the agencies have to be able to accept the calls and do something with them. Ms. Skidmore stated that with a regional call center it depends on if the call center handle only information calls or if they handle service requests as well, but it could reduce call volume based on the system.

Shelley Hearn offered to show the system Tempe is using and how it operates to any of the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee members. Ms. Hearn noted it is critical that each member agency decide how they are going to handle calls, especially with the opt-out clause. Ms. Hearn stated she does not believe agencies necessarily need a call center. Ms. Hearn noted that Tempe is not only rolling out a ten digit number, but a mobile app that will work directly with Tempe's work order system. Ms. Hearn stated that different modes will be advertised at the same time so citizens can determine what method they would like to use to communicate with Tempe. Ms. Hearn stated if an option is picked, each community will have to decide how and if that option will be rolled out to their community. Ms. Hearn stated that Maricopa County wants to use the number and Tempe wants to use the number. Ms. Hearn noted that Tempe could test an option selected and gather data to assist other agencies in providing details such as how much call volume increased and creating best practices.

Chair Morris thanked Ms. Hearn for the offer to let members of the committee tour Tempe's facilities. Chair Morris asked David Stevens if Maricopa County was ready to roll out 3-1-1 today. Mr. Stevens stated the call center is in place, but some discussion and prep work would need to happen.

Alex Deshuk noted the disparity in the public's perception of a potential regional call center. Mr. Deshuk noted that with 28 cities, Native American communities, and school districts which are not included in this model, there are overlapping issues. Mr. Deshuk noted that if any decentralized model is chosen, even an IVR which Mr. Deshuk noted he considers decentralized, we lose the opportunity of not duplicating the back end. Mr. Deshuk noted that is where the millions of dollars are in each member agency, building their own call center because it requires people software, work order systems, and phone systems. Mr. Deshuk stated that if the math was really done and talked about, the opportunity costs are in centralizing the back end costs. Mr. Deshuk noted that Mesa does not have a CRM solution in place due to the large investment cost in software. Mr. Deshuk noted a centralized option is an opportunity to have a real impact on not spending money by centralizing the cost.

Chair Morris noted that Mr. Deshuk had a good point about the IVR system is not truly a centralized option. Chair Morris noted it was centralizing one number but the management of the calls would be decentralized and asked the matrix be updated to reflect that.

Brent Stockwell noted that another item that should be added to the Matrix is a marketing piece. Mr. Stockwell noted that a regional call center with 3-1-1 number is great if people can remember it exists. Mr. Stockwell pointed out that 9-1-1 was so successful because it was heavily marketed over a long period of time.

Chair Morris stated her plan was to bring an information and discussion item to the Management Committee in April. Alex Deshuk moved to bring the five options to the Management Committee. The motion failed with no second from the committee. Ms. Hearn asked if the motion meant the committee was still in favor of all five options, or if the committee wanted to narrow down the selections. Chair Morris stated that staff would be directed to put a report together in a format Management Committee is used to in order to provide information to the Management Committee in April. Chair Morris noted the report would be presented to the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee in March before going to Management Committee in April. Chair Morris stated that as a committee, and backed up by staff, the information discussed so far should be put into document format with possible attachments to create a dialogue with the Management Committee.

7. Future Agenda Items

Diane Goke from the City of Glendale will provide a presentation to discuss what they have determined about their internal call handling as it relates to 3-1-1.

Chair Morris stated that City of Phoenix will be giving a presentation to discuss what they have determined about their internal call handling as it relates to 3-1-1.

The 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee has requested that a presenter from Montgomery County, Maryland give a presentation on their 3-1-1 system.