

April 17, 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, April 24, 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 March 27, 2012 Meeting Minutes

4. Agency Call Center Update

Diane Goke from City of Glendale 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. Discussion of Management Committee Input

The group will discuss the input provided by the Management Committee at their April meeting.

6. Working Session

The group will identify steps to meet the requirements of the Management Committee.

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 March 27, 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
March 27, 2012
MAG Offices, Ironwood Room
302 N. 1st Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

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

* 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 10:30 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 February 28, 2012 minutes. Shelley Hearn moved for the approval of the minutes with Pat Timlin seconding the motion. The February 28, 2012 minutes were approved unanimously.

4. Montgomery County 3-1-1 Overview

Joann Butler, former MC311/CRM Director for Montgomery County, Maryland, provided a presentation on Montgomery County's experience with 3-1-1. Ms. Butler stated there are four types of calls to 3-1-1: information requests, referrals, service requests, and complaints, compliments, and comments. Ms. Butler noted that 70-80% of total calls are information requests and referrals. Ms. Butler stated that the goal of 3-1-1 in Montgomery County Accountability, Responsiveness, and Efficiency, referred to as the A.R.E. model. Ms. Butler stated the objectives of 3-1-1 were to establish a call center, provide tools to service departments to ensure timely and satisfactory responses, provide management with information and data to assist in program and budget decisions, provide self service channels, and integrate with Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) systems and statistical operations. Mr. Butler noted that Montgomery used a customer centric model for 3-1-1 and ensured results-based outcomes of the A.R.E. model. Ms. Butler also discussed some technologies used in the Montgomery County 3-1-1 system.

Patrick McDermott asked if the 3-1-1 system was only for Montgomery County or if the two municipalities in Montgomery County were participating. Ms. Butler stated that the implementation was phased and the municipalities due to budget constraints decided to wait until phase three. Mr. McDermott asked during Ms. Butler's research what were the top implementation of 3-1-1 she had seen. Ms. Butler stated that cross-jurisdictional 3-1-1 systems that she had seen that were good included Miami-Dade, Chicago, Baltimore, and New York. Mr. McDermott asked what percent of requests were phone versus email versus walk-in. Ms. Butler stated that email is inefficient as a communication channel and it was never more than 15%.

Janeen Gaskins asked what is the annual cost and how was each entity's proportionate share calculated. Ms. Butler stated the project is capitolally funded currently but a fee for service model may be implemented in the future. Ms. Butler noted the annual cost of the call center is just under \$4 million per year and cost around \$8 million per year to implement over two years. Ms. Gaskins asked how will technology affect the future of 3-1-1 systems. Ms. Butler stated it already has with the open technologies, but the problem that is arising is how to integrate the technology with existing systems. Ms. Gaskins asked about the percentage of people that call 3-1-1 versus using web portals. Ms. Butler stated that about 20% of all service requests now come in through the web portal. Ms. Butler stated that Montgomery County was not using Interactive Voice Response (IVR) because they realized that people want a live voice, and the mandate is that the caller will have a live voice within 20 seconds of calling.

David Stevens asked the monthly call volume for 40 full time employees (FTEs). Ms. Butler stated that the volume peaks at about 3,000. Mr. Stevens asked if call volume has increased over recent years or if it has stayed steady. Ms. Butler stated since people are being pushed to the web portal Montgomery County is not seeing an increase in call volume, but an increase in contacts. Mr. Stevens asked if Montgomery County has surveyed citizens to get a reaction to the implementation

of 3-1-1. Ms. Butler stated that citizens were surveyed every quarter and there has been a positive response to it. Ms. Butler stated that 3-1-1 is not a panacea for poor service delivery, it is a triage for customer phone intake. Ms. Butler stated without performance management and management of back-end processes service delivery will still impact the overall customer service satisfaction.

Shelley Hearn asked if the two years for implementation included all research and getting all departments in Montgomery County on board or if there was more involved. Ms. Butler stated that it took one year for business planning and system design, six months to build the system, and six months to train and phase in departments to get to the soft launch. Ms. Hearn asked if that time line included the bid process for the project. Ms. Butler stated that Montgomery County had just finished a two-year ERP Request for Proposal process and decided on Oracle before the beginning of the project. Ms. Hearn also asked if Montgomery County has decided on a mobile app and, if so, how successful is the deployment. Ms. Butler stated that process has not been done yet, and the only concern is managing the app once it is deployed.

Chair Morris asked if the municipalities that are being phased in will have staff in the Montgomery County 3-1-1 call center. Ms. Butler stated that most likely it will be a fee for service and it is not expected staff from the municipality will work in the call center.

5. Agency Call Center Update

Chair Morris provided an update on the City of Phoenix efforts in determining their internal call handling as it relates to 3-1-1. Chair Morris stated that Phoenix is decentralized in their service and information. Chair Morris stated that employees are given tools on their desktop including an internal knowledge base. Chair Morris provided an overview of what the web-portal looks like for the City of Phoenix. Chair Morris stated there are almost 800 numbers for the City of Phoenix in the blue pages of the phone book. Chair Morris stated that Phoenix provides a contact list of around 190 phone numbers in the water bill for customers. Chair Morris discussed the number of calls Phoenix receives a year and how many are non-police and non-emergency as well as the number of operators needed to handle the calls. Chair Morris stated that 90% of calls go to 12 phone numbers in 11 departments.

6. Discussion of Management Committee Update

Audrey Skidmore stated that the last meeting it was stated that the group would like to review the documentation being presented to Management Committee in April. Ms. Skidmore stated the documentation includes a summary of what was learned about 3-1-1 and questions on which the committee needs guidance. Ms. Skidmore stated the meeting of the Management Committee is on April 11, 2012.

Chair Morris stated that the key question is are the Cities and County still interested in pursuing a regional 3-1-1 system. Chair Morris stated the Management Committee agenda item was for information and discussion and the members should inform their management staff about 3-1-1 to ensure an adequate discussion.

Mr. Deshuk stated that model number one is not a 3-1-1 implementation, model two is a 3-1-1 implementation, three is a combination of 3-1-1 and 2-1-1, and model four and five are do nothing.

Mr. Deshuk noted there is not a yes or no answer, there are different models. Mr. Deshuk stated that model number one is not a 3-1-1 system, it is simply using an IVR to redirect calls. Mr. Deshuk stated that there is a mix-up of using 3-1-1 as a number and as a concept. Mr. Deshuk noted that Customer Relationship Management System (CRM) may be a better term to use in discussing 3-1-1. Mr. Deshuk stated that all members would be benefitted by having a CRM implemented for the citizens of the region, and model one does not solve that, model number two does.

Shelley Hearn commented that on the report it would be good to add a purpose statement as to why 3-1-1 was taken on. Ms. Hearn disagreed with the statement that number one is not a 3-1-1 system. Ms. Hearn stated that it allows members to join the system when they are ready and allows for an opt out clause. Ms. Hearn stated members can get a process or CRM in place, then join the regional 3-1-1 system.

David Stevens stated the report looks good and it is important to go back to the Management Committee to find out if the committee is on track to meet their expectations, and based on their input take the appropriate next steps.

Patrick McDermott stated that it is important to talk about money as well as customer service, and the Management Committee will understand the costs involved.

Brenda Buren stated that if we get to the do nothing point, this should not become a dead issue. Ms. Buren stated that in a couple years there may be a change in desire, need, or technology and it would merit conversation in the future even if the do nothing option is chosen now. Ms. Buren stated that even if do nothing is chosen the committee should not be saying they are done with the issue. Ms. Buren stated she would hate to see the end of the good discussion and movement forward just because it is chosen not to do a big regional solution at this point.

Mr. Deshuk stated that model one is a bad technical implementation. Mr. Deshuk stated that the IVR will not understand the caller a good portion of the time, leading the caller to have to key in an entry. Mr. Deshuk stated that the caller will have to choose from 31 options until they find the one they want. Mr. Deshuk noted that it is possible after the first IVR there could be a second level of IVR.

Chair Morris stated that the process will be a very long road for the City of Phoenix and phasing in will be a key issue. Chair Morris stated Phoenix wants to be a regional partner in the 3-1-1 system and keep working on the system, but it has to be a group that wants to work together to accomplish that.

Pat McDermott stated that he entered the 3-1-1 discussion against implementation, and that he has come full circle and is still against it but for different reasons. Mr. McDermott stated that the discussion has led where the 3-1-1 system needs to go and he is uncomfortable with any other jurisdiction or regional entity taking control of any of Chandler's customer service. Mr. McDermott stated that while maybe it is not right today, as CRMs evolve over time it may change.

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 (Decentralized IVR), 4 for model two (Regional

Call Center), 1 for model three (Co-Location with 2-1-1 Call Center), 5 for model four (Do Nothing), and 1 for model five (Jurisdictional Control).

Some of the attendees indicated that they would follow-up with their preferences after the meeting.

7. Future Agenda Items

No future agenda items were discussed.

Note: After post-meeting follow-up. The straw poll results for the 14 agencies in attendance were as follows.

- Model #1: 12
- Model #2: 4
- Model #3: 3
- Model #4: 8
- Model #5: 1