Broadband/Smart City Ad-Hoc Committee Regular Meeting Minutes

November 4, 2021 at 2:00 p.m.

City Hall, Chase Room
401 S. Park Avenue ı Winter Park, Florida

Present:

Michael Poole, Wes Naylor, Richard James, Paul Conway and James Everett, Chris Johnson,

Also Present

Director of Information Technology Parsram Rajaram
Assistant Director of Information Technology Sujay Sukhadia
Deputy City Clerk Kim Breland

Call to Order

Mr. Rajaram called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m.

Consent Agenda

Approval of October 21, 2021, regular meeting session minutes. Approved by consensus.

Staff Updates

a. Discussion with City of Orlando

Mr. Rajaram explained that the city started their process internally with their committee, consultant, and each department to determine what a smart city means to them. He stated that in his discussion with Michael Hess, the goal was to define what "smart city" meant for Orlando and started the process with an internal discussion, then engaging with community businesses, and lastly, completing the process with public engagement. Mr. Rajaram opined that the plan was successful and well thought out. Discussion followed on how the City of Orlando outlined their process including their definition of a smart city, what the city was actively doing, what the city could do and ranking those items in order of importance. Mr. Rajaram will distribute the document outlining the City of Orlando's methodology to the committee. Discussion followed on what changes Winter Park can achieve now, in five years, ten years, and public engagement.

Mr. Poole suggested using the Magellan study as an outline for public surveys. Mr. Rajaram noted that the study does not reflect community engagement and will reach out to Magellan inquire on pubic engagement element.

b. Possible Funding for Contractor

Mr. Rajaram explained there is ARPA funding available to hire a consultant to help move forward. He stated that the consultant for Orlando was an entity that had experience in multiple facets of a Smart City and suggested the committee consider using the same consultant, especially if there is a contract the city can piggyback on. Mr. Naylor agreed that using the same consultant would be good for the timeline and acquisition cycle and having someone who already understands what Orlando has done. Further discussion followed on the procedures for using ARPA funding.

Mr. Rajaram stated that during his conversation with Mr. Hess, it was expressed that without internal departments representing themselves at the meetings, nothing would have happened. He stated that internal engagement is critical to encompass needs of the city on a whole. Consensus to get consultant on board as soon as possible.

Mr. Naylor suggested the committee continue to explore idea of proper engagement. He stated early engagement and transparency would be beneficial to the city and residents. He suggested having a listening session where the consultant can lead the conversation to explained what the city is doing, followed by community engagement efforts with surveys once concepts of operations and roads ahead have been mapped out. Mr. Conway suggested having a survey to make people aware of what is going on in conjunction with a listening session. Dr. James suggested inviting the different departments at the city to the committee meetings to discuss and understand their smart city needs. Mr. Rajaram will invite department representatives to subsequent meetings.

Mr. Rajaram stated that he spoke with Mr. Robert Thompson of Tavistock and explained that Mr. Thompson is willing meet with the committee to discuss his experiences and help ensure the city's path to becoming a smart city is successful. Mr. Naylor added that resources from UCF are available to assist with research needs, if desired.

Mr. Conway suggested setting milestones to move toward successful conclusion by July 2022. Discussion followed on the city's broadband assessment report, using components of the report to build a business model, the charge of the committee, role of the consultant, and the process for building a business plan. Mr. Rajaram suggested having the consultant review the broadband assessment report and their feedback.

In-depth discussion followed on capital investment, "buy infrastructure", how use and get the most out of city fiber, and ways for existing businesses to expand their network without having to bring in other service providers.

Mr. Conway stated that there are six topics for the committee to accomplish before the end of year: create and distribute a survey, creating a communication plan to announce the survey is available and that a Smart City is coming, arrange the January community engagement kickoff, hire a consultant, review broadband operations aspects and include the right people in the conversations, and clarify the committee's charter and deliverables.

Discussion followed on having the City Manager and the Division Director of Office Management and Budget attend the next meeting to discuss funding, what the city infrastructure should look like, monetizing the Frog and defining the architecture. Consensus was to have Division Director of Office Management and Budget Peter Moore attend to the next meeting. Further discussion followed on the architecture being designed by Michael Voll for city buildings.

Discussion continued on components for the survey, creation of a smart city portal/web page for community engagement, steps to present a high-level business plan/road map to the commission in July.

After discussion, Mr. Rajaram will reach out to Mr. Moore to attend the next meeting, arrange for department representatives to attend subsequent meetings, send the latest draft of the Sustainability Action Plan to the committee and reach out to other cities to inquire how they used surveys to engage their residents. Mr. Poole will contact Mr. Thompson to have a representative from Tavistock speak with the committee and. Mr. Naylor will reach out to UCF to have a representative speak with the committee.

Public Comments (for items not on Agenda)

There was no public comment.

Non-Action Items

None.

Action Items

None.

Board Comments

None.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:29 p.m.

Minutes approved the board on 11/18/2021

/s/ Kim Breland