Broadband and Smart City Ad-Hoc Committee Regular Meeting

Agenda

January 7, 2022 @ 9:00 am

Commission Chamber - City Hall
401 S. Park Avenue

welcome

Agendas and all backup material supporting each agenda item are accessible via the city's website at cityofwinterpark.org/bpm and include virtual meeting instructions.

assistance & appeals

Persons with disabilities needing assistance to participate in any of these proceedings should contact the City Clerk's Office (407-599-3277) at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting.

"If a person decides to appeal any decision made by the Board with respect to any matter considered at this hearing, a record of the proceedings is needed to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based." (F.S. 286.0105).

please note

Times are projected and subject to change.

agenda	time
1. Call to Order	
2. Consent Agenda	
a. Approve minutes of the December 2, 2021 meeting.	1 minute
b. Approve minutes of the December 16, 2021 meeting.	1 minute
3. Staff Updates	
4. Public Comments (for items not on the agenda): Three minutes allowed for each speaker	
5. Non-Action Items	
a. Commission Work Session Agenda Prep	60 mins
6. Action Items	
7. Board Comments	
8. Adjournment	

Broadband & Smart City Ad Hoc Committee

agenda item

item type Consent Agenda	meeting date January 7, 2022
prepared by Kim Breland	approved by Parsram Rajaram
board approval Completed	
strategic objective	

subject

Approve minutes of the December 2, 2021 meeting.

motion / recommendation

background

alternatives / other considerations

fiscal impact

ATTACHMENTS:

Draft Broadband-Smart City Ad-Hoc Committee Meeting Minutes 120221.pdf

Broadband/Smart City Ad-Hoc Committee Regular Meeting Minutes

December 2, 2021 at 9:00 a.m.

City Hall Commission Chambers
401 S. Park Avenue ı Winter Park, Florida

Present:

Richard James, Chris Johnson Janelle Zurek, Paul Conway, Michael Poole (arrived at 9:06 a.m.), and James Everett (virtual). Absent: Wes Naylor.

Also Present

COO Courtney Violette, Magellan Advisors (virtual); Director of Information Technology Parsram Rajaram; Division Director of Budget and Performance Peter Moore; Director of Finance Wes Hamil and Recording Secretary Kim Breland.

Call to Order

Mr. Rajaram called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

Consent Agenda

Approval of November 18, 2021, work session minutes. Approved by consensus.

Staff Updates

a. Smart City Portal

Public Comments (for items not on Agenda)

There was no public comment.

Non-Action Items

a. Discussion with Magellan Consultants.

Chief Operating Officer Courtney Violette of Magellan Advisors was present (virtually) to answer questions regarding the report created for the city in 2016. He stated that since the report was generated five years ago, a lot has changed considerably due to COVID, funding landscape, labor, material pricing, etc. He provided a history of the city's electric system underground effort that moved all the electric assets underground and explained that as a part of that project, there was an opportunity for the city to begin laying conduit to support a fiber optic telecom system throughout the city. He stated that Magellan was brought in to help determine the potential cost savings to the city if they were to deploy conduit and fiber at the same time they were undergrounding the rest of the electric assets.

Mr. Violette explained that he worked with Public Works and IT to identify the areas of the city planned to build out and provided a zone by zone forecast of the cost for the city to build a network from scratch vs. the cost savings alternative if the city put conduit in the trench with the same undergrounding effort. He added that other topics such as trends, case studies from cities in Florida and around the country were doing were included in the report. He stated that Magellan also outlined recommendations the city could utilize to not only make a case to build a network, but also to monetize parts of the network.

Regarding surveys, Mr. Violette stated that Magellan did generate two residential surveys. Both were considered by the city, but to his understanding, it was decided not to survey the community. He stated he did not recall why that decision was made but offered ideas for why a city might opt to not survey the community in the early stages of a project, such as not wanting to raise awareness of the project prematurely and setting expectations to take a particular action.

Discussion followed on the monetization of fiber strands, network architecture, backbone segment projects, connectivity, and processes. Further discussion was held on how many fibers the city will need over the next ten years.

Mr. Violette gave the committee an update on various projects Magellan is working on in different cities around the country. He stated that their consultant team is developing infrastructure plans as well as smart city plans across the country. Mr. Rajaram listed some of the smart projects the city has currently including AMI network, public wifi, parking project, environmental sensors, and building automation amongst others. Mr. Violette stated that the report from 2016 laid out a conduit network backbone with 288 strands and that's the process to take when building a master plan.

b. Discussion with Peter Moore – Current Fiber Contract

Mr. Moore provided the history of the electrical program and explained that when Director of Electric Utilities Dan D'Alessandro began working at the city, staff was able to get a process in place and begin the conduit deployment. He added that Mayor Leary supported the fiber effort which gave the city the political capital to be able to hire Magellan to create the report, which helped the city understand various business models around the word.

Mr. Moore explained the financial challenges the city faced with trying to build a fiber backbone. He stated that a fiber optics task force was created to generate political momentum, community awareness, and funding to move the project forward. He reviewed processes developed by the task force and discussed budget challenges during that time. He stated that the city met with different businesses to find a capital partner, but discovered that each business was deploying its own fiber. He stated that the city was seeking a financial partner that was willing to work and co-build with, which is how the agreement with Frog began.

Mr. Moore stated that the CEO of Frog Michael Voll is a Winter Park resident and business owner and the city was able to negotiate a deal to co-build a "backbone light", which is the contract that was approved last March by the city commission. He discussed parameters for the contract and explained that the contract execution is to be completed within 18 months. He added that 75% of all conduit to every location has been completed and remaining areas are expected to be completed by the end of March 2022. He added that the contract with Frog is a co-build agreement where they city saved on capital costs. He stated that the city wanted to connect its facilities, have sufficient bandwidth to achieve various goals from a smart city municipal context.

Mr. Moore discussed how different companies are navigating the push for 5g technology and its impacts to the city. He stated that he would like the committee to consider what the city should do the conduit that has been placed in the ground. He talked about monetizing fiber and lack of interest in government owned fiber. He stated that the Frog contract came with a maintenance agreement and explained that if the city has any break in the system, the city pays the repair on a pro-rata basis where the city considers the conduit 50/50 replacement cost, and considers the fiber strands on a strand basis. He discussed the benefits with working with Frog as a local company and shared how wifi was implemented in central park and shady park during the pandemic. He noted that the positive response from the implementation allowed the city to extend wifi across park avenue resulting in all of the downtown corridor having free wifi. He discussed technology being used by the Planning & Transportation to provide smart streetlights throughout the city. He added that the commission has $1million allocated for smarty city and transportation related issues and noted that the commission is very interested in how a smart city can help with transportation issues.

Discussion followed on conduit capacity, franchise tax/ monetizing tax on services, monetizing the city conduit, 5g nodes in the city, the potential need for an RFP to allow the conduit to be used; potential for city owned broadband service vs. private network, and leasing city conduit to recover costs. Mr. Poole suggested staff reach out to other municipalities around the state to understand the economics and competitive issues, if any, for their cities. Mr. Rajaram will reach out to the City of Lakeland. Further discussion followed on cities around the state and country that are building their own systems, having the committee meet with Magellan to discuss business models, community surveys to determine community desire for different broadband services, and broadband and fiber access for businesses and residential areas throughout the city.

c. Public Involvement Document Feedback

Discussion was held on processes to define the committee's mission statement and when to include community input. Mr. Conway suggested having a public portal focused on education and what a "smart city" is and a survey to gain feedback on how to prioritize efforts across public safety. He stated that the portal should have a scorecard for each of the functional areas of the city to describe what efforts have been implemented and what is being worked on. Ms. Zurek added that this framework was consistent with the outline City of Orlando used, discussion ensued.

Action Items

a. Mission and Vision statement.

Discussion was held on the purpose of the committee and parameters of the vision statement, regulations impeding the city from becoming an internet service provider, business model, competitive advantage, and the city owning its own fiber. Further discussion was held on the different types of smart projects being used for traffic, different technologies being used, integration and consolidation.

Michael Poole left the meeting at 10:29 am

The members reviewed the purpose of the committee located in Section 2 of the ordinance to define aspects of the mission statement. After discussion, Ms. Zurek will review and create a draft mission statement for the committee to review at the next meeting.

Board Comments

None.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:07 a.m.

Respectfully,

Kim Breland

Recording Secretary

DRAFT

Broadband & Smart City Ad Hoc Committee

agenda item

item type Consent Agenda	meeting date January 7, 2022
prepared by Kim Breland	approved by Parsram Rajaram
board approval Completed	
strategic objective	

subject

Approve minutes of the December 16, 2021 meeting.

motion / recommendation

background

alternatives / other considerations

fiscal impact

ATTACHMENTS:

Draft Broadband-Smart City Ad-Hoc Committee Meeting Minutes 121621.pdf

Broadband/Smart City Ad-Hoc Committee Regular Meeting Minutes

December 16, 2021 at 9:00 a.m.

City Hall Commission Chambers
401 S. Park Avenue ı Winter Park, Florida

Present:

Richard James, Chris Johnson, Wes Naylor, Paul Conway, Michael Poole, James Everett.and Janelle Zurek (virtual).

Also Present

Director of Future Ready (City of Orlando) Michael Hess; Electric Dan D'Alessandro; Electric Utility Operations Supervisor Justin Isler; Director of Information Technology Parsram Rajaram; and Recording Secretary Kim Breland

Call to Order

Mr. Rajaram called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Consent Agenda

Staff Updates

Public Comments (for items not on Agenda)

There was no public comment.

Non-Action Items

a. Discussion with Director of Future Ready Michael Hess, City of Orlando.

Mr. Hess provided a background on the City of Orlando "smart city" project and steps taken to develop a master planning effort, working with the community, staff, and businesses to define what "smart city" means to Orlando. He added that while the city had staff working on the effort in addition to other tasks, they decided to hire a consultant that would be dedicated to and run the program.

Mr. Hess stated that when he joined the City of Orlando, he began the master planning effort and Orlando made the decision to rebrand "Smart City" to "Future Ready". He explained that the master plan was not centered around technology, but around community and stakeholder engagement. He stated that the city went through a thorough process where interviews were held with key leadership from city departments, surveys of city staff, focus groups with city staff, external stakeholders, and experts to brainstorm what "smart city" should mean for Orlando. In addition, workshops were held with the community to gain input on what issues residents felt the city should work on as well as assist with driving the city mission, goals, and strategies. He stated that the "Future Ready" master plan was adopted by the city council in May 2021.

Mr. Hess noted that a budget was developed along with the plan and every short-term strategy or project is a funded project that has been moved into implementation, such as equitable resilience, digital divide, broadband access, etc. He added that the city has continued with additional community input to prepare for their "Future Ready" plan version 2.0.

In response to questions, Mr. Hess explained the FCC definitions for broadband and access respectively. He added that the City of Orlando is in the process of building a strategy around the digital divide. He discussed efforts for identifying which neighborhoods have higher or lower usage and why, and additional community engagement. Discussion followed on cable fiber vs. cellular, 5g access, their impacts on residential areas, the city's approach to assisting with underserved areas, and public/private partnerships to provide service.

Additional discussion was held on how the "future ready" plan involves and works with city departments; potential partnership plans with surrounding cities and communities and community engagement efforts.

Mr. Hess reviewed the city's RFP process for hiring their consultant and explained that the city hired a consultant team with a wide array of expertise in all areas. He stated that having the group of consultants has been instrumental as they drove the community engagement process. In addition, the consultants, as part of a continuing contract, are regularly involved in projects and have weekly meetings to ensure the plans are moving forward properly. Mr. Hess will provide the committee with a copy of the RFP.

b. Electric Department Technology Requirements.

Mr. Isler discussed technologies currently being used by the Electric Utility department, the system for control and acquisition of data is used in substations, GIS data, AMI meter system. He discussed how the systems assist with identifying outage management and feels that the technology will improve with the compass project being worked on. Discussion followed on how the current technology identifies outages and how predictive maintenance technology would benefit the city.

Mr. Isler explained how substation relays work and stated that outages are identified by GIS maps and that the new compass system will improve the ability to know when devices are out, but will not identify devices. He noted that a new OMS system would be beneficial to the city. In-depth discussion followed on the benefits of having an improved OMS system, meter sensors; outage management in different scenarios, and how an improved system can improve the lives of residents.

Additional discussion was held on the followed on the following topics:

- Street light technology
- Residential energy conservation management
- Data collection
- Sensors for field components
- Cyber security and vulnerability
- Process for pulling power from OUC and Covanta and related costs

DRAFT

After discussion, Mr. Rajaram asked Mr. D'Alessandro if there is a need for streamlining of any services and if there are methodologies that perhaps technology can help with to ensure that service delivery is better. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that smart street lights would be beneficial for identifying outages, cycling, and blinking issues.

Mr. Rajaram summarized the discussion and listed the smart technology items that would benefit Electric Utility:

- OMS
- Customer App
- Predictive maintenance
- Cyber OT
- Smart street lights

Mr. Conway asked how smart meters are currently leveraged. Discussion followed on how outages are reported, how meter data is stored, the process for turning on power, and response times for customer service calls and outage reports. Mr. Rajaram stated that the city is working on a new call center project with a product called Genesis that will provide better solutions for reporting and communication, including phone, text, and email data aggregation. He noted that there is an outage report form on the city website as well as the @YourRequest portal for reporting outages. Further discussion was held on solutions for responding to outage reports.

Action Items

a. Mission and Vision statement.

Ms. Zurek gave a presentation and explained that she took verbiage from the ordinance she felt should be a part of the mission statement. She stated that there are two key sections of the ordinance the committee should consider; the purpose and the specific direction in terms of recommendations. She highlighted the points of the ordinance and presented a draft mission statement based on that verbiage as well as a draft of the proposed vision and mission. Discussion was held on the draft document and recommendation categories and how it relates to the discussion held with the Electric Utility discussion.

Ms. Zurek stated that she feels that the committee needs to have recommendations for the five points of the mission statement (Broadband availability and choice, optimizing traffic flow, expanding public wifi, environmentally friendly buildings, and enhanced public safety and security) as well as have a broader city plan. The committee continued to discuss points of the ordinance, recommendations, and committee directives.

After discussion, the committee would like a work session with the commission to discuss the parameters of the ordinance, tasks, and deliverables. Mr. Rajaram will reach out to city management to request a work session with the commission.

Board Comments

None.

DRAFT

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:02 a.m.

Respectfully,

Kim Breland

Recording Secretary

DRAFT

Broadband & Smart City Ad Hoc Committee

agenda item

item type Non-Action Items	meeting date January 7, 2022
prepared by Parsram Rajaram	approved by
board approval	
strategic objective	

subject

Commission Work Session Agenda Prep

motion / recommendation

Discussion on preparing agenda/items to present to Commission during work session to seek clarity of mission and direction.

background

alternatives / other considerations

fiscal impact