

January 9, 2013

TO: Members of the MAG 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee

FROM: David Stevens, Maricopa County, Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA OF THE  
MAG 3-1-1 BUSINESS PLAN COMMITTEE

Tuesday, January 29, 2013, 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 3-1-1 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 November 27, 2012 Meeting Minutes

#### 4. 3-1-1 Direction and Governance Study Session

The group will discuss agency positions on a regional 3-1-1 system and determine next steps for addressing the level of interest identified. Questions to be considered include:

- Would your agency be willing to help define a regional 3-1-1 system that would serve those agencies willing to pilot the program and allow other cities to join in the future when ready?
- Would your agency be likely to participate at the start of such an implementation?
- Would your agency be likely to participate at some point in the future?
- Can a subgroup be formed to propose a governance and cost sharing framework for such an implementation and would you like to participate in that group?

#### 5. 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 November 27, 2012 meeting.

4. For information, discussion and possible action to create a subcommittee to create a preliminary governance and cost sharing framework.

5. For information and discussion.

# 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.

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.

# Agenda Item #4

## DRAFT 3-1-1 Usage Charges for Hosted Solution by Agency Based on Population Summary for MAG Region for July 1, 2012

Jurisdiction	Population (Maricopa)	Population (Pinal/Yavapai)	Total July 1, 2012 Population	Projected Call Volume	Cost per Year	Operator Costs *4	Percentage of Calls Via Century Link	CenturyLink Cost *5	Total Annual Usage Cost
Apache Junction *1	296	36,632	36,928	99.00	\$ 7.92	\$ 12.67	15%	\$ 0.02	\$ 20.61
Avondale	76,870		76,870	25,623.00	\$ 2,049.84	\$ 3,279.74	15%	\$ 4.61	\$ 5,334.19
Buckeye	54,102		54,102	18,034.00	\$ 1,442.72	\$ 2,308.35	15%	\$ 3.25	\$ 3,754.32
Carefree	3,388		3,388	1,129.00	\$ 90.32	\$ 144.51	15%	\$ 0.20	\$ 235.03
Cave Creek	5,110		5,110	1,703.00	\$ 136.24	\$ 217.98	15%	\$ 0.31	\$ 354.53
Chandler	241,214		241,214	80,405.00	\$ 6,432.40	\$ 10,291.84	15%	\$ 14.47	\$ 16,738.71
El Mirage	32,067		32,067	10,689.00	\$ 855.12	\$ 1,368.19	15%	\$ 1.92	\$ 2,225.23
Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation	976		976	325.00	\$ 26.00	\$ 41.60	15%	\$ 0.06	\$ 67.66
Fountain Hills	22,695		22,695	7,565.00	\$ 605.20	\$ 968.32	15%	\$ 1.36	\$ 1,574.88
Gila Bend	1,932		1,932	644.00	\$ 51.52	\$ 82.43	15%	\$ 0.12	\$ 134.07
Gila River Indian Community*2	3,010		3,010	1,003.00	\$ 80.24	\$ 128.38	15%	\$ 0.18	\$ 208.80
Gilbert	219,666		219,666	73,222.00	\$ 5,857.76	\$ 9,372.42	15%	\$ 13.18	\$ 15,243.36
Glendale	229,008		229,008	76,336.00	\$ 6,106.88	\$ 9,771.01	15%	\$ 13.74	\$ 15,891.63
Goodyear	69,018		69,018	23,006.00	\$ 1,840.48	\$ 2,944.77	15%	\$ 4.14	\$ 4,789.39
Guadalupe	5,943		5,943	1,981.00	\$ 158.48	\$ 253.57	15%	\$ 0.36	\$ 412.41
Litchfield Park	5,621		5,621	1,874.00	\$ 149.92	\$ 239.87	15%	\$ 0.34	\$ 390.13
Mesa	444,856		444,856	148,285.00	\$ 11,862.80	\$ 18,980.48	15%	\$ 26.69	\$ 30,869.97
Paradise Valley	13,106		13,106	4,369.00	\$ 349.52	\$ 559.23	15%	\$ 0.79	\$ 909.54
Peoria *3	157,653	7	157,660	52,551.00	\$ 4,204.08	\$ 6,726.53	15%	\$ 9.46	\$ 10,940.07
Phoenix	1,464,727		1,464,727	488,242.00	\$ 39,059.36	\$ 62,494.98	15%	\$ 87.88	\$ 101,642.22
Queen Creek *1	27,249	459	27,708	9,083.00	\$ 726.64	\$ 1,162.62	15%	\$ 1.63	\$ 1,890.89
Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community	6,437		6,437	2,146.00	\$ 171.68	\$ 274.69	15%	\$ 0.39	\$ 446.76
Scottsdale	219,713		219,713	73,238.00	\$ 5,859.04	\$ 9,374.46	15%	\$ 13.18	\$ 15,246.68
Surprise	119,530		119,530	39,843.00	\$ 3,187.44	\$ 5,099.90	15%	\$ 7.17	\$ 8,294.51
Tempe	164,659		164,659	54,886.00	\$ 4,390.88	\$ 7,025.41	15%	\$ 9.88	\$ 11,426.17
Tolleson	6,579		6,579	2,193.00	\$ 175.44	\$ 280.70	15%	\$ 0.39	\$ 456.53
Wickenburg*3	6,458	18	6,476	2,153.00	\$ 172.24	\$ 275.58	15%	\$ 0.39	\$ 448.21
Youngtown	6,188		6,188	2,063.00	\$ 165.04	\$ 264.06	15%	\$ 0.37	\$ 429.47
Balance of Maricopa County (Unincorporated)	276,634		276,634	92,211.00	\$ 7,376.88	\$ 11,803.01	15%	\$ 16.60	\$ 19,196.49
Other Maricopa County Calls				205,099.00	\$ 16,407.92	\$ 26,252.67	15%	\$ 36.92	\$ 42,697.51
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,884,705</b>	<b>37,116</b>	<b>3,921,821</b>	<b>1,500,000.00</b>	<b>\$ 120,000.00</b>	<b>\$ 191,999.97</b>		<b>\$ 270.00</b>	<b>\$ 312,269.97</b>

Notes:

- \*1 Maricopa and Pinal County portions
- \*2 Maricopa County portion only
- \*3 Maricopa and Yavapai County portions
- \*4 Operator costs assume 10% of calls route to the operator and that the system is at full build out. Costs would scale according to participation.
- \*5 CenturyLink is allowed to charge \$0.0012 for calls transferred from its lines. This spreadsheet assumes 70% of calls come from cellular phones and that half of the remaining calls originate with CenturyLink.

**NB: Usage charges are representative and assume full, hosted system, built out with no additional negotiated discounts. Actual charges may vary based upon future procurement. These costs do not include the setup or non-usage based charges.**