

February 20, 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, February 26, 2013, 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 29, 2011 Meeting Minutes

4. 3-1-1 Recommendation to Management Committee

The group will finalize their recommendation to Management Committee.

Adjournment

2. Information and discussion.

3. Review and approve the minutes of the January 29, 2012 meeting.

4. For information, discussion and possible action to recommend the following to Management Committee:

- Disbandment of the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee effective April 1, 2013
- Creation of a Citizen Communication Stakeholders Group to meet quarterly

Agenda Item #3

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
3-1-1 Business Plan Committee
January 29, 2013
MAG Offices, Saguaro Room
302 N. 1st Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

David Stevens, Maricopa County, Chair
Shelley Hearn, City of Tempe, Vice Chair
Karen Peters, City of Phoenix
Brenda Buren, 9-1-1 Oversight Team
Jessica Blazina, City of Surprise
Michael Ciccarone, Town of Fountain Hills
Alex Deshuk, City of Mesa
Tikki Farias for Gabe England, Town of Gilbert
Jenna Goad for Diane Goke, City of Glendale

* Dee Hathaway, Town of Buckeye
Chris Nadeau, Goodyear Police Department
Linda Mendenhall for Carmen Martinez, City of Avondale
Patrick McDermott, City of Chandler
* Gary Neiss, Town of Carefree
Dave Collett for John Imig, City of Peoria
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. Alex Deshuk moved for the approval of the revised minutes with Karen Peters seconding the motion. The September 25, 2012 revised minutes were approved unanimously.

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

Chair Stevens noted that a communication was sent to committee members as a result of the last 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee to try and get some actionable items in regard to where the committee may go with 3-1-1. Chair Stevens stated he hoped the questions could start to be answered today to ultimately give a recommendation to the Management Committee in March or April. Chair Stevens stated the first question is what is the level of interest from the communities.

Patrick McDermott stated this has been a good exercise and has provided Chandler with good information about how Chandler provides service to their customers. Mr. McDermott continued that going regional would probably be one of the last things Chandler would want to do because the committee process has made him realize how much work Chandler has to do internally. Mr. McDermott stated that adding the complexity and money needed for a regional solution does not currently make sense for Chandler. Mr. McDermott noted that in the future if the internal system reaches a level of acceptability then a regional solution could be an enhancement. Chair Stevens stated that he appreciated the feedback and asked Mr. McDermott if Chandler would be okay with a test program of the system and would Chandler like to participate in a governance group or would Chandler prefer to look at this from afar and see how it plays out. Mr. McDermott responded that Chandler would probably look at it from afar and see if other communities joined.

Shelly Hearn stated she would be interested in hearing if other communities are interested in a regional 3-1-1 system. Ms. Hearn stated that Tempe is ready for a 3-1-1 system and is willing to be part of a pilot program for the system.

Alex Deshuk stated that Mesa has had discussions internally on the 3-1-1 system and the decision came down to how Mesa feels the future interactions with citizens will occur. Mr. Deshuk stated that Mesa believes future interactions will not be by telephone. Mr. Deshuk also stated that due to the recession the budget is not where it was in 2006. Mr. Deshuk stated that Mesa is looking to fund projects that will not impact the City long term in terms of ongoing costs. Mr. Deshuk noted that Mesa believes the 3-1-1 system will create the need to hire more people to answer phones. Mr. Deshuk stated that previous presentations have shown that the 3-1-1 system will increase call volume and Mesa wants to increase contact with citizens without increasing phone calls. Mr. Deshuk stated that Mesa is going to invest in technology such as web and mobile applications. Mr. Deshuk stated that Mesa would be interested in a system that improves citizen interaction while being more efficient in staffing costs. Mr. Deshuk stated the IVR system would have up front capital costs, ongoing costs, and possibly increase staff and that Mesa is not interested in it at this time.

Chris Nadeau stated that Goodyear would be interested if the system was regional and hosted. Mr. Nadeau stated that for 3-1-1 to be effective it would need to be a regional application to avoid citizen confusion. Mr. Nadeau stated that one of Goodyear's main concerns is the governance

structure and that Goodyear would like to see this complete before agreeing to a pilot project. Mr. Nadeau noted that Goodyear is part of the Regional Wireless Cooperative (RWC) and that Goodyear likes that structure.

Tikki Farias stated that Gilbert was not currently interested in going forward for similar reasons as Mesa in that Gilbert is looking for web based interaction with citizens.

Linda Mendenhall stated Avondale was currently not interested and unable to invest money in the solution currently due to budget constraints. Ms. Mendenhall stated that like Mesa and Gilbert, Avondale was looking into other alternatives for citizen interaction.

Jenna Goad stated that while Glendale could possibly see value in the 3-1-1 system, budget constraints would prevent them from committing to the 3-1-1 system at this time.

Karen Peters stated that Phoenix is in a similar situation as Chandler in that this has been a useful exercise in understanding from where the calls are originate. Ms. Peters stated that Phoenix has determined there is work to do in terms of consolidating or streamlining internal processes at the City of Phoenix. Ms. Peters stated that Phoenix receives thousands of calls a day to many different numbers and the IVR model would mean Phoenix would have to have a centralized location to receive all calls. Ms. Peters stated that Phoenix is not ready to accept all calls in one place and that it may be years before that model could be in place. Ms. Peters noted if a governance or cost sharing group is formed that Phoenix would want to be included.

Brent Stockwell stated the Scottsdale looked at the proposed 3-1-1 solution and the stated expectations of the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee given at the beginning of the committee. Mr. Stockwell noted the expectations were to reduce costs and improve customer relations. Mr. Stockwell stated after reviewing the solution it increases costs to Scottsdale and could give their citizens the perception of decreased customer service as they would get an IVR instead of a live person when calling. Mr. Stockwell noted that Scottsdale is not interested in participating at this time.

Dave Collett stated that Peoria would be interested in participating in governance, but not interested in participating in the 3-1-1 system currently.

Michael Ciccarone stated that Fountain Hills sees value in the 3-1-1 system but, due to the budget, the timing is not right to participate in a 3-1-1 system. Mr. Ciccarone stated that Fountain Hills must get their internal call center worked on before joining a regional system.

Brenda Buren stated that the 9-1-1 committee has experience with governance and would be willing to help with governance.

Audrey Skidmore stated that what she heard from the committee members is there is not much interest in participating in the 3-1-1 system, but there is interest from members in participating in a group looking at governance structure. Chair Stevens agreed with Ms. Skidmore. Chair Stevens stated he is looking for opinions from the group about forming a subcommittee on governance and possibly a small pilot to give a report to the Management Committee in March.

Chris Nadeau stated that the response from the group was that most did not want to or did not have the budget to move forward. Mr. Nadeau asked if it was worthwhile to develop a governance structure for a system that, if it moves ahead tomorrow, will have two or three agencies involved. Mr. Nadeau wondered if it would be a better approach to shelve a regional approach until such time that budgets allowed more communities to participate and then develop a governance structure. Mr. Nadeau stated that Goodyear was a maybe on a regional approach and hearing the responses from other communities will make Goodyear step back since it is not a regional approach at this time.

Shelly Hearn stated she would hate to see the regional approach die after all the work that was put into its evaluation. Ms. Hearn asked where the County was at in relation to moving forward with 3-1-1. Ms. Hearn further suggested that maybe the regional 3-1-1 system be tabled until one or two more communities were willing to participate in a pilot program, but that the option should be kept open for communities who want to participate in the future. Ms. Hearn supported other technologies as and adjunct to 3-1-1 and noted that Tempe has just launched their new mobile application. Ms. Hearn continued that while interaction may be moving towards technology it will never completely replace phones. Ms. Hearn stated that a limited pilot program would provide the information needed to other communities looking to join later about call volume increases and other data.

Mr. Deshuk stated that his concern with a limited pilot is the impression the citizens of the county would think the pilot is a countywide effort while only a few communities are participating. Mr. Deshuk stated that presenting this as a countywide effort gives a misleading impression.

Chair Stevens stated that the best solution may be to present to the Management Committee exactly what was discussed at this meeting. Chair Stevens stated the will of the committee seems to be due to budget considerations and the original purpose of the system there are still doubts in terms of the ability to meet the expectations set forth to the committee. Chair Stevens stated that the governance should be put on hold and see what feedback is given from the Management Committee.

Audrey Skidmore asked Chair Stevens if Maricopa County can implement 3-1-1 on their own at any time. Chair Stevens stated that was true. Ms. Skidmore asked if there would be any value to Maricopa County in knowing how the governance would work with other agencies before making their decision to implement 3-1-1. Chair Stevens stated that while the information is not needed, Maricopa County wants to be supportive of the communities and be active in the committee process and they will continue to work with the cities to make a regional 3-1-1 happen when the time is right for other communities.

Audrey Skidmore asked if there was no governance subcommittee would the recommendation be to sunset the committee or keep it together as a stakeholders group. Chair Stevens asked committee members for input on a recommendation. Alex Deshuk stated he would be in favor of a stakeholder committee to continue discussions on what is the best way to interact with citizens. Mr. Deshuk stated that the committee could be possibly used to create standards on interaction with citizens including web and mobile applications. Brent Stockwell stated since the committee was formed to explore the implementation of a regional 3-1-1 system and there is not currently

support to explore it, the committee should be sunset. Mr. Stockwell stated there seems to be a different issue on whether the communities should continue to collaborate on ways to interact with citizens and the issue should be a separate question to the Management Committee of do they want a group to continue on the discussions and have a new scope. Mr. Stockwell noted that if Maricopa County is implementing a 3-1-1 system, Scottsdale would be supportive in terms of information sharing.

Chair Stevens stated an update to the Management Committee should be drafted with the recommendation to sunset the committee. Chair Stevens stated the update would be brought to the committee members to review prior to the March Management Committee meeting.

5. Request for Future Agenda Items

There were no requests for future agenda items from the committee.

6. Adjournment

David Stevens requested a motion to adjourn the meeting. Karen Peters motioned to adjourn with Alex Deshuk seconding. The 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee meeting was adjourned at 11:13am.

Agenda Item #4

Summary of 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee Activities

Accomplishments

- Educated agencies on potential benefits and costs of implementing 3-1-1 as a phone number
- Educated agencies on potential benefits of call center consolidation
- Evaluated and reviewed different models for implementation of 3-1-1
- Learned about successful implementations across the country

Findings

- 3-1-1 is rarely undertaken to save money. The primary driver is customer service.
- The majority of the agencies are not ready to stand up a consolidated call center behind a 3-1-1 phone number and feel they are at least 5 years away from such an implementation if they intend to go in that direction.
- Other agencies expressed concern about the extra layer of technology potentially separating them from their citizens or the potential increase in call volume.
- The 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee has provided valuable information to agencies on centralizing citizen communication.
- There is no objection to agencies who wish to proceed moving forward, but it is considered premature at this time to define governance structures.
- The concept should be revisited in the future as agencies are more prepared.

Recommendations

- Disband the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee effective April 1, 2013.
- Create a Citizen Communication Stakeholder Group to meet quarterly.