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**INTRODUCTIONS**

**Heather Lewis:** Thanks, everyone, for the introductions. This is the sign-up sheet. I'm going to pass it around. Cass is kind enough to take notes but it really helps he if we speak up because she is also recording tonight. The first item on the agenda is the December minutes approval. Can I get a motion to approve.

**Steven Maheshwary:** I move to approve.

**Jose Vasquez:** Second.

**Heather Lewis:** All in favor, say 'Aye.' Any abstentions?

**Amy Hirotaka:** I abstain. I wasn't here.

**Heather Lewis:** Next up we have a presentation from Ben Weagraff from MIT Enterprise Forum.

**MIT ENTERPRISE FORUM NW**

**Ben Weagraff:**  Thank you very much for having us here today. It means a lot to us. I don't have actual slides. I hate slides, I'm sorry to say. Too many years working in slides. I'm never going to work with them ever again. Many, many years as a business consultant, and i hate slides. That's a topic for another day.

MIT Enterprise Forum of the Northwest is a subsidiary of the MIT Technology. This is an organization that started in the 80s and early 90s, and started to really bring MIT faculty members from Cambridge out to different areas, and they created all of these satellite chapters. So, there's MIT Enterprise Forum of the Northwest, Southern California, New York, Tel Aviv. You can imagine all of the different chapters that are out there. W used to bring in MIT faculty members, but recently our direction has changed, and we've kind of stepped a little bit away from Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and we're focusing on highlighting different technologies, and how Seattle can be at the forefront of these different technologies. What we do is we organize forums, and our next on is January 17, called Creating the Block Chain Ecosystem. What we're trying to do in our events is to highlight a piece of technology. And the main reason that we're here today is to build bridges with you guys from a policy perspective so that we can start to understand. There's this exciting new technology, and how do we make sure that Seattle is the leader of that technology. I think you all know the statistics on cloud computing. Cloud computing in 2007-2008 started to blow up in Seattle. We have Amazon, we have Microsoft, we have Google, we have Adobe, we have Century Link. Almost everybody that's got a cloud computing headquarters is here in Seattle, with a few exceptions. If you want to be in the cloud, you want to be in Seattle.

So, now we have all of these new technologies. We've got Block Chain. We've got Internet of Things. We have Artificial Intelligence. We have all of these different technologies. And if you look at Eventbrite or Meet Up, there are technology meetings every day, every night on Blockchain, on Dragonchain, on Crypto. Technologists getting together all around. So, what we're trying to do is we're trying to say, look, this technology is an economic opportunity, and how can we align, as a society, to make sure that our City is putting the right investments into making this an economic engine of the future.

Our next event is Creating the Blockchain Ecosystem. While we've had a number of different technologists, developers, architects that wanted to come and speak on the actual technology, what we have instead are people that are plugged into the legal structure of Blockchain. We have people that are plugged into the investment culture of Blockchain. And we have people who are kind of plugged into the enterprise level of Blockchain. What is missing from that discussion, and what we hope to create in the near future, is an actual policy discussion of Blockchain. What can we do? What is in-bounds? What does the City of Seattle want to do? How much can it do? How much can King County do? How much can the State of Washington do? We're not allowed to necessarily make actual investments, but we certainly can pave the roads. We can allow for different types of investments, for different businesses to make different investments in Blockchain, and Artificial Intelligence in Dragonchain.

We center around technology. We typically have a technology bent. And we're typically trying to bring how can we make us awesome in this space. How can we get policy aligned? How can we get the society aligned? How can we make the technology work? What are the infrastructural roads that we need to create? As we look to next year, we're looking to engage the City of Seattle. We're looking to have an actual representative from the City of Seattle, from King County, in some political capacity to sit on our forums with us, and say, "Here's what the City of Seattle is doing on Blockchain. Here's what we're not doing and here is why. Right? There are different limitations that policy makers face. We want to understand what those look like. We want to engage with you guys more proactively. We want to start to understand what can we do to make Seattle the next epicenter of the next exciting technology.

Our next event is January 17. It's on the campus of Seattle University. Tickets are $10. We will have probably over 400 people at our next event, who want to know how we build that Blockchain ecosystem. What do we do from a society perspective. What do we do from a policy perspective? What can we do so that five years from now, when somebody thinks Blockchain, they think Seattle?

We want to do the same thing with Artificial Intelligence, Internet of Things, Dragonchain. Does anyone have any questions?

**Jose Vasquez:**  It might be too early on that you're considering policy. Are you including communities who might be using Blockchain, like small businesses, customers, utility customers even. Have you thought of any municipalities perspectives?

**Ben Weagraff:**  I absolutely want to. I think that, more so than anything, raise our forums into the realm of reality, if that makes sense. Historically, we've kind of lived in the ethereal, the conceptual. You know, what is Blockchain? We get developers up there, they start coding on a big screen. They say, "Everyone got it?" And everyone says no. I have no idea of what just happened. But there is this narrative around what are the use cases that quite frankly are still in the ether, as it were, on something as conceptual as Blockchain. But to get to a point where the City of Seattle can say, "Here's a real use case where we could actually use Blockchain to make our City better for our citizens, and here is how we would be willing to invest in that, and here is how we would be willing to pilot that," I think that's a very compelling story for us to bring an audience and basically say, "Look what the City of Seattle is doing. Look at what King County is doing. Look at what Kirkland is doing." I think everybody is clamoring for, within the realm of these new technologies, that tangible use case of here's how it can actually help you. What we've found, invariably, is the more we focus on that topic, the bigger audience we get. Smart Cities is a classic example. And there are a lot of people here who were on the Smart Cities panel, and attended our Smart Cities event. And the reason that that resonated is because it is a very real challenge that people here in Seattle face, and we've got some perspectives on what that would look like. That's going to continue to be our north star. And as we continue to look more at these intangible technologies, we want to do more of that. So, what is real and what can be done.

**Heather Lewis:** Ben, thank you for coming to speak to us tonight, and for answering our questions. Can you speak a little bit about -- I understand you'll have technologists who would be panelists -- however the intended audience is lay people.

**Ben Weagraff:** Yes. I think that's one challenge that we try to overcome every time, that the event marketing space world here in Seattle has changed quite drastically. You can go on Eventbrite or Meet Up, and you can find 29,000 different Blockchain events every day. And they're typically by people who are kind of knee deep into the technology, and are often looking for technology help, trying to overcome a technological or functional challenge. What we're trying to do is say, let's understand what the heck Blockchain is, let's look at how IBM is using it to help it's customers, let's look at how the City of Seattle is using it to provide more readily available data to its customer, that's been validated and federated, and all of those types of things. Within that, we're continuing to try to shine a spotlight on the average person and see how these new technologies can help them solve some of the challenges that they face. Within the Open Data world, Blockchain is smack dab in the middle of it. Blockchain provides secure data to a huge, federated audience. As we start thinking about a municipality, there are certainly points in contention on how much data do we provide, and how do we make sure it doesn't get into the wrong hands. So, for us, we're really excited about technologies that have that civil or societal overlay.

**Heather Lewis:** Thank you. Are there other questions for Ben?

**Comment:**  Is there a specific municipal end point? I know Seattle to be first. [unintelligible]

**Ben Weagraff:** We want Seattle to be first on everything. Just to be clear. That's a good question,. The point I'm trying to make here is that we don't have the strongest representation from the political side right now. And when we start thinking about what the average Joe cares about here in Seattle, there is an unserved market, and here's what the Seattle official perspective on Blockchain is, here's how we formulate it, that's the specific example, and here is what we're doing about it, here's what we're not doing about it, and here is why. For us, we don't necessarily have that, and that's the reason why we came here today. Our season wraps up in May, and as we start looking forward to our 2018/2019 season, we want that representation because there is an opportunity. We do have an audience and a platform to communicate the values of these different technologies, and from our perspective, we would be more than happy to share the mic. You guys know more so than I do what the limitations are within a City of Seattle perspective than I do. And I'm never, ever, ever on the panel.

**David Doyle:**  I'm not signing up to speak on the panel, by the way. You asked about an example? The national government of Estonia have done an implementation using Blockchain. I thank that's probably most advanced. And I have one comment on open data and the intersection of that with Blockchain. A lot of the research that I read in my spare time points to the idea of it being permanent open data, which is a policy challenge for us because it means you can't get the data back once you've released it. And we have to have the ability to be able to retrieve data if we inadvertently release something that could cause harm. That's definitely a policy challenge.

**Ben Weagraff:** Those are the type of anecdotes, to be candid, that our audience are craving. Gibraltar is leaning in towards creating their own crypto currency. These are the types of anecdotes that we're hoping to get out of there. You shared something from Estonia. Estonia appears to always be first from an identity perspective. But at a municipal level, there isn't necessarily an Estonia equivalent, to the best of my knowledge. And to your point, how can Seattle do that? It would have to overcome these types of hurdles. Our audience welcomes those hurdles and they are certainly interested in those. And there are technologists out there that can figure that out if need be. And we'd love to pilot that conversation.

**Heather Lewis:** Are there any final questions or comment for Ben?

**Jose Vasquez**: Just what time is the event?

**Ben Weagraff:** Five thirty is networking. And the forum itself is at 6:30. Tickets are available on our web site.  [<https://www.mitefnorthwest.org/>]

**David Keyes:**  I have the link in the agenda, but if you wanted to send me a link to the listing of events or details about this event, I would be happy to share it around.

**Heather Lewis:** One last comment. You are a nonprofit. Are you looking for volunteers either for this upcoming event or for a future event?

**Ben Weagraff:** Just like every nonprofit, we are forever looking for qualified and capable volunteers.

**Heather Lewis:** Could you add your contact information to the white board, then, for anybody who is interested?

**Ben Weagraff:** Yes, I'll give Greta Knappenberger's. Greta is also a board member. Happy to do that.

**Heather Lewis:** Thank you for your time, Ben. Karia Wong has just stepped out, so maybe we'll do introductions when she returns. Which means our next agenda item is Julie Pham with Ion.

**ION COMMUNITY CREATING SOLUTIONS 2018 PROJECT RECRUITMENT**

**Julie Pham:**  My name is Julie Pham, and I head community engagement and marketing at Washington Technology Industry Association (WTIA). I just want to share a little bit about my background before I get into what the Ion program is. I grew up here in Seattle, and my first foray into the business world was by running my family's Vietnamese newspaper. I learned a lot about mobilizing communities, community engagement. And then after three years of running the newspaper, I realized I was working with [unintelligible] people. Half of them have the same last name as me, and I needed to go for bigger organizations. So then, I went from advocating on behalf of one under-represented minority to another. I have seen a lot of changes over the past -- I moved back in 2008 -- I've seen a lot of changes through the years. Now I'm at WTIA, and what we see is a lot of challenge and a lot of growing pains in Seattle. And there is this feeling of have and have not. The tech industry is driving a lot of that economic disparity and a lot of those growing pains. What I know, actually, from the tech industry and straddling both worlds, is that there are actually a lot of tech employees who want to do good. But they just don't necessarily know how.

In order to get anything done in Seattle, you have to know someone who knows someone. But what happens is everyone you know is like you. Last winter, WTIA decided to do this crazy experiment and see if there is a way that we can actually bridge tech and the community. Most collaborative efforts start with a problem. Like, oh we're trying to do work on homelessness, affordable housing. Let's get the experts around that. We decided, hey, why don't we do the opposite, and actually start with the people? What if we actually bring together really curious, passionate and committed people who come from tech, who come from government, and from community organizations who share the same values of equity who don't know how to approach it. What if we actually let them discover the community together and then decide on the problem they were going to work on, rather than saying you start with the problem.

To our surprise, we were actually able to recruit 18 volunteers. By design, one-third from tech, one-third from government, and one-third from community based organizations. And they were really diverse. We decided to not have limitations on where you are in your career; what your job title is; what your function is. So, we had coordinators, managers, individual contributors, directors, C-level people. We also had all functions. So there were human resources, marketing, finance, engineers, business development from small and large organizations. It started from [unintelligible] to Amazon and Adobe. We had four people participate from the City of Seattle, one from King County, another from the City of Bellevue. We also had organizations as small as community service to Seattle Goodwill. They were all ages, too. Baby boomers. millennials, and  Gen X-ers. They came from Renton, Kent, Issaquah, Bothell, and Bainbridge Island. Half of them were first generation immigrant refugees from Ethiopia, Somalia, Mexico, Chile, and all parts of Asia. Despite all of their differences, they actually had this one thing in common. They said yes to this experiment. They said they want to be part of this collaborative effort, even though they [unintelligible]. They want to help solve community problems even though they really don't know what they are. They are willing to give up 18 hours of their time a month for six months to work on this. Most importantly, they said, yes, I have a lot to learn about other people. I want to learn through doing, and I want to be a part of this. Those 18 people weren't the only ones to say yes. During the six month period, the first two months were what we called community discovery. There were 50 organizations that were interviewed by these 18 people. They went out in cross sector pairs. We included nonprofits, businesses, and governmental department agencies. We said we were going to take a cross sector approach to this.

People often ask me, what does success look like? You built this program. How do you measure success? I think we're really proud of the fact that we got 18 people who are really busy to give us 1500 hours over six months. The last half of that they built three projects that none of them knew they were going to do going into the program. They built three projects. They protoyped them. The implemented them, and then they found homes for them under budget. We're pretty proud of that.

I want to show you some images from that. I said I'd tell you what Ion means. Ion is not an acronym. You can see that the reason it's called Ion is we thought of all of these words that we want to use to describe the program. There was exploration, connection, action, collaboration. So that's where Ion comes from. There is also the idea that we can create a charge in our community.

This is a picture of the first cohort. They graduated at the end of November at what we call the Ionosphere, which is a designated space inside the Impact Hub. They really love the idea of what Ion is trying to achieve, and said let's designate one of the spaces that we have after the program. As you can see, there are just a lot of different people who just graduated, so they're pretty happy.

This is the process. There is the formation, exploration, ideation, solution. Then there is creation, execution, reiteration. We really like the Ion, as you can see. All this is to create the ionization. All of this strengthening of the community. Because the short term goal is to create practical solutions that the community can use, and might get adopted by businesses, nonprofits, or a government entity. And then the medium term goal is to deepen the capacity of the participants to innovate using new approaches that they encounter by being in Ion. The long term goal is to actually evolve this practice and this language of collaboration. A lot of the people who participate, they already come in knowing how to collaborate, but Ion gave them the unique opportunity to collaborate in different climates.

These are just the boards that were interviewed. You can see this whole different range of organizations.

The 18 people were divided into three teams. [Unintelligible], Livability, Economic growth, and Acceptability. And each of those teams , after a period of exploration, and discovery, then they decided what they wanted to work on, what they want to contribute. The Livability team actually decided not to do a tech project. They created a small group story sharing format. These are images from the trial run. They did a prototype of trying two different story telling formats, and then they used the one that won. They piloted it at the Seattle Public Library. Their result is actually a template for how to do this format that is now being adopted by [unintelligible]...Bellevue is going to do it with their employees. They talked to somebody at Seattle Housing Authority, and we actually have been talking to some of the former Ion members . Another team decided to build a neighborhood finder portal for Seattle. In one of their interviews, it came out that it would be really great to help people figure out where they can live with an easy commute time. The team came back and they said, well, we can do that, but the things that we care about are we actually want to help those who are trying to find affordable housing. There was someone from the City of Bellevue on that team, and he said, you know Seattle is so Seattle-centric. Let's also promote cities outside of Seattle, too. Two other members on that team, one was from community service and the other was Seattle Goodwill, and they said that a lot of the web sites are really kind of geared towards white collar workers. How do we actually think about the amenities and different things that other communities would want to consider. So it wasn't just that the teams heard, hey, I want you to do  this, and then they built it. They actually said, well, we hear what you are saying but we actually want to work on this. That was the result of their project. And then the last project is a web site to help employers learn about hiring formerly incarcerated individuals. This team interviewed a factory owner who hires formerly incarcerated individuals. And they were so inspired that they came back and said, hey, we really want to do something to help employers learn about this. So, there are lots of resources for helping clients, but there  aren't that many resources to inspire employers. So they actually created this and now this team, they couldn't find--one of the things we really want is for teams to find a host for the project, so that it lives on beyond their collaboration. This team wasn't able to do  it, because they really wanted to find a host that already has traction with employers. But they have said that they are going to stay together until they do. So they're still collaborating. At the end of this month, they're going to host a fundraiser at Amazon, because one member is at Amazon and she is excited about promoting this. And they're working now with What's Next Washington, which is a cool wishing group to help fund individuals. They want to link up with other people who are doing this work.

To that question of how do we measure success, it's really hard to measure the value of a relationship. And that's one of the things we're doing, we're building relationships among people who normally wouldn't work together. On one team, we've got someone who is at Amazon, when she had an issue with operations where she talked to her team mate about starting a union, which gave her a different perspective on what's happening. How often would a conversation like that happen?  One of the ways we do try to measure is we use network analysis, which basically means that we try to see the development of relationships over the course of a program. So, what you see here is potential for collaboration. Each of these nodes, the different colors, represent the different sectors. So orange represents tech, and green represents community based organizations, and the blue represents government. We basically ask them, before  this program what was your potential for collaboration with other people in this program. And then, after, what was your potential for collaboration. So, as you can see, before, especially with the tech, they are really isolated. They're out there; they're not with anyone. And then, afterwards, you can see this really dense clustering.

My ask is basically, we are recruiting for our second cohort right now. Because we are still in the experimental stage -- we just had a pilot, we learned a lot from the pilot -- we think that the second cohort will take on those lines but will still be experimental. So, we would like referrals. And, basically, we're looking for six employees working in tech, six employees working in government, and six employees working at a community based organization. That is my ask. To basically think about the people you know who would be good candidates for this. We're looking for people who are highly curious and who are open to ambiguity.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  I wanted to ask, would you send your information out to be distributed to this group?

**Harte Daniels:** May I ask that you add to the list to actually include the customer voice? Everybody you just mentioned is employed. How about the people who are so marginalized. It would benefit the other people on the project. They would have to learn how to work with other people, even those they are uncomfortable with, and would be able to break down compartmentalization, out of sight, out of mind, and change their viewpoint from I'm going to do something for or to someone. If you would be more inclusive. By the way, your work is already fantastic. Some of the basics have been done before, but obviously, it needs to be done over and over again. [unintelligible]

**Heather Lewis:** Thanks for that feedback. We have about two minutes for questions. Does anybody else have a question for Julie?

**David Keyes:**  Can you talk about how the projects are selected?

**Julie Pham:** The teams actually choose the projects. One of the members said, 'I've been in a lot of hack-a-thons and this still feels different,' because they go through this really uncomfortable period of discovery where they go and actively listen to people. Then, after that, they decide what they're hearing is needed. So that's how each team eventually comes up with their project.

**Heather Lewis:** And one more question?

**Jackson Brown:**   You said that this is the second iteration of your experiment. What are the potential differences between the first run and this new run?

**Julie Pham:** There is going to be some more training. There needs to be more interview training because not everyone knows how to interview. Also, we're looking at increasing socio-economic diversity, and also political diversity.

**Amy Hirotaka:** I just want to say that I worked with Julie and some other folks as they were building out the idea for this project. It's really thoughtful and she is doing an amazing job. I just wanted to thank her.

**Julie Pham:** Thanks to Facebook for being one of the sponsors, too.

**Heather Lewis:** Thank you, Julie, for your work, and for making the time to come speak with us tonight. Your information will go out with the minutes.

**Julie Pham:** Excellent. Thank you for giving me this opportunity.  Sorry for the tech issue.

**Heather Lewis:** I got a reminder from Cass Magnuski that we have to approve the agenda. Could I get a motion to approve the agenda?

**Jose Vasquez:** I move to approve the agenda.

**Heather Lewis:** Thank you.

**Steven Maheshwary:** Second.

**Heather Lewis:** Second from Steven. All in favor, please say, 'Aye.' Anyone opposed? Motion passes. We have had a couple of people enter the room after we did our initial introductions. Starting at the table, can we get quick introductions?

**Introductions**

**Heather Lewis:** Next up, we have David Doyle with the Open Data program.

**OPEN DATA UPDATE WITH DAVID DOYLE**

**David Doyle:**  I'm David Doyle, the Open Data manager here at the City. What I wanted to do is just give you an update. It's been a few months since I talked about anything that we're doing. I wanted to show some preliminary data on what we've done last year and then share our draft top priorities for this year, and get your feedback before we publish the open data plan. Feel free to stop me at any point with questions.

Everything I'm talking about here will be issued as a public report over the next two or three weeks.

Some of you may remember last year this was one of the top things that we wanted to achieve as a program. The first one was open data publishing. That was mostly internal. We built a lot of infrastructure to improve the process through which internal departments could identify and then release open data sets. We were actually able to proactively share that information with the public and say, 'Here are the data sets that the City plans to release in the year. So we're going through that process right now.

Improving the quality of the open data platform--that's actually a project we've got going on right now. We're basically auditing the platform with folks from the meta data layer. Looking at all fo the descriptive information within data sets, data sets that are stale, looking at data sets that don't have the right licensing, things like that.  We are cleaning all of that up. A lot of data sets have just gotten stale over time, and so we're probably a month or two away from being finished with that.

Increasing the discoverability of open data to our public. A bit part of that, some of you may remember that we launched a new design for data.seattle.gov in the summer. So that was a complete refresh. It's easier to navigate and is also mobile-friendly. The previous site was not. The work that we're doing with meta data will also help with discovering our open data sets as you search for data. It just improves the quality of those searches.

You may remember also that the Future of Privacy Forum, here last February, talking about privacy risk assessment on the open data program, issued a draft in August for feedback. We got a lot of feedback, which is great. They sent us, right before the holidays, the final draft of their public report, the assessment, but also a new model for reviewing data sets for privacy issues prior to release. We are actually reviewing the final draft internally right now, and we hope we can have FPF publish that in the next week or two.  Not a huge change between the draft and the new one. I'll touch on this again.

And the fifth one is just about increasing our awareness of our open data program. Personally, in my role, I've been pretty active out in the community, speaking at various events and conferences, and active on social media, through our blog, and so on. We have had a lot of awareness over the year, but we've definitely got more to do.

That's just a rough synopsis of what we did. It was really about stabilizing things just getting the baseline figured out, and so now we're going to start building some fun stuff.

This is preliminary data, but I want to share it to just give you a sense of what we did this year. We released around 70 data sets this year from 19 different departments. This number is wrong, actually. We're trying to figure out why we keep coming up with this number, but we released all those 71 data sets, well over 100 million rows of new data. So, it's a lot of information that we've been sharing. You can see it right down here which departments publish what data sets. And also down here you can see how we distributed the data sets throughout the year. This was actually pretty encouraging because in the past we used to have a big spike towards the end of the year because departments realized they hadn't published anything. What we've been doing now is trying to quell that culture of just releasing open data sets continually, and have it as a by-product of all the other work that departments are doing. We're making some progress there.

We even suggested the idea of, as those data sets go out, how many people are touching them. We haven't really advertised a lot of these data sets as people are currently seeking them. This is preliminary data, but we'll have more in the new report.

So, relatively successful. This is what I really wanted to share. This is what we want to do this year. This is super high level, and I'll break each one of these down a little bit.

The frst one is basic. We want to increase the automated publishing of open data sets. Right now, most of our data sets, I would say, about five percent of them are what we consider manual, one-time operations, where people have to go in and manually update them later. It's just not automated. We have automated data sets. If you look at our 911 data, for instance, it's continually updated.

We're setting some goals around increasing how many data sets are being published in an automated fashion, updated every few minutes, every few hours, every day, every week, every month, whatever the cadence is. That's part of making sure our data is high quality and it is continually refreshed. That just leads to a better experience for the public. We're doing some work internally on this, but we're also partnering pretty closely with Socrata.

We want to unlock more value from our open data platform. What we really mean by that is we've been creating data sets, tabbing the data sets, and pushing out a lot of data in that form. We haven't done as good  job of giving good use cases for people on how they can use our data. So we want to create more visualizations of the data. We want to create more spatial representations of the data through mapping. We're going to partner on that with our GIS team. We also want to think about things like leveraging machine writing techniques, thinking about natural language scenarios. Some of you may remember we did a hack-a-thon on Facebook a while ago where there were some very interesting projects that applied machine learning techniques to our open data platform, and built some really interesting applications. So people have started to look into that. We're also thinking about natural language scenarios, and taking our open data to the place where people are already accessing information. So, we're thinking about Siri or Alexa, or whatever, thinking about use cases where we could identify and supply data to support those, so that if you wanted information about the City, we could support that. It's more of an experimentation that we're doing at this point.

And then also the Privacy Risk Assessment, which I talked about. We are now in the phase where we're going to implement some recommendations. They provided a new model to assess data sets when it comes to privacy. So, we're actually looking at how do we program, how do we build something to allow people to do that, and generate data from that.

The fourth one is -- these are not in any sequence of priority. Earlier, I talked about in 2017, we were focused on the meta data there. In 2018, we want to go deeper. We want to go into the quality of the data within the data sets themselves. We're going to try to work with the departments in pushing some of that quality upstream, but also we are partnering with Socrata on some features that they're working on. We're hoping that in addition to having better quality data, and meta data, it's also a lot more data going out in automated fashion, really bringing up the level of the platform, as a whole.

And then finally, supply versus demand. This is something that we've been thinking about for a little while. What we mean by that is we are supplying open data sets proactively that we think the public wants, but we're not doing a great job of understanding what the public is actually looking for. And so, we're trying to figure out how to marry those two things and get them much closer. We actually have some work underway right now where we are analyzing all of the public disclosure requests that are coming into the City. We're extracting those out of the back end, and we're going to do some actual data processing techniques on data mining. figure out if there are ways to identify clusters of things that the public are asking for, and what kind of information people want. And then look at that along side of all of the other channels through which we get requests for information, bring it all together, see if we can figure out some key insights, some key words in clusters, that kind of thing. Like, here is what we're producing today and giving to people. Here is what they actually looking for. And figure out how we can better serve data proactively. This is a really interesting project, and we'll see how we get on with that. I thank the departments, open data champions, and public disclosure officers who have been pretty interested.

So that's where we're going this year. I just wanted to share that before the plan goes out, and give you the opportunity to give feedback and help us shape this. If anyone has any questions now, or else you can contact me later. My details are in the slides. Before I go to questions, we do have the privacy report [unintelligible]....

**Heather Lewis:**  Thanks for coming. We have time for one question.

**Torgie Madison:** We can we go to get the Privacy Risk Assessment?

**David Doyle:** The draft is online. I can put that in email in a few minutes. The one we have right now is internal to make sure that it's good to go. I'm guessing before the end of the month, it will be public. This will be a public report. We will make sure to release it on social media.

**Torgie Madison:** When the data sets are released, you mentioned that there are 71 of them. Is there a use case design behind the data that is released? Or is it more like we release it and you figure it out?

**David Doyle:** No, That's a great question. The model that we have here at the City is that each department owns the decision around which data they are going to release to the public. I don't own that decision. I just help support getting the data out. Basically, it's the subject matter expertise within each department that they come up with suggestions for data sets that they feel are the right fit for going out to the public. So, what we're doing with this one is saying, you have thta expertise, now how else can you cede ideas, come up with suggestions for new data sets. It's basically a way to try and bring those two things together. Maybe they are doing a really great job of proactively providing data to people, and maybe there are areas where they can actually find more. It's just a way to help get all the champions and data owners within the departments to have some information to help them make decisions on which data sets they should prioritize.

**Torgie Madison:** I like the idea of having some sort of example use case. Like, with this data, you could....

**David Doyle:** Some of these data sets take many months to generate just because they're huge. It's a lot of work.

**Heather Lewis:** We have time for one quick question. Do we have any more? Charlotte?

**Charlotte Lunday:**  Is there an overarching provision for the open data program? What does a successful program look like? What is the end goal?

**David Doyle:** I would say that the short answer is that vision is articulated in the policy. There are four goals in there. That's the overarching reasons why we're doing what we're doing. We are trying to make sure that everything that we are doing here aligns to one or more of those goals. But, definitely it's a great question, and I am in the process right now of taking advantage of a really great intern that we have, who is interested in doing program evaluation. So, I'm asking her to spend a few months actually evaluating our program and policy, not from the risk assessment point of view, but just from a policy program evaluation. And seeing that the original tent was this. Are we on the right track? Or do we need to tweak the policy and revisit our visions. That's my short answer. Hopefully, by summer or late spring, we might have something that we can share.

**Heather Lewis:** Thank you for sharing your evening with us, and for providing the update. Next up, we have the Digital Equity update from David Keyes.

**DIGITAL EQUITY UPDATE**

**David Keyes:**  I'm just going to talk through a couple of things, to give you a general picture of where we're at as we start the new year. Just one piece coming out of initial meetings that we had: the three Digital Literacy Network meetings just before Thanksgiving. Chris Alejano sent out the invitation for people to join a leadership group from that. So, we've got five people who have signed up for that with an interest in the Digital Literacy Network leadership group. If other are interested, please let me know. This month is taking what we've got from initial ideas from thta Digital Literacy Network, organizing those and pulling together the leadership piece to start moving ahead and picking which projects we're going to work on first with the Digital Literacy Network. That's my other question about projects, where we can link up with Ion for some of that, too. So, interest there.

We completed a whole set of initial work with the University of Washington Information School on the Digital Equity framework, and indicators, theory of change, set of measures. We started to take those measures, those outcomes that we are looking for, and measures of outcomes in the Digital Equity framework of connectivity, devices, and tech support, skills, capacity building, and trying to move that into an operational framework, starting with this year's grants and contracts. So, we've been spending a bunch of time on what are the data fields int the Tech Matching Fund, as we move forward, that we want to revise. So that we can be sure that we're capturing how many devices are going out to build capacity to community organizations, how many devices are going out to low income individuals, as we do that. Similarly, for connectivity.

A piece for this year, particularly in the skills framework, we identified about six different areas as goal areas, or subject matter areas on skills training, from gateway skills to applied life skills from ESL transportation and so on, to jobs skills, education skills, furthering education, parent engagement in technology, and business and entrepreneurship. One of the projects this year, I think, is working with the education community and identifying and settling in what are the common frameworks for the skills checklist in those different areas.

Then, we're going to begin compiling the 2017 year end stats: how much WiFi is used in our public settings, how many people we train, and so on. This year, we're also working on a group within the City that's working on  a new grants management system. We're going to launch the Tech Matching Fund on web grants, the old system, because the new one is not quite ready yet. But then, as the year goes one, and we start to do contracts and reporting, we'll head towards migrating the Tech Matching Fund to the new grants management system.

We've also started taking some of the indicators and working with the Associated Recreation Council that manages the Parks and Recreation community center tech labs, and they also do some of the WiFi management, the first line tech support on that, and on the kiosks in 29 different community centers.  We're working on getting a contract into place for 2018, and also to map out, as they're doing their program elements, they're starting to review their data gathering and evaluation, in mapping that to the Digital Equity indicators. That a nice movement to see.

I just want to mention, there was a second sheet that was being handed around here. It had a couple of events coming up. I don't know if everyone got one. I'll make more copies at break. But just a few events coming up. On the top half, the Office of Cable Communication has just set February 13 as a date for a morning workshop and forum on competitive broadband for multiple dwelling units. They will also have the results of some survey work of apartment and condo owners and dwellers. They'll be presenting there, and so we'll have information coming out  soon for that, for folks that are interested or if you work with housing developers. Next Century City, which does promotion of gigabit speed broadband around the country and does policy work on that municipal network. They have this cool mobile only for a day broadband challenge. Try going through your whole day using only your smartphone for all of your broadband. They want people to then report on that. You ready to do that? I just included the link here, or you can search on the Next Century Cities web site and find it. Part of that is to gather some information and story telling to share with the FCC as they look at whether mobile broadband is enough, and what should that speed be as a standard. I'm happy to explain more about that.

I included the Ion link here, too.

If folks are interested, April 17-19, the National Digital Inclusion Alliance is holding their national conference in Cleveland. They also do ongoing webinars and training. There was just a webinar today on the FCC Lifeline program, which I'll talk about in a second. But if you go to http://digitalinclusion.org, you can sign up. And also organizations can sign up to be affiliates, if you endorse the digital inclusion mission, like Latinos in Tech, for instance, should be a great organization to bring on board to say, yes, we affirm nationally digital inclusion. That's a way to do it and also get into that information loop around the country that's working on policy and so on.

Then, I wanted to mention, on the Lifeline program, there are another couple of sheets that I handed out, there is a comment period in front of the FCC. They had proposed reducing --  under Obama they had expanded Lifeline to include broadband, and to also allow broadband only providers and resellers to be eligible. So you didn't need to be a telephone provider, but you could just be a broadband provider. Like Mobile Citizen, it sells low cost mobile broadband hotspots for low income people and organizations. For instance, if you're getting it through that, or there are a couple of other major, and it may actually be a majority of people using Lifeline in the state get their Lifeline service through a mobile provider. I don't have the numbers in front of me. That had been starting to be implemented under Obama. Under the Trump administration, they put a freeze on authorizing those other providers of broadband and rolled back the eligibility, and they also proposed a rollback so that they would not include devices as part of that, or any device requirements. Which means that if somebody gets Lifeline and if they get Lifeline with a smart phone, then they could also use WiFi and not have to use up minutes or data, or they could just connect to somebody else's device. So the FCC has now made an announcement that they are going to execute that order. So, folks are rallying and submitting comments. The National Digital Inclusion Alliance has just published a template to submit comments and suggestions to the FCC on that. I think some of the stories you have from here in the past could be useful.

**Heather Lewis:** Could we share the address to access that?

**David Keyes:** Yes. I could send that out and send the template, and the sample letter that they have. I had some copies going around of that letter and the background on it.

**Heather Lewis:** Thank you for putting that together. We have a couple of minutes for Public Comment. Does anyone have an announcement or a comment that they would generally like to make? Jose?

**PUBLIC COMMENT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Jose Vasquez:**  The legislative session is now open in Olympia. I think it's a good opportunity to engage with our legislative officials on a lot of the issues coming up. I know there's a new Democratic majority. I don't know what that means, but I'm going to be participating in Latino Legislative Day, happening on February 6. If anybody wants to connect and maybe take a road trip down there, I'm definitely going to be bringing up the Lifeline program, net neutrality, and municipal broadband as topics of interest. If you have any other talking points that you want to talk through as I'm thinking of engaging elected officials down there, reach out to me during the networking break, or afterwards. Or feel free to reach out to your elected officials as they build their agenda. Now is the tiem to have those interactions.

This Saturday, Para Los Ninos in Burien are hosting a workshop on how to provide tools for parentsto engage with their kids at schools. They are asking for volunteers who want to come out and be there to maybe help answer questions that parent might have, especially from the tech sector. If you want more information -- I don't have the details yet, but if I get your contact info, I can send your more information once I get the final info.

**Heather Lewis:** Anyone else? Do I see Dorene Cornwell's hand?

**Dorene Cornwell:**  Two comment. One is that i was on the webinar today with regarding Lifeline, and I wonder if people have the bandwidth to compile comments because the comment period ends on  the 24th. So I think David's suggestion that we recycle some of the stuff we collected from net neutrality. Jose, I know that one of the issues about net neutrality is states that are trying to make net neutrality sustain, even if the FCC is against it. Have you looked at what pieces of legislation are up before the legislature. And the other piece is Trump made some comment at the Farm Bureau about rural internet access.

**Harte Daniels:** Making it easier for independent companies to put their towers or whatever on federal land. I don't know whether he's piggybacking. The state has something called Longnet, which is the backbone for responders that other communities along the backbone will be doing. His is just merely to say that it's okay for somebody to put their towers and make it easer to put their towers on public land. That's it. No money.

The Obama administration, in the State of Washington, does have the money for the one net. The reason that it is not going forward is that the vendors, the requests for proposals for it, are arguing. They're fighting, saying, "I should have gotten it, not the other person."  Because theyr'e ready to build it out, but they've been held up on that.

**Heather Lewis:** Thanks. We have time for one more quick question.

**Harte Daniels:** Tomorrow, there is a free webinar on reducing bias in mapping human geography. This is something that anybody can use:  worldwide working group that the U.S. State Department under the former administration ...[unintelligible]. The technology industry has a bad reputation on age discrimination, and I would like to see--I know it's a difficult topic--I would like us to think about making a statement about this ongoing discrimination. It has a ripple effect. But I don't want to take up too much of your time. We have income inequality. We're a difficult City to live in. Housing is not available, because older workers have to retire early because nobody will hire them. Good skills go to waste. You would re-do the work that somebody already has done, etc. There are a lot of reason not to do it, but I would like us to consider saying enough is enough.

**Heather Lewis:** That might be a project or a task to propose. We could have a side chat about that. We're going to take a 10-minute networking break now. And then we'll carry on the vice chair vote right after that. We will reconvene at 7:20, which is is a six minute break, to keep us on track. Hopefully, that's enough time for people to use the bathroom or to help yourself to some of the food over here.

**BREAK**

**Heather Lewis:** Thank you for bearing with us for the short break. Next item up on the agenda is nominations for a second vice chair. As many of you know, Chris Alejano, the initial vice chair, has accepted a job with Mayor Durkan, advising on education. We're thrilled for him, and know that he will be an asset to the Durkan administration, but we are down a chair. So, we will follow the same process that we followed in December, which means that people are able to either self-nominate, or nominate someone else. First of all, we will ask anyone if they are interested in nominating themselves. It is my understanding that Mark De Loura, who i on the phone, is interested in nominating himself. Are there any other self-nominees.

**Steven Maheshwary:** Can Mark speak for himself?

**Heather Lewis:** It is my understanding that Mark will be able to speak for himself.

**Steven Maheshwary:** Mark, are you able to hear us and speak?

**Heather Lewis:** Now, we have the opportunity for those who are interested in nominating someone else to nominate someone else. Just a reminder, this role is open to CTAB board members. It looks like Jose Vasquez would like to nominate someone.

**Jose Vasquez:** Yes. I would like to nominate Torgie Madison.

**Heather Lewis:** Okay. Would anyone else like to nominate someone?

**Amy Hirotaka:** Should I nominate Mark, since he's not ....

**Heather Lewis:** Let's do that for formality's sake.

**Amy Hirotaka:** Okay, I nominate Mark De Loura.

**Heather Lewis:** Okay, so we have two nominees. Generally, we would give each nominee an opportunity to speak to their goals for the year, or why they are interested in serving in this manner. It sounds like Torgie will be able t odo that. Mark is unable to hear us. So, let's start with Torgie and then maybe we can work out what it takes to reach Mark.

**Torgie Madison:**  First, I want to congratulate Chris Alejano, on his appointment to the Durkan administration. That's pretty awesome. Thanks to the board for giving me another opportunity to go through this process. If you voted for me last time, I would truly appreciate your support this time. Last time, I went through some of the accomplishments in the position that I have, and my experiences with the board so far. I don't want to repeat too much of that. But, looking forward, I think that my greatest priority in the vice chair role, would be helping Heather with process improvements, specifically around the process and pipeline of getting new board members' applications reviewed and approved in a timely manner. And with the new administration, helping with a fresh set of eyes and fresh enthusiasm, building inroads into the Durkan administration. Finding places n Seattle IT where we can be the best suited, and then I expect the position to overlap with my position as chair of the Privacy and Cyber Security committee. That is it. Thank you very much.

**Heather Lewis:**  Thank you, Torgie. I can pull up a statement from Mark De Loura, but hearing it from him would be better than hearing it from me. Thank you all for bearing with us.

**David Keyes:** Plain old telephone service. Here we are. I see that you've just logged back into Skype.

**Mark De Loura:** It looks like my web cam driver is not loading.

**David Keyes:** Okay. Do you want to share your statement on speakerphone here?

**Steven Maheshwary:** And you were nominated by Amy Hirotaka. Just FYI.

**Mark De Loura:** Thank you, Amy. Should I just read the blurb that I sent over?

**Heather Lewis:**  That would be great.

**Mark De Loura:** Awesome. Thank you. First off, hi, everybody. I've been watching you all and you're all beautiful at 7:20 p.m. I'm Mark DeLoura. I'm in Washington, DC, right now, having some meetings with the State Department and the department of Education, talking about computer science education, and some crazy STEM education stuff in Kenya, which is pretty exciting to talk about. I ran away from a dinner I was having with a bunch of Obama White House science and technology policy folks I used to work with, so I could jump in on the meeting. I'm just sitting here, reflecting over how that conversation reminded me of how valuable it is to work with groups like that, work with that federal network of experts. Being able to tap into that really helps us out a lot with things like the FCC comment that we did. And it's something that, if I was able to be vice chair on CTAB, I would be able to provide. Another instance where that came in really handy was the work that David Keyes has been doing with the National Digital Inclusion Alliance.

I have always felt that the states and the cities are living laboratories. It's important for us to stay in touch with the laboratories, or it's sort of a waste of time. We talk about the Department of Education being a bunch of different systems. They don't talk to each other. Nobody learns best practices. Through these networks, I hope to be able to help to leverage and inform. So that was one thing I wanted to say.

The other thing I wanted to say is we should have conversations around how we can continue to improve the size of CTAB, as well as increase our engagement with the community. As a lifelong data developer, I think engagement is always one of the things that I'm always paying attention to quite a bit. How do we bring people in, attract people to the work we've been doing. But beyond that, find ways to enlist them in the work that we're doing. It's great if we can get people to come into the room, but if we don't have things for them to do, employ their particular skills, we're going to lose them right away. We need to consider the work that we're doing, and how we can leverage the powers of everybody that comes to the meetings.

Those are just a couple of quick thoughts that I had, listening in on the board meeting today. I want to thank you all for considering me for the vice chair role. I've had a lot of fun over the past two years, and look forward to collaborating with you all in whatever role I have. So, thank you.

**Heather Lewis:**  Mark, thank you for leaving your Obama colleagues to speak to us tonight and for joining the meeting. And we clearly have two very valuable and appreciated candidates here tonight. I'm going to ask each of the CTAB members to add their vote. One name. You can vote for either Mark De Loura or Torgie Madison, and then pass your ballot up here. And we'll do a tally. Do I have all of the ballots. Karia, are you still voting? I'm sorry. I didn't mean to rush you.

**VOTE TALLY**

**Heather Lewis:**  Ready? Okay. I'm going to read out the votes and Steven is going to keep track of the tally. First one is one vote for Mark. Next is one vote for Torgie. Next is one vote for Torgie. One for vote Torgie. One vote for Mark. One vote for Mark. One vote for Torgie. One vote for Mark. By my math, unless I'm missing something, that's 4-4.

**Comment:** Did Mark vote?

**Heather Lewis:**  Mark, you have not voted.  Text your vote or email your vote to David Keyes, but you will be the tie breaker. Apologies for the lack of oversight on that one. Mark, would you be so kind as to anonymously vote. We need a record of this. Sorry about that, Mark.

**David Keyes:** Heather, here is this anonymous vote that just came in. Democracy is messy.

**Heather Lewis:**  All right. So Mark will be the next second vice chair. We look forward to working with Mark in that capacity. Thank you all for voting. Next up on the agenda, we are going to describe the three committees.

**David Keyes:** And then, just text me if you want to join one of the committees.

**Heather Lewis:**  David Keyes, would you be so kind as to pull up the Durkan letter, just so we can hand it out to the committees?

**David Keyes:** Can you actually mention, too, about Chris Alejano? I don't think you stated at the meeting why Chris is not here? Just to get that on the record.

**Heather Lewis:**  Oh! Okay. Just to make sure that it's on the record, Chris Alejano, who was a CTAB member, and was the initial second vice chair of CTAB, has joined the Durkan administration. He will be advising Mayor Durkan on education policy. So, we are thrilled for Chris. And that is what led to the rather messy vote that we just carried out a moment ago. Again, congratulations to Chris. We are thrilled for him and know that he will be a huge asset, and we look forward to working with him in his new capacity.

**Cass Magnuski:** Has he left the board?

**Heather Lewis:**  He has left the board. No member of the City of Seattle can also participate on a community board or commission.  So, his acceptance of this new role in the Durkan administration necessitated his stepping away from the board.

Next up, we will be discussing the three committees that we will be working with this year. The first is Digital Equity. I'm going to read out the description, for those who maybe can't see the points on the screen. What we will be doing is ensuring all Seattle residents and neighborhoods have the information technology needed for civic and cultural participation, employment, lifelong learning, and access to essential services. Access to essential services is CTAB's long term vision. This necessarily includes the board's continued and historic work on facilitating the Technology Matching Fund process, and advising the City on broadband internet franchise agreements. CTAB also partners with Seattle IT, to cultivate a digital literacy network comprised of community members, community based organizations, and local businesses who want to advance a digital equity and literacy agenda. For those who might be curious, the Digital Equity Committee then absorbs two previous committees: the Broadband Committee and the Digital Equity Committee. That work was increasingly overlapping, especially as we look to other forms of internet service delivery.

I'm going to read through the other two and then we are going to take ten minutes to quickly join into groups for those who are interested in potentially participating in the Digital Equity Committee, the Privacy and Cyber Security Committee, or the Smart Cities and Community Innovation Committee, to quickly get to know each other, and do a quick survey on when it might make sense for either the January or February meeting to take place. We need to agree on a day of the week. We can follow up with each of the committee leads to determine exactly when those meetings will take place, and where they'll take place. And then we'll follow up on the CTAB agenda notes. So, I'm going to read through the next two.

Privacy and Cyber Security: In an increasingly networked world, it has become even more important to help our community understand data privacy and security. CTAB ants to support City initiatives, and help support digital equity, with an emphasis on helping the community use technology with an understanding of the needs of privacy and security.

Last committee: Smart Cities and Community Innovation: Seattle citizenry and home grown companies are well known internationally for its innovation and technological know how. In that spirit, CTAB is committed to helping the City tackle urban challenges like traffic congestion, fostering economic growth, improving the delivery of government services through Seattle's Smart City initiatives. CTAB looks forward to supporting the emerging work stemming from Seattle IT and other departments within the City that are working on technological solutions, to improve systems, and the day to day life of Seatteites.

Those are from three committees that we'll be working on this year. There may be other projects that are proposed throughout the year, but these are the three large buckets of work that we'll be focusing on. It is 7:40 right now. We will take ten minutes, and we need to be prompt with that, to quickly, for those that are interesting, get to know or serve on one of these committees to get together and  take a quick survey of which day of the week might work, as well as which time might work for your first meeting.

In the far back corner over here, we can have the Digital Equity Committee. You'll be gong over here to this corner. Far back corner over here, we will have Privacy and Cyber Security. And then, on this wall, we will have the Smart Cities and Community Innovation Committee. We will be reconvening at exactly 7:50. Please take a quick survey as to which day of the week might work for you, and what time might work for you.

**COMMITTEES FORM**

**Heather Lewis:** All right, everybody please go back to your seats. Thank you to everyone for your brief conversations. Of course, there are details still to come. But the point of the quick chat is to get us to when a meeting might work. If we could get a representative from each of the committee to provide that information. Could we get someone from the Digital Equity meeting to give a quick update on when their first meeting of 2018 might be?

**Steven Maheshwary**: Yes. Tentatively, it's scheduled for January 16, 6:00 p.m;, at the Starbucks on Capitol Hill at 1600 E. Olive. We're still soliciting information from interested people, so that is subject to change. But we'll send out an email.

**Heather Lewis:** Great. We can send out a follow up, and we can add each of these to our notes that will go out with our minutes from this evening. Next, can we get the information from the Privacy and Cyber Security Committee?

**Torgie Madison:** Yes. Historical meetings were at the Seattle Public Library Montlake Branch. I'm going to try and keep them there. I think what I'm going to do to solicit interest here in this room for Privacy and Cyber Security is email the existing list, and also get Christopher, the previous chair of the committee, get his previous list of members who were going to that meeting. I don't think they're here right now. I'm going to try for third Wednesdays of every month. That would be the 17th of this month at 6:30, Seattle Public Library Montlake. That's very tentative. I'm going to get feedback from the list on exactly who is interested this time around, and what their  schedules are.

**Heather Lewis:** Historically, that has been a small but very engaged group, so thanks for your leadership there.

**Torgie Madison:** I'm going to try to expand that.

**Heather Lewis:** Lastly, we have the Smart Cities and Community Innovation group.

**Scott Wang:**  This is a brand new committee, and we're still working on priorities for the City. The group will send out contact information to all. We're looking at the first meeting occurring sometime in early February.

**Heather Lewis:** I will follow up directly outlining what happens in the Smart Cities space. You need to reach out to David Keyes and the Seattle IT team, or I am happy to help find spaces.

**Ben Weagraff:**  I have a space where you would be more than welcome for those meetings.

**Heather Lewis:** Thank you all for engaging and humoring me in that quick first discussion. Typically, the way we have done it in the past is the first meeting for each committee has been a discussion of strategic planning for the year, or what it is you would like to achieve. And then, the team builds out some shared goals and objectives. We look forward to hearing back from you in February, and potentially in the Smart Cities and Community Innovations case, in March, after you have had a chance to have that conversation.

**ACTION ITEMS**

**Heather Lewis:**This is the last item on the agenda, which is wrapping up. Our action items for the evening: I will follow up with each of the committees to ensure that we have the correct date and times for your first meetings. And we are certainly happy to help with support if you are looking for meeting space. David Keyes, did you have other items on your end?

**David Keyes:**  Quick mention of something that maybe we can bring to the next meeting. One of the things that CTAB worked on a while ago was changing the rules so that ore telecom cabinets could be placed on the street and enable Century Link to build out its broadband service. A fun, cool thing: a group just finished doing an art project in South Park, where they did wrap around art on those cabinets in collaboration with Century Link, and I think, with Comcast, too. That might be just a fun thing to share out. If you're in South Park, look for those cabinets. I know for the next meeting, we did have Ginger Armbruster, who is going to come and talk about the Surveillance Ordinance piece. There is some interest in the things going on around the low income internet program. WAVE is about to roll out their low income internet program, so we want to do an update. I will send out a notice about the multiple dwelling unit workshop, as part of my follow up. I've got a couple of other follow ups to do. The Digital Equity Committee start initial planning work on our next round of the Community Technology Access and Adoption survey. It's a community survey about that level of access.

**Heather Lewis:**  Cass Magnuski saw a headline while we were having our discussion groups.

**Cass Magnuski:**  Democrats just forced a Senate vote on net neutrality. That means that if the Republicans vote against it, they will have to wear it in November.  So, there is some hope. Salon just published this.

**Torgie Madison:** There have been some outspoken GOP members of Congress who have also expressed that they are not going to support Ajit Pai in the revocation of net neutrality.

**Heather Lewis:**  Well, we look forward to watching that conversation unfold. And, unless anybody else has a final thought to add, the meeting is adjourned on time. We look forward to seeing you in February.

**MEETING ADJOURNED**