

June 20, 2012

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

FROM: David Stevens, Maricopa County, Chair

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

Tuesday, June 26, 2012, 10:30 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.  
MAG Office, Suite 200 - Ironwood Room  
302 North 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, Phoenix

A meeting of the MAG 3-I-I 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-I-I 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-I-I 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 April 24, 2012 Meeting Minutes

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

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

The group will discuss the Draft IVR Business Requirements created by the working team consisting of representatives from City of Mesa, City of Phoenix, City of Tempe and Maricopa County.

#### 6. Working Session

The group will discuss governance issues including levels of participation, cost allocation, and term of agreement.

#### 7. 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.

#### 8. 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 April 24, 2012 meeting.

4. For information and discussion.

5. For information, discussion and possible action.

6. For information, discussion and possible actions.

7. For information and discussion.

8. For information and discussion.

# Agenda Item #3

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
3-1-1 Business Plan Committee  
April 24, 2012  
MAG Offices, Ironwood Room  
302 N. 1<sup>st</sup> 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 Ciccarone, Town of Fountain Hills  | Patrick McDermott, City of Chandler                           |
| # Alex Deshuk, City of Mesa                  | * Gary Neiss, Town of Carefree                                |
| # Melanie Dykstra, Town of Gilbert           | # John Imig for Vicky Scott, City of Peoria Police Department |
| # Janeen K Gaskins, City of Surprise         | 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 10:30 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 March 27, 2012 Minutes

Chair Morris asked the committee for any comments on the March 27, 2012 minutes. Shelley Hearn, City of Tempe, moved for the approval of the minutes with Paul Luizzi, City of Goodyear, seconding the motion. The March 27, 2012 minutes were approved unanimously.

4. Agency Center Update

Diane Goke from the City of Glendale provided an overview of Glendale's call center. She gave details on the switchboard that resides in the finance department that answers calls to the city's main number and directs them to the appropriate location. Ms. Goke also stated that there is also a call center that handles customer utility and sales tax questions and is staffed by ten employees from 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. weekdays. This center is supplemented by both Interactive Voice Response (IVR) and Interactive Web Response (IWR) systems. The city also has a Transportation Call Center. Ms. Goke further added that the city purchased a new Cisco phone system with the eventual goal of moving to a call center approach on the main line which would answer caller questions directly.

Patrick McDermott from the City of Chandler asked how Glendale tracks calls. Ms. Goke stated that calls are tracked using the new Cisco system which provides reports on a variety of call metrics. Mr. McDermott clarified that he was interested in knowing if the calls and resulting requests for service were tracked. Ms. Goke stated that service request tracking is performed outside the phone system by the Harris Northstar system and is not directly tied to calls. Chair Morris requested clarification on the time line for the transition from switchboard to call center. Ms. Goke indicated that the transition was an eventual goal.

5. Discussion of Management Committee Input

Audrey Skidmore of the Maricopa Association of Governments provided an update of the presentation made to the MAG Management Committee and the resulting discussion. She reminded members that the MAG Management Committee was provided with the matrices previously developed by both the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee and Technology Advisory Group as well as information on the straw polls taken to date.

Ms. Skidmore summarized the MAG Management Committee input. The direction from the committee was to focus on model number one, the IVR. The 3-1-1 Business Plan committee is to focus on providing tighter costing, cost sharing recommendations, and determine how to proceed on operator calls. Ms. Skidmore also noted the continuing concern around messaging for non-participating members. She then invited comment from the nine committee representatives who had attended the meeting. Chair Morris clarified that no action was taken by the Management committee because the item was posted for input. David Stevens of Maricopa County concurred with the report.

6. Working Session

Chair Morris stated that there had been some initial brain storming on next steps and that a document was available online and at the committee members' places that summarized the thoughts to date. Audrey Skidmore reiterated that the list was a straw man and subject to change. She then started through the items on the list at Chair Morris' request.

Chair Morris started the discussion of lead agency by indicating that she felt MAG was well suited to that role. Janeen Gaskin, City of Surprise, and Shelley Hearn, City of Tempe, concurred with this assessment. Alex Deshuk, City of Mesa, indicated that creating a set of business requirements would help define the best lead agency. Brent Stockwell, City of Scottsdale, suggested that the group consider whether an agency with a call center capable of handling operator calls (i.e., Maricopa County) might be preferable in that role so that MAG would not be processing all of the operator calls. Chair Morris clarified that she saw the lead agency as a governance role and that she was making the assumption that the technology would allow the appropriate redirection of operator calls. Ms. Gaskin agreed that developing requirements was a logical next step and reiterated her support for a neutral lead agency like MAG.

Chair Morris requested that model one be clarified for the group. Ms. Skidmore explained that model one consisted of an IVR. Callers would be asked to identify the desired agency verbally and then be transferred. Touch tone options would be available for those who could not complete a verbal selection. Chair Morris clarified that participation would be voluntary and that calls would be transferred to the agency and the agency would then determine how to handle the calls. Mr. Deshuk reiterated that an operator option also must be available and that the cost of handling operator calls must be taken into consideration. Ms. Skidmore added that it would be ineffective for MAG to handle 3-1-1 operator calls as MAG does not currently have a call center. Chair Morris stated that a center currently handling calls would be a better option for operator calls.

Chair Morris summarized additional points regarding governance, marketing and interagency agreements. She stated that she assumed Maricopa County would require some sort of agreement. David Stevens, Maricopa County, indicated that this would make sense. Paul Luizzi, City of Goodyear, suggested that the agreement used for fire dispatch might serve as a template.

Ms. Goke asked if the group is considering purchasing a new system or using an existing system. Ms. Skidmore stated that unless another agency was going to host the system, a hosted solution would likely be the most cost effective. Mr. Deshuk suggested the group write a narrative on the systems capabilities to distribute to the team for reference. Chair Morris suggested creating a subgroup to create the document. Mr. Stevens and Mr. Deshuk stated that they would be interested in being involved.

Ms. Skidmore listed her action items for clarification. The first item was to work with Mr. Deshuk, Ms. Hearn and a representative assigned by Mr. Stevens to work on a narrative. Additionally, Mr. Luizzi will send Ms. Skidmore the fire agreement, Ms. Hearn will forward the communications plan and Ms. Skidmore will supply Ms. Hearn with a list of the groups email addresses to add to the roll out mail list. Ms. Skidmore stated that she would reach out to the 2-1-1 group to see if she can review their marketing plan.

## 7. Future Agenda Items

No future agenda items were discussed.

# Draft Business Requirements for IVR Solution

## 1. Purpose of Document

This document will summarize the business requirements for an IVR solution to handle calls to 311. It does not define any agency-level action taken regarding those calls.

## 2. Introduction

### 2.1. Project Background

On July 13, 2011, the Management Committee formed the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee and assigned additional tasks to the Technology Advisory Group to evaluate a potential Regional Implementation of the 3-1-1 phone number. The committees performed basic analysis on a number of models and provided the Management Committee with summaries of the relevant information on April 11, 2012. The Management Committee directed the committee to focus on doing a complete analysis including costs and proposed governance structures for a regional implementation based on automated call routing using Interactive Voice Response (IVR). In furtherance of this objective, the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee has developed this document to summarize the business requirements of such a system. This document will be provided to the Technology Advisory Group for the development of technical specifications and a preliminary cost estimate.

### 2.2. Experience Summary

A citizen calling 3-1-1 will experience the following through this system:

- Greeting and request to select language. This greeting should include the reminder to hang up and call 9-1-1 if this is an emergency.
- A request to speak the name of the agency with whom they wish to converse.
- A list of available agencies from which they may select via touch tone number if they are unable or unwilling to verbally identify the desired agency.
- Transfer to the appropriate agency, submenu or a recorded message.

### 2.3. Goals

The individual goals of the 3-1-1 routing solution are summarized below, but the overriding objective is citizen satisfaction.

- Efficient and accurate routing of calls – The primary concern is getting the public to the correct location as often as possible.
- Reliable service – The system need to be available and operate correctly for citizens to realize any value.
- Flexibility – The system needs to be able to respond to changing conditions and agency requirements.

## Draft Business Requirements for IVR Solution

- Accountability – The system needs to be able to provide reports to allow users to verify that performance targets are being met and to allow accurate accounting for potential cost sharing models.
- Expandability – The system needs to be able to expand to suit the needs of current and future potential partners.

### 2.4. Scope

These business requirements are intended to solely cover the routing and messaging associated with an IVR or equivalent system. The scope of these business requirements does not include individual agency call handling procedures or their associated mechanisms. The business rules are intended to provide flexibility for agencies to handle calls as they see fit and to provide messaging consistent with the desires of agencies that are not choosing to have calls routed through the system.

### 2.5. Stakeholders

- MAG Member Agencies
  - Participating – Participating agencies are directly concerned not only with the actual routing method and solution, but also with provisions for the termination of call routing if they chose to decline future participation.
  - Non-Participating - Nonparticipating agencies are directly concerned with establishing methods for appropriate communication of status to their citizens and with maintaining an avenue for potential future participation.
- Citizens – Citizens are concerned with getting to the correct agency as quickly as possible.

### 2.6. Users

- Administrators – Central administrators will need to be able make changes to the system as appropriate
- Agency Users – Agencies could potentially administer their own portion of the menu.
- Citizens – Citizens will access the system and have their calls routed.

### 2.7. Assumptions

Expected call volume can be assumed to be roughly analogous to similarly sized jurisdictions and should include 20% for growth.

3. Business Requirements

<b>Requirement</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Rationale</b>	<b>Priority</b>
Automatic Number Identification (ANI) information must be passed with call	Transferred calls should be accompanied by ANI information.	This information will help agencies handle calls more efficiently.	Required
Call Reporting	Administrators must be able to generate reports at the system, agency and menu option level detailing call disposition. Information must include: ANI, option selected, dropped calls, time between answer and transfer, disposition, operator calls, etc.	Administrators must be able to generate reports to show the effectiveness of the system and provide call volumes for potential cost allocations.	Required
Customizable Recorded Messages	Administrators must be able to change recorded messaging in real time to reflect changing requirements without causing system downtime.	In an emergency, it may be necessary to include additional information in the welcome message to handle an increased call volume or convey critical information.	Required
Flexible Operator Routing	Operator calls should be able to be routed to more than one agency using both a proportional and round robin method. The routing should also be able to be changed in real time.	Multiple agencies may act as operator and the calls may need to be proportionally allocated depending on the sizes of the agencies acting in this capacity.	Required
Flexible Routing	Administrators must be able to change the routing destination for any agency in real-time without causing system downtime.	Agencies may experience interruptions to their standard service delivery line or desire to change the routed location for their calls.	Required

Draft Business Requirements for IVR Solution

<b>Requirement</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Rationale</b>	<b>Priority</b>
High System Availability	The system should be available to answer and route calls 24 hours a day, seven days a week including holidays.	The public will expect the system to be available at all times.	Required
Multilingual Support	Requirement Description – Any system must be able to provide menus and recognize responses in a minimum of two languages (English and Spanish). Support for other languages may be desired at a future date.	There is a significant Spanish speaking population in the service area.	Required
System Sizing	The system must be able to handle expected call volumes without providing a busy signal.	Citizens will quickly become frustrated if the system cannot be reached.	Required
Tagged Operator Calls	Calls directed to the operator should carry information that lets the answering agency know the caller selected the operator option.	Agencies acting as operators need to know that the caller selected the operator option in order to provide an appropriate greeting, account for distribution of calls and gather routing information.	Required
Voice Routing	Users must be able to indicate their agency preference via voice in all supported languages with a significant level of accuracy.	Routing will be quicker and more efficient using voice response	Required
Ability to Vary Before and After Hours Timing by Agency	Administrators should be able to define schedules for different menu trees to switch between before and after hours routing and messaging.	Agencies have different business hours and holidays. The system should allow those to be defined for the different menu trees to reduce the administrative burden of manually handling agency schedules.	Preferred

Requirement	Description	Rationale	Priority
Before and After Hours Messaging	The system must be able to provide different messaging during and after business hours to accommodate the needs of agencies that have opted to provide different routing at these times. The change should happen without user interaction, but administrators should be able to override the setting.	Agencies may want to have the system provide different messaging after hours to accommodate non-emergency police and fire.	Preferred
Before and After Hours Routing Trees	The system must be able to route calls differently during and after business hours to accommodate the needs of agencies. The change should happen without user interaction, but administrators should be able to override the setting.	Agencies may want to have the system provide an additional layer of routing after hours to accommodate non-emergency police and fire.	Preferred
Delegated Management of Submenus	The system should support delegation of routing and messaging administration to the agency responsible for a given submenu.	Agencies will have more control over the dispensation of their calls.	Preferred
Dynamic Sizing	The call handling capacity of the system should be able to be dynamically increased and decreased.	Call volumes may significantly increase if there is a regional event. The system should be able to handle the relative increase in call volumes for these events.	Preferred
Multiple Level Routing	The system must be able to support multiple levels of menu options for agencies that desire them.	Some agencies may require a second level of menu to separate non-emergency police and fire from standard municipal business calls.	Preferred

4. Next Steps

The Technology Advisory Group will be provided with this document to create technical specifications and a cost estimate. The estimate should include capital cost, implementation cost, ongoing operational expenses, operator costs and projected MAG overhead.

# **MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review**

**DATE:**

June 20, 2012

**SUBJECT:**

Additional Materials on Governance and Marketing

**SUMMARY:**

At the April 24, 2012 meeting of the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee, members discussed possible models for governance and marketing. Alex Deshuk of City of Mesa agreed to provide information on the structure and agreements associated with the Topaz Regional Wireless Cooperative (TRWC) and Shelley Hearn of City of Tempe agreed to provide the communications plan for the City's 3-1-1 Rollout. All documents are available on the Maricopa Association of Governments web site at the location below under resources.

<http://www.azmag.gov/Events/Event.asp?CMSID=4081>

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

None.

**PROS & CONS:**

PROS: None at this time.

CONS: None at this time.

**TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

TECHNICAL: None at this time.

POLICY: None at this time.

**ACTION NEEDED:**

Information and discussion.

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

None.

**CONTACT PERSON:**

Audrey Skidmore, Information Technology Manager, (602) 254-6300.