

November 20, 2012

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, November 27, 2012, 10:30 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.  
MAG Office, Suite 200 - Saguaro 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 September 25, 2012 Meeting Minutes

#### 4. Update on Interactive Voice Response (IVR) Request for Information

The group will receive an update on the results of the Request for Information and discuss next steps.

#### 5. 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.

#### 6. 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 September 25, 2012 meeting.

4. For information, discussion and possible action.

5. For information and discussion.

6. For information and discussion.

# Agenda Item #3

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
3-1-1 Business Plan Committee  
September 25th, 2012  
MAG Offices, Ironwood Room  
302 N. 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona

## MEMBERS ATTENDING

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| David Stevens, Maricopa County, Chair                    | * Jeff Fiegenschuh, City of Goodyear                 |
| Shelley Hearn, City of Tempe, Vice Chair                 | Carmen Martinez, City of Avondale                    |
| John Wayne Gonzales for Karen Peters,<br>City of Phoenix | Patrick McDermott, City of Chandler                  |
| * Brenda Buren, 9-1-1 Oversight Team                     | * Gary Neiss, Town of Carefree                       |
| # Janeen Gaskins, City of Surprise                       | # John Imig, City of Peoria                          |
| # Michael Ciccarone, Town of Fountain Hills              | Brent Stockwell, City of Scottsdale                  |
| # Alex Deshuk, City of Mesa                              | # Aldo Elizondo for Pat Timlin, City of El<br>Mirage |
| Andi Welsh for Melanie Dykstra, Town of<br>Gilbert       | * Gino Turrubiartes, Town of Guadalupe               |
| Diane Goke, City of Glendale                             | # Mark Ashley, Fort McDowell Yavapi<br>Nation        |
| # Dee Hathaway, Town of Buckeye                          |  |

\* 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 10:34 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 June 26, 2012 Minutes

Chair Stevens asked the committee for any comments on the June 26, 2012 minutes. Carmen Martinez moved for the approval of the minutes with Andi Welsh seconding the motion. The June 26, 2012 minutes were approved unanimously.

4. Presentation on Pinal County Call Center

Jerry Keeley, IT Operations Manager for Pinal county, presented on the implementation and operation of the Pinal County Call Center. Jerry Keeley stated that the driving issue that initiated the push for a centralized call center was simplifying the citizen call flow. Mr. Keeley stated that citizens call looking for answers and they get transferred multiple times before getting a final result. Mr. Keeley noted the call flow complexity led to citizen frustration, employee frustration, and incorrect information being provided to the citizens. Mr. Keeley stated the purpose of the central call center is to get information to citizens more quickly and accurately.

David Stevens asked how Pinal County gauged citizen frustration. Mr. Keeley stated there was no direct gauge but employees of Pinal County noticed the citizen frustration. Mr. Keeley noted that each time the citizen was transferred the employee receiving the call would notice the frustration from the citizen due to the citizen needing to explain their question or concern to another employee after just explaining it before being transferred.

Mr. Keeley noted that other 3-1-1 systems were examined such as New York, Miami-Dade, and Chicago before implementing the Pinal County call center. Mr. Keeley stated Pinal County took away the best practices from each system that were applicable to Pinal County's call center. Mr. Keeley noted that, to determine potential call volumes, call center staff sat with each department and gauged volumes and gathered information on why citizens were calling. Mr. Keeley noted that City and County call volumes were event driven and events can raise the call volume for departments. Mr. Keeley noted the Pinal County Treasurer's Office used to hire six temporary employees during a tax event, but the call center call center now takes the calls and has reduced response to citizen times significantly.

Mr. Keeley noted that an elected official gave direction that the call center would be operational in six months, giving them a time frame for completion. Mr. Keeley noted the time frame had a positive effect in that it made Pinal County look at alternate solutions including hosted call center solutions. Mr. Keeley noted that a premise-based solution would be more cost efficient in the long run because hosted solutions are charged per call and per minute. Mr. Keeley noted that because of the long-term cost the Request for Proposal (RFP) for any hosted solution they looked at had to be portable, meaning it could be moved on-premise at any time in the future. Mr. Keeley stated that after two years of running the hosted solution he reached an agreement with the CIO that if the system showed a 13 month return-on-investment then Pinal County would purchase the on premise solution.

Mr. Keeley noted that the center eventually did transition to an on-premise location. Mr. Keeley noted the call center started out as a warm transfer center where the call agents were trained to take the call and do their best at transferring the call. Mr. Keeley noted the call center started with a small knowledge base including triage questions about items such as taxes that agents could ask

citizens to help transfer them to the correct department. Mr. Keeley stated that the call center worked with departments to gather frequently asked questions and expand the knowledge base to help the call center agents answer questions without transfers. Mr. Keeley stated that blind transfers were not the preferred method of transfers and the call agents would try to transfer using warm transfers to explain the citizen request before transferring them to the correct department. Mr. Keeley noted that by using warm transfers the call center agent could gather information from the department and use the information to further build the knowledge base. Mr. Keeley also noted that Pinal County uses Customer Relationship Management (CRM) software that uses a Geographic Information System (GIS) to determine if the call center is receiving multiple calls about one incident such as a loose dog. Mr. Keeley noted the duplicate calls are added as a child ticket to the original call and given their own case number to help inform the citizen later of the status on their request.

Patrick McDermott asked if Pinal County looked at the amount of calls that were informational versus calls for service. Mr. Keeley noted that 84 % of all calls are answered by the call center staff without transfer and almost all of those calls are informational.

Shelley Hearn asked if Pinal County is able to map the service requests taken in through their CRM system using GIS. Mr. Keeley stated that the requests are opened with a geo-spatial code and they are able to locate them, but service requests and calls for information are not separated. Mr. Keeley noted that Pinal County is separated into departments and the call volumes are tracked per department and reports are made to determine call volume for each department.

Mr. Keeley stated that Pinal County acquired the 3-1-1 number in 2006 but are still not using the number. Mr. Keeley stated that currently the call center is using a ten digit number that is listed on every page of Pinal County's website. Mr. Keeley noted that use of the 3-1-1 number needed executive direction and that he was hopeful in early 2013 Pinal County would start using 3-1-1. Mr. Keeley also noted the unknown factor about using the 3-1-1 number over a ten digit number is the potential impact on call volume. Mr. Keeley noted that once 3-1-1 is presented to citizens there will be an expectation from the citizen of being able to get their question answered and service needs addressed. Mr. Keeley noted that citizens may have difficulty identifying what city they currently are located in when calling 3-1-1.

Chair Stevens thanked Mr. Keeley for the presentation and stated the information provided was very valuable.

5. Update on Interactive Voice Response (IVR) Request for Information

Audrey Skidmore presented the group with an update on the Request for Information under development. Ms. Skidmore stated the Request for Information was given to the MAG Technology Advisory Group who created a sub-group comprising of technical experts and had participation from members of the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee. Ms. Skidmore stated the group put together a thorough document that has been given to the MAG fiscal services division for review. Ms. Skidmore stated the request for information should be made public around the first or second week of October 2012 and the results should be presented back to the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee in November.

6. Agency Call Center Update

There were no agency call center updates provided at this meeting.

7. Request for Future Agenda Items

There were no requests for future agenda items provided at this meeting.

8. Adjournment

David Stevens requested a motion to adjourn the meeting. Diane Goke motioned to adjourn with Brent Stockwell seconding. The 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee meeting was adjourned at 11:24am.

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

**DATE:**

November 20, 2012

**SUBJECT:**

Cost Summary of Responses on 3-1-1 Interactive Voice Response Request for Information

**SUMMARY:**

At the June 26, 2012 meeting of the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee, members discussed draft business requirements for an Interactive Voice Response (IVR) system to handle 3-1-1 calls. The committee directed the Technology Advisory Group to use the draft document to develop a Request for Information to establish a stronger cost estimate that the group could use for determining how to proceed. The Technology Advisory Group created a task force of subject matter experts to create and review Request for Information (RFI) responses and several members of the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee were also included on the task force.

RFI responses were received on October 29, 2012. The task force reviewed and summarized the information and forwarded it to the Technology Advisory Group. There was a wide variation in costs provided for each type of solution, but the task force focused on the costs they felt represented the most likely scenarios. The costs given assume a fully implemented system and do not include the option of having one of the agencies add the IVR to their existing system. The ongoing costs of such an option would be analogous to an on premise system with a reduced initial year outlay. Other assumptions are detailed below.

	Hosted System	On-Premise System
Definition	In a hosted system, all hardware and software resides with the vendor. The vendor will be responsible for the upgrade and maintenance of the system.	On-premise systems reside at an agency that is part of the system and require the hosting agency to take responsibility for upgrades, hardware refresh and maintenance. On-premise systems will also require phone lines.
Total First Year Price Range	\$402,000 to \$1.724M	\$516,000 to \$792,000
Total Ongoing Price Range	\$384,000 to \$1.617M	\$469,000 to \$513,000
Estimated Cost of Implementation including Hardware and Software	\$37,000	\$128,000
Estimated Cost of Annual Maintenance	\$0	\$23,000

	Hosted System	On-Premise System
Estimated Annual Costs due to lines and subscription fees	\$5,000	\$50,000
Estimated Usage Fees	\$120,000	\$0
Estimated Cost of Handling Operator Calls	\$192,000	\$192,000
Estimated Staff Required	1 FTE to train, onboard agencies and generate reports \$70,000	1 FTE to train, onboard agencies and generate reports 1 FTE to support the IVR System \$164,000
Estimated Administrative Overhead (15% non-implementation costs)	\$58,000	\$64,000
Total Estimated First Year Costs	\$482,000	\$621,000
Total Estimated Ongoing Annual Costs	\$445,000	\$493,000
Five Year Cost	\$2.262M	\$2.593M
Considerations at Year 5+	Contract would need to be renewed or reprocured, potentially resulting in paying the start up fees again.	Hardware and software refresh required.
Scaling Considerations	The usage fees and operator calls are the only areas subject to significant variation with the number of participating agencies.	The monthly line charges and operator calls are the only areas subject to significant variation with the number of participating agencies.
Scaling Example: (500,000 calls per year)	Lower usage fees and fewer operator calls	Fewer lines and operator calls
Scaling Example: Total Estimated First Year Costs	\$280,000	\$474,000
Scaling Example: Total Estimated Ongoing Costs	\$243,000	\$376,000

**Assumptions:**

- Pricing assumes full implementation at all agencies with a total of 1.5M calls per year.
- Operators are assumed to handle 64 calls per hour because people were either unable or unwilling to navigate the voice recognition system.
- If per-minute charges apply to the duration of the call, all calls were assumed to be 5 minutes.
- If the per-minute charges applied only to the time in the IVR, the time in the IVR was assumed to be 1 minute.

- Busy hour call volume was assumed to be 2000 for purposes of sizing systems.
- Operator service is assumed to be available only during normal business hours (8-5 M-F)

The Technology Advisory Group also indicated that the following items should be noted when evaluating this information and potential next steps.

- There may be additional price breaks as volumes rise under a hosted solution.
- In an on-premise solution, the rise in costs with capacity is much flatter. This reflects primarily the cost of additional telecommunications capacity.
- The group should consider including an option for mobile application integration in any future associated Request For Proposals.

**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, discussion and possible action.

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

On November 15, 2012, the Technology Advisory Group unanimously recommended forwarding the Cost Summary of Responses on 3-1-1 Interactive Voice Response Request for Information to the 3-1-1 Business Plan Committee.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Pat Timlin, El Mirage, Chair  
 Debra Jackson for David Stevens, Maricopa County, Vice Chair  
 Rob Lloyd, Avondale  
 #Dee Hathaway, Buckeye  
 #Jim Keen, Carefree  
 #Patrick Hait, Chandler  
 #Mike Ciccarone, Fountain Hills  
 \*Mark Kramer, Gilbert  
 #David Atchison, Glendale  
 \*Evan Allred, Mesa

#Duncan Miller, Paradise Valley  
 \*John Imig, Peoria  
 #Greg Binder, Phoenix  
 #Kevin Sonoda for Brad Hartig, Scottsdale  
 #Tracy Mills, Surprise  
 \*Dave Heck, Tempe  
 David Borquez for Arkady Bernshteyn, Valley Metro Light Rail  
 \*Patrick Cutts, Scottsdale Police Department

\* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

+ Attended by Videoconference

# Attended by Audioconference

**CONTACT PERSON:**

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