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**Mark De Loura:** Well, let's kick it off. I'm going to be standing in for our Chairperson, Heather Lewis.  I'm Mark De Loura. I'm the vice chair of CTAB. Let's start off by going around the room and introducing ourselves.

**Introductions**

 **Mark De Loura:** Thank you all for being here. We've got a pretty packed schedule. Have you all seen the agenda? the first thing we should do, though, is a little bit of administration. We have the January minutes. If any board member has seen the minutes, and would like to move to accept them.

**Torgie Madison:** I move to approve.

**Eliab Sisay:** Second.

**Mark De Loura:** All in favor, say aye. Motion carries. Thank you!

**David Keyes:** If you want to give me feedback, I just did something different with the minutes this time online. We can work on just doing the quick agenda summary, here, and then, I embedded the document with all the details so you can just scroll down. And then, the presentation that was done at the meeting from WTIA. I just did that instead of the running transcript, so you can click on that and download it, scroll through it.

**Mark De Loura:** We should put that up on our Facebook page. February agenda approval. Would anybody like to move to accept?

**Amy Hirotaka:**  I so move.

**Torgie Madison:** Second.

**Mark De Loura:** All in favor, say aye. Thank you very much. Motion passes. I'll dive right back in, then. I believe that we have a couple of great presentations, starting with David Harris. Do you want to introduce yourself?

**INNOVATOR IN RESIDENCE FELLOWSHIP**

**David Harris:**   I probably won't use the whole time. I just want to update the board on a project that I'm working on. My name is David Harris. I'm the Startup Advocate for the Office of Economic Development, here at the City of Seattle. My role is in two parts: One to help connect tech startups, specifically, with information; and the other half of my job is to help connect under-served communities with the tech industry. One initiative on that side of things connecting communities, that I work on is the Tech Hire Initiative. Tech Hire is an initiative started by President Obama back on 2015. And in 2016, the City of Seattle designated a Tech Hire Community. Since then, there are 72 different communities around the country that share resources and best practices around connecting people who and under employed or unemployed with tech jobs. Here in the City of Seattle, we expressly work on helping women, people of color, and the formerly incarcerated get connected to opportunities in the tech industry. So, we've done that in a number of different ways. Specifically, helping to bring employers, community organizations, and accelerated training providers all to the table around a goal of getting at least 2,000 people trained and placed by 2020. Compared to other cities, we have a lot going on in that regard. There are probably about 20 different coding bootcamps in the Seattle area, and they range from different flavors of free to $10,000 per course, to online, to in person data science, to web development. But we, particularly, really love the nonprofit organizations that are mission aligned. I'll mention a couple: Ada Developers Academy, that works on software training for women and non-binary gender people. Also, Floodgate Academy, which is led by black and brown people and works expressly with black and brown communities. And also, Unloop, which works with the formerly incarcerated and currently incarcerated.

I've noticed, in my role of helping to get resources for these different organizations is that there is a big push to skill up a lot of people and get them access to jobs, but there is still kind of a wall that a lot of organizations and their people are hitting. After going through a course and learning how to code, we still need to convince employers that they should hire you.  We still have a lot of work in convincing employers that there are people with skills that should get a shot at getting a job in some of their companies. They might not have a four-year computer science degree, but it might be worth it to give them a shot. One thing we think would help a lot is a kind of 'Catch 22' scenario, where employers are looking for people with experience, but we're hoping that employers can give some of our candidates experience so that they can have the experience to get experience. That's one thing. And another thing we've noticed is that a lot of jobs, as we know, come from your networks. So, we think  that helping people build networks into the industry is just as important as building skills.

That being said, the Office of Economic Development had a chance to really brainstorm with our counterparts and our different teams, working with our workforce development team, being on the entrepreneurship and industry team, we're looking at various sectors, especially emerging industries. We realize that we could think outside of the box and try some new things and help learn more about this alignment of resources. We came up with an idea to have a fellowship, called the Innovator in Residence Fellowship, where we actually target zip codes with low economic opportunity and access to opportunity, and high risk and displacement, and work on really concentrating opportunities for connection with the tech industry in those neighborhoods. But also, work on getting networks established and also hands on experience in the tech industries, specifically in the emerging industries. There is a concept called the Fourth Industrial Revolution, and that is just blurring the real world and the tech world that we are right in the middle of. Seattle has a lot going on in that regard. Because the participation of disenfranchised communities already in the tech industry, we want to think ahead to these emerging industries and not have to repeat the same story.

What this fellowship looks like is a nine to twelve month opportunity where participants aged 18 to 24, get a chance to dive into software development, data science, and other foundational skill building training for three months, as well as, as they're going through the training, have connections with industries through events and meet-ups. But then, also have an opportunity to work inside their neighborhoods and their communities with other community-based organizations, and building products and projects that are explicitly for those community-based organizations. Through building those products, they will have a private sector employer that would actually take them on as an intern, and we think it's an interesting model to bring the City, community-based organizations, for profit private sector partners, as well as social enterprise partners that bring support around case management and other things that are needed when engaged with job training all together to the table to help these participants have this experience that is relevant to their communities and relevant to the skills that they will need to be in this emerging industry that we're in. As an example of that, I was actually speaking with Heather Lewis last week, and she said she would share this with this group. A project that we're working on and have been exploring is working with the Rainier Beach Action Coalition, which has a food innovation district project that they've been working on for a number of years. we teamed up with SIXER, which stands for Simulated Immersive Experiences in Reality. They are the production agency that also does a lot of community oriented events. We've done some brainstorming with them and also some tech training providers to figure out what a project for Rainier Beach Action Coalition would look like. We're all excited because they are looking to create an experience in the virtual world that is language agnostic with all the different cultures and languages that are spoken in Rainier Beach, but also highlight some of the different foods that actually bring a lot of people together. As they are working on their food stands and other projects, they are hoping that this project will help to bolster momentum around that, and also at the same time, give the students, aged 18 to 24, in that community opportunities to work on something that is relevant and ahead of its time. That's an example of some of the projects we're working on. We're also looking for other projects. I think, going forward, that the City's Office of Economic Development will be to look for opportunities to align these different partners that are already doing great work, but bring them all to the table for an opportunity to do something impactful as well. So, that's my spiel. Any questions or feedback? I can also give my email address.

**Mark De Loura:** Anybody have any questions?

**Eliab Sisay:** How can we be of help? Is it just in getting the word out?

**David Harris:**  Definitely in getting the word out when the time is right. We're hoping to launch this by April. We're currently working on the selection process. We really want that to be equitable and really targeted at the people that are in those communities that I mentioned. That's one way. The other way is, we're always looking for new ideas. I think that's the most fun I've had on this project, really thinking ahead about some of the different projects that people can work on, and companies and organizations that they can come together around, For instance, I've had the chance to talk with some mobility companies around data science opportunities, specifically in the neighborhoods where the participants come from. We're looking at opportunities for user research and user centered design, and teaching those skills as well, and benefitting organizations that provide opportunities. Ideas for projects is another great way to go.

**David Keyes:** The folks that are going to go through that, will they have already gone through one of the coding academies, or is this baseline, start with this fellowship?

**David Harris:**  I think it all depends. There might be a cohort. The first cohort, we're looking to have them go through training. We talked to some organizations that already have students that will be graduating and are looking for internships right away. So, with another cohort, we might be able to start them right after they come from training.

**David Keyes:** We have a project like the Ethiopian Community Center, which right now is looking for help with developing their Wordpress site with all their materials, getting that translated, getting a server and their content set, design and so on. Is that the kind of thing you are looking for? Are you expecting a range of things, or is that the kind of thing that could be a potential project?

**David Harris:**  I am expecting a lot of opportunities like that, and we're really excited about it. Startup Seattle had opportunities in emerging industries. My research from venture capital investment has pegged things like artificial intelligence and blockchain distributive technology, as well as virtual reality as some of the big things that are upcoming. While we don't think that we can just plop somebody in the middle of those things, we want to think about how the skills that we bring to the table in the projects that we work on can at least give people some acclimation to those industries. If we could think more around how an opportunity in redoing a web site can also lead to baseline training for other skills and there are opportunities to stack on top of that that leads them down that path....

**David Keyes:** Could be data base design, virtual reality.... So companies are interested in learning more. Should we be sending them information?

**David Harris:**  Yes, so far it has been great just to sit down with companies, just to learn more about what some of the roles that they're hiring for, and whatever they can share about future, upcoming projects that they're working on. We're envisioning some great conversations around that. At least we can start the conversations and think about what sorts of opportunities that we can start to align with their companies and the other organizations that we're working with.

**Mark De Loura:** How can people get in touch with you?

**David Harris:**  My email is just like my name. david.harris@seattle.gov, and I'm hoping -- mostly Mondays through Thursdays -- to speak more.

**Mark De Loura:** Sounds good. Thank you for presenting. All right, Chance. It's all you.

**TECHNOLOGY ACCESS AND ADOPTION SURVEY**

**Chance Hunt:**  My name is Chance Hunt, and I am the broadband community technology manager. This evening, we're going to do a short presentation for you about the upcoming survey, the Community Technology Access and Adoption Survey. This is a piece of work that has been happening since the year 2000, about every four years. David Keyes and others have been really amazing leaders in this work, which, every four years or so, telling a new story about technology and the way people are accessing it. As technology has changed over this last almost 20 years now, how that is changing peoples' behaviors and expectations.

For the last survey, the data was collected in 2013. The report came out in 2014. Some key take-aways, four or five years ago, we had about 15 percent of our population who didn't have a reliable access to broadband in their homes. That about 90,000 residents. We were starting to see a marked uptick in terms of cell phone ownership, and particularly around smart phone ownership four or five years ago among our population. And we were also starting to see that access to the internet, though important, less of an issue than peoples' need to develop skills in order to navigate the information, navigate the technology, navigate the internet increasingly important. Here we are now. Fast forward five years later. We expect to learn a lot more. A lot has changed in that time. Technology usage has changed. Certainly, the City of Seattle, in terms of what we produce and what we make available to residents in an online format, sometimes online format only, has certainly become more prevalent. We're politically in a different place. We have Council Districts now, versus not four or five years ago. We also have seen a lot of change in our population. So, as we go into this work, we're looking at who we are and the way that we interact with technology, what the barriers might be, where the needs might be. We expect to learn yet more and new information that we hope doesn't just tell us what to do as a City, where should we put that next investment, particularly around issues of digital equity or trying to close a digital divide here in the City, but how do our City departments use this information when they are deploying more and more app-based, or technology-based, kiosk-based types of interactions with residents.

The nonprofit organizations that we work with, and who are also serving the same clientele, how might this help them make choices as far as how they're communicating and interacting with their populations. So, we think there's great potential for what this information will yield for us. What we've done for you for tonight is invited Pacific Marketing Research. This is Chelsea and her team. This is just a representative group. There are more working back at the home office, as it were. So, Chelsea going to lead you through a short presentation to give you a sense of what we hope to learn in our approach to the work. We've done some work already with City departments. We did a bit of a town hall just to begin to engage during this first phase, the discovery phase, if you will, to test our hypotheses, to think about our approach and how that may be a workable solution here in Seattle. And this will be followed up after tonight's presentation. We're in the process of setting up some one-on-one discovery opportunities. I know that Karia Wong is one of the folks we'll be talking to. John Krull from the school district is another. Just to really get a sense of what we need to be cognizant of as we move into this first phase of research. The other thing I'll add before handing it over to Chelsea is because the technology is changing so rapidly, because peoples' access and adoption rates are ever-changing, we also see this as perhaps a new baseline, if you will. And it's very likely that we cannot wait another four years after this process to do the next survey, the next pulse checking. We're hoping that this particular project starts to show that to us, find ways to interact with the public, either more deeply, as we uncover needs, but also, in a more frequent way. We have a lot of work ahead of us in this first phase of research collection, but it will not be the last time that we will be interacting with the public around this topic. There is too much happening too quickly, and we need to make the best investments that we can. So, I'm going to turn it over to Chelsea, who will walk through the slides, and we'll have a few minutes for questions when she is finished.

**Chelsea Benning:** Thank you. For those of you who were not here when we introduced ourselves in the beginning, my colleagues, John Cell and there are several others back in the office, and they may jump in if somebody asks me a question that I can't answer, they are the keepers of lots of pieces of information.

Some of the things I think Chance talked about a little bit, and I only have about ten minutes worth of content here, so we wanted to  give some opportunity for you to ask questions, or to comment on what we have done so far. This is very much the beginning of this massive effort to, first, really understand where the digital use and adoption rates are in the City of Seattle residents, as well as their access points or barriers, some of the things that Chance already talked about a little bit.

The slides that I have today go through the why we are doing it, which Chance spoke to, the how we are doing it, without going into more detail, because I certainly would love to hear some of the comments as we present it, and then a very high level of what questions we are going to be asking. I have a lot of other content, as well, but I did want to keep this fairly brief.

The Statement of Problems is where we start off with is trying to take a very 30,000 foot view, and try to understand what exactly it is that we're trying to measure here. This is just a statement of our recognition that there is a digital divide that exists in the City of Seattle, and that by closing that gap, closing that divide, it will create a healthier populace. So we believe that to be true as we go into this research effort.

Our goal: On a very high level, we have a very detailed list of objectives, as well, that, if anyone is interested, we certainly can circulate. That is continually being updated and refined as we do some of these discovery opportunities that Chance mentioned, and we'll be continuing to do. But the goal at the very high level is to understand the current level of the City of Seattle's populace in terms of how they engage on digital connectedness. We do want to make sure that we understand that for several key areas, including the communities of color, non-English speakers, people with disabilities, older adults are some examples. Some of the other research that we have been reviewing has shown that these are most impacted or can be impacted by the digital divide in greater levels. We also note that previous national studies have found pretty strong linkages between home broadband internet adoption with things like educational success, income, etc.

You think I'm talking fast? the reason why is I have such an amount of content, so I definitely do tend to go fast.

We do hope to identify specific strategic and tactical things in order to increase this level of digital connectedness and ultimately lower the digital equity divide.

Any comments, so far, in terms of what we're hoping to achieve at a very high level? Any additional detail that you would like to know about why we are doing this, how it is similar to the past studies and how it might be different, before I go into the how?

**Cass Magnuski:**  Is this the new Indicators Report?

**Chelsea Benning:**  It is!

In terms of the study approach, this is one of the areas in which we are taking a pretty large step away from the past ways in which the Indicators Report was compiled, and that data was collected. In the past, it has been a combination of telephone interviews, as well as online interviews, as well as some focus groups with particular under-served. For various reasons, we feel that that probably had some challenges, and so we have proposed and are planning a pretty different approach. There is, as we know, a lot of change in the use of telephones. A lot of people are cell phones only. That is a situation that didn't exist as much in 2013. Many individuals have lots of ways in which they can block numbers, or cannot be accessed via cell phones. There are plenty of people with online access, but individuals who may be most impacted by the digital divide may have challenges with online access, so we're concerned about using that as a primary method of data collection when we are attempting to measure the digital divide. So we have chosen to go back to what we would call an address-based sampling method, or ABS, which is basically, in fancy terms, a mailing survey. This is the way in which we know, and we have seen research that supports the best way to reach the most number of individuals in the City of Seattle. It does include about 95 percent of all residents who can be reached through an address-based sampling method. We do recognize that there are certain groups that may be insecurely housed, or not housed at all and we do have a plan to address those. Or we are talking about plans to address those. But we do feel that this is a very good coverage level for he largest number of individuals. We also recognize that there are certain populations that are less likely to respond to a mailing survey. And so we do plan to over-sample those individuals in certain key areas where they are going to be less likely to respond. Those tend to be areas of many of the under-served communities that we've already talked about, individuals who are of lower socio-economic status in certain areas of the City. So we will be over-sampling in those areas. That provides a little more detail. We will be offering the survey in English and Spanish, and we are also exploring other options in order to address other languages. That is still somewhat in flux. We are doing 15,000 mailings and we expect to get about 1,800 returns. That is the number that we are shooting for. This does allow us to then segment the results by Council District. Also mentioned previously, we are mailing to over-sample in certain areas to ensure that we get an adequate representation of areas that we know will be lower response. As I also mentioned, we will be doing -- or we are planning to do -- follow up research with additional subgroups of interest. That is a TBD at this point. It does somewhat depend on some of the community partner interviews that we are currently undertaking. It also depends on some of the things that we learn in this first population level. That's a pretty high level view of how we are going to do it. Any comments, questions?

And then, finally, the what. This is a very brief questionnaire outline of the types of information that we are going to be collecting. We have much more detail that is already beginning to be formulated, as well as continually speaking with lots of individuals both within the City, as well as out in the community in order to refine this and create the ultimate questionnaire that will be reflective of the goals and the objectives, but also meet the needs of the City to the best extent that it can be possible. We have it divided into five areas. Behaviors: Currently, what they are doing, the levels that they are currently accessing, how they are accessing it, and the reasons why they're accessing, what types of activities that they are currently doing, the reasons why they are not accessing for some things or all things, their attitudes and perceptions not only of the technology that they are currently using, but other types of technology, some of their fears, some of their reasons behind engaging or not engaging. That will allow us to build models to understand the City populace from more than just what they are currently doing, but also what they may continue to do, and how much of  their behavior we can expect to change over time, and that will allow us to better plan strategies and tactics. And then, of course, demographics, types of questions that help us understand inherent groups and the inherent market structure within.

Again, a 30,000 foot level view.

This is the timeline, very general. We are working here in February, so we are in the questionnaire development stage right now, and that will continue through until March, when we will begin our data collection efforts. That will be our mailings. We do plan on doing several mailings. We don't expect to get the types of returns are projecting with just one mailing. So, we do have a fairly long data collection period planned to allow individuals to either mail back the survey. They will also be offered options to call in and have the questions administered to them over the telephone. They will be offered the option to go online and fill out the survey, if they would prefer to do it that way. We also are working with community partners, as well, to offer assistance for individuals who are unable to complete the survey. It is a household level survey, and not an individual level survey. That is one thing I didn't mention earlier that is a little bit different from the impact survey in the past, which has been very individually focused. There was no way to control how many individuals, or even to know how many individuals from the same household could potentially have responded. It was possible that two individuals could have technically responded. And this one will attempt to do much more of a household level, so we could understand the household as a whole, including children, older adults, or individuals that wouldn't be able to respond themselves to the survey.

May/June is the analysis reporting, and then we will be wrapping up this population level survey in the mid-summer, and moving on to additional efforts, as identified. See? I talk so fast that I'm on to questions!

**Karia Wong:** I'm just wondering, how many questions will there be on the survey?

**Chelsea Benning:** Well, it will depend on a few things, although obviously, we recognize that we have limitations. that we will have to make it fairly simple because it will be a mailing survey. We're planning an eight-page booklet, so it's really four pages, front and back. Most of the questions will be designed for everybody to answer, but there will be a few where, perhaps, they will skip sections. It's really hard for me to say an actual number of questions, but it is designed to be something that you could fill out thoughtfully in less than ten minutes, give or take the amount of effort that the individual wants to put into it. but we understand that it is best practices to not create an onerous thing that individuals just look at and see it as a test. I know that doesn't really answer your question, and I apologize. Depending on the format of the questions, it will probably be anywhere between 40 to 60 questions.

**Karia Wong:** The reason why I'm asking is because we do have to actually implement a survey that is about 100 questions. We were told that the survey takes about 30 minutes to 45 minutes. But it takes -- for my folks to fill that out -- the survey was translated into Chinese, and it takes about one and a half hours. Because some of the terms people might not be able to understand right away, so they have to ask.

**Chelsea Benning:** Yes, I would have to say that when I say designed for somebody to take it in the English language. Obviously, when you do translate it into another language, it does expand out the time fairly significantly. The reason why I kind of hesitated on the number of questions is because, if it's a hundred separate, very distinct, questions, some of which are open-end, and you have to respond with a verbatim response, those can take much longer than attribute types of questions, where it is quickly check the box. Like, 'Do you have a smart phone? Do you have a laptop?" I'm just giving you an example. Those can be very, very quick when administered in the English language to a fluent English speaker. I do think that, yes, it will probably be a little bit longer for somebody that will take it in another language, or was having it administered to them, but certainly not 30 to 45 minutes, or absolutely not an hour or an hour and a half. It is designed to be a relatively straight forward instrument which to take with a lot of questions that are about current behavior as opposed to ones that would maybe create more thought.

**Karia Wong:** One more thing that I would like to mention is about the terms in English, because there are a lot of terms in English that are hard to translate. For example, cop in and cop out. Even though we might be able to translate it into Chinese, people might have a hard time, depending on their literacy level, understanding what exactly it means. When they look at a word separately, they may be able to understand. But when we put the translation together, then they will have a hard time. They have to guess.

**Chelsea Benning:** Absolutely. Certainly, I can speak a little bit to the Spanish language translation. Pacific Market Research owns another division called the Team of Decisions, which has some of the pre-eminent are very highly trained in cultural literacy in Spanish, and can help us navigate those particular areas. Certainly, for other languages and how we approach those, we're not currently planning on translating, ourselves, into other languages. We may come up with a solution to provide an option, somebody who speaks certainly the seven languages that are identified by the City of Seattle as under the race and social justice initiative, Mandarin, Cantonese, etc. We are hoping to identify people in the community who will be able to assist in translating that. That is currently our plan, but certainly, we would love an opportunity to have resources to at least flag those areas of the questionnaire where we are going to need to be particularly cautious when it is translated.

**Chance Hunt:**  I just wanted to say that that is the one of the reasons that this discovery phase that we're doing, both departmental conversations and these one-on-one conversations to really kind of get at some of that. It would not only help inform this particular piece of research, but then those subsequent deep dives that we are planning to do following this research.

**Dorene Cornwell:** I want to follow up on this language question, because I can tell you that there are a lot of English speakers in the under-served population who are not going to understand the terminology at all, and will get a headache in the first ten minutes. I would encourage you to think about the survey where if somebody gets a term they don't understand, they can look it up in a glossary, because if they're willing to do that, that is a measure of their engagement. If you make the survey longer, it will make people cranky.

**Chelsea Benning:** That's a really good point. I know, as a researcher, and a lot of the language that I may use today is not language that I would use in a questionnaire. But even I have to be reminded. We do actually have a group of individuals that are pilot testers who are instructed to look at the sixth grade level. That's really what we have tried to do, the sixth grade level, for any kind of population level survey. But, certainly, additional individuals who might be looking at it from that perspective are very welcome as we get to that point. I think it's an excellent point.

**Mark De Loura:** What is the intention for the results of the survey? How will it be used or distributed, or....

**Chance Hunt:** I can speak to that to some degree. In previous surveys, it resulted in a report, a several page report with lots of data, and that came out of a tremendous amount of analysis, not just a display of raw data.  And then, the Community Technology team was very engaged then with City departments and ther agencies, to not just share the results, but also help organizations see what they might need from this, or what from this story might help them think about as they engage with their own clientele. We're going to build further on that. We anticipate, yes, a report, but also there will be a lot of rich data out of this research that we can utilize throughout the year, and in subsequent years, if we want to make a particular point around digital equity, digital literacy, using a smart phone, accessing Wi-Fi in a public setting. If the City were to embark on a new initiative, this will be some of the evidence that says this is why we're doing it. The likelihood of it being utilized, not just in a reporting capacity, but really to help inform future investment I think is important for us to think about. The other piece, and I think this is something we're anticipating, which is why we're going to be able to sort the results by Council District, is we have a City Council that is very interested in what is going on in their District. So, how they choose to use that information will be up to them, but I think it also allows us, this time around, to take our understanding one layer further. It's a population level survey, so we're not ever going to be able to say ,here's what's happening in this zip code, or this street, or this person.'  It's a random survey, so the representation of who ends up participating may not be literally everybody. But I think that being able to look at a particular Council District gives us a sense of what is going on in a neighborhood. We also have other data. We have data and research that talks about Wi-Fi coverage in certain areas, broadband coverage in areas. We can look at national research that looks at adoption rates and uptake rates in that way. It's really going to be ultimately combining all of that stuff together, and it will help us in Community Technology, but beyond that, will help us make decisions and tell the story of what is going on in Seattle. There are some assumptions we think we're going to see, but we'll have to see what happens when people tell us. Those are just a few examples of how that might be used. For awareness, but also for actual planning and development of programs and activities.

**David Keyes:** We found a whole range of applications, and so we're continually pulling out some new data, or sharing particular aspect of that. We've had some things like Seattle Public Utilities was looking at some new customer service initiatives. So we sat down with them and walked through what we found in that. So, as they were doing that outreach plan, they could consider those populations in what they might need to do to reach them or what might be required to reach folks. Then, we've had people like a cancer prevention health project look at the data and use that to say how we take that to inform our clientele or outreach. There is also an opportunity with projects like David Harris's, think about virtual reality or bandwidth needs for particular applications for the City or others, then there is an opportunity to say, if you are going to get that, we need to at least factor this in. And we may or may not know about the specific sub-population, but what we have is enough data to know that there are some variables and some variances that you need to look at in designing that. Those are some of the different kinds of applications that we've had and expect.

**Mark De Loura:**  Chance, if people have questions or want to follow up....

**Chance Hunt:**  They can reach me directly at chance.hunt@seattle.gov. David.keyes@seattle.gov is another resource. This will not be the last time we come and chat with CTAB about this. I'm sure, as we move through the process, and certainly when we get to the early reporting, and some of what we're starting to find, I would also think as we begin to distribute--and this is something that we'll be talking about in more detail--is once that communications plan is hitting the streets, if you will, and then when we're ready to do the reporting. So, there will be other opportunities to engage, not just with us directly, but also with CTAB and answer any questions you may have, as far as a follow-up.

**David Keyes:**  Last time, we did a big launch at Seattle Goodwill. We had a combination of community folks and industry folks, and so on, that CTAB helped present and participate in. We've had a little bit of discussion on rolling out pieces like Pew does on some things, for instance. Snapshot portfolio of 'this,' while we're rolling out the next one.

**Mark De Loura:**  Great! Thank you very much!  Heather has joined us on Skype, so the person you see on here now  is Heather, our chair. Up next is Ginger Armbruster, Chief Privacy Officer for the City of Seattle.

**SURVEILLANCE ORDINANCE UPDATE**

**Ginger Armbruster:**  Hi, everybody. Thanks for giving me a few minutes here. Some faces look familiar and some look new. I think that's how it works. I am Chief Privacy Officer of the City of Seattle. I came and spoke to CTAB briefly just as we were starting to stand up our plans for how we were going to meet and comply with the Surveillance Ordinance. If that is new to you, I'll take just a moment to position that for you, and then talk about what we're doing. A new person that has joined our Privacy team, one that is visiting tonight, and then the role we're going to ask CTAB to participate in as we try to meet the requirements of the Surveillance Ordinance.

First of all, let me introduce Sarah Carrier. Sarah has joined the Privacy team for the City. She is going to be helping us meet all of the compliance requirements for the Surveillance Ordinance. And my daughter has joined me tonight. That's what we do in the evening.

I was last here talking about the new ordinance, which went into place September 1, and it is designed to provide some transparency around the acquisition of surveillance technologies in the City of Seattle. Surveillance is defined as any technology that tracks, observes or analyzes identifiable individuals in a way that may have some impact on civil liberties, or perceived to have impact on folks' civil liberties. A little bit of a broad definition. There are more details written into the Surveillance Ordinance, and also exemptions. Things like body-worn cameras, some of the things you might think about that are a little bit obvious that are public safety technologies, cameras in police vehicles, cameras that are used to watch infrastructure, so underneath bridges or or dams, those kinds of things, technologies that you give consent or notice about, and are not a surprise. You may not love it, but it's not a surprise You're not being secretly recorded, for example. Those are the exemptions. And then the requirements are for the City Council to receive a report, a review and have an opportunity to review the technology, the reasons for  its use, and then vote on whether this technology can be implemented or not. And we were tasked with coming up with a master list of currently in use technologies. That activity was completed. It was in effect an audit of all of the things that we have at the City that could be considered surveillance. And, believe it or not, we came up with 28. Most would reside in the Police purview, that's really what they do, but we had a handful in fire. We had a handful at the Seattle Department of Transportation, and we had a handful at City Light.  They do some things around diversion on folks who are using electricity without paying for it. We identified these technologies that are currently in use. They need to be retroactively reviewed, and so we have a schedule to get that done over the next year and a half or so. It was identified as one per month per department. So we are working on that right now. We have other reports that are due on a quarterly basis about new acquisitions that do not meet the definition of surveillance so the Coiuncil can have an idea of how to review something that's coming in, and keep an eye on that. And any technologies that we know are surveillance that need to be reviewed in advance. It's kind of a mish-mash, but a way to get a perspective on new use and coming soon to City department use.

It is also a task as part of the Surveillance Ordinance to figure out what would we do about an advisory committee. If Council wanted to go to some group, or something that would advise them as they were doing these reviews, what would that look like. So, we went through an exercise that Torgie Madison was a part of, to say what would that look like. What would we do? So, we came up with recommendations out of that group. There were folks from different departments. We had the Office of Civil Rights involved; Immigration and Refugees; we had somebody from the Mayor's Office; we had an outside legal advisor; w had somebody from CTAB come and join us, and we came up with a list of recommendations. And what we came up with was a standing advisory group for reviewing technologies. We had a wide breadth of technologies. I don't know how you get them to meet on a regular basis. It's a difficult, sort of overwhelming thing. It didn't make sense to have an advisory board on a policy level, taking a look at how we make decisions about surveillance. But in terms of reviewing those technologies, one of the things we identified--we couldn't come up with a standing group--but we could come up with a process that took a look at race and social justice and equity issues in review that would play up our RSJI process. We wanted to take a look at a group within each department as they set up technology to talk about outside experts, folks that could speak to why does this technology work in other locations, what is some of the research that has been done, and what are the benefits. And then, a piece about community engagement, and making sure that we can reach out to the community which may or may not be impacted. A lot of these technologies are used everywhere all the time, so that may be a little difficult. Taking a look at how we get the community to speak to us about the issues they're concerned about. One of the things we identified is par of this advisory idea was we'd love to have those technologies brought to CTAB, whether it's the Privacy Committee, specifically--I know you have a subset of that--to take a look and see what your comments may be from a technology point of view. We're going to be inviting community members in, as they have absolutely the right to tell us what they think. But we'd also like folks who may be a little more technology oriented and maybe have some background in evaluation, and may have different perspective because of their background.

We're going to be looking at these technologies. Instead of doing one a month, we're going to bundle them together as they make sense, because some of these go together. We may have camera use at Fire, for example. You may have listening devices at Police, and those kind of come in a lump. Seattle City Light, as I mentioned, have diversion technologies. They try to figure out who is using electricity and not paying for it. They have to go and figure out who that is with different technologies, and those get lumped together. So we will be submitting those in groups to Council, and we would like an opportunity to bring those for review to whoever is interested, and get comments back. What we're tasked with doing is providing those comments back to Council so they can see what issues were raised, what were the concerns out in the community, and hear it from folks. Because we certainly know the civil liberties organizations will be involved, but we need to spread that around and hear the opinions of other folks, as well.

Sarah Carrier is leading the charge of all of this. We're starting our first round of reviews, we're getting a web site up, we are tasked with have a draft of these reviews as well as the final product. The web site will be coming very soon, I think within the next week. Super exciting. And we're putting our first group of reviews up for that process. We are finalizing the process we are asking departments to follow. We have a playbook that we're bringing to their attention. And we've been working closely with Council, on due dates and getting this all done.

That's the update on surveillance. It's going to be interesting to see how all of this plays out in the next few months, but we're hoping for your support. We'll talk about details with Torgie Madison, and with you to see what you think that might look like. The goal is by the time we submit these technologies to review to Council, we will have done the community engagement and we'll have the comments made. So that's over the next couple of months when we'll be saying, here's the reviews, tell us what you think. Give us some comments that we can incorporate into our presentation to Council. So that's what we're up to. Any questions around this?

**Torgie Madison:** You say that there are 28 technologies flagged for review…

**Ginger Armbruster:**  Twenty-eight. In the end, that was the master list. That will also be published on our web site soon. Those were the ones that were identified as surveillance. We had to get narrow, because there are a lot of data sets that the City collects that could be used as a surveillance tool, but we're really looking at technologies acquired purposely to surveillance. So that really limits the bucket of what we are looking at. There are plenty of those out there, especially in public safety.

**Jim Loter:** Which is consistent with the ordinance.

**Ginger Armbruster:**  Which is the ordinance requirement. Which is really looking at the technologies that are required. If we start to look at data, that gets difficult really quickly.

**David Keyes:**  But it's 28 instances of surveillance? Twenty-eight technologies?

**Ginger Armbruster:**  Twenty-eight technologies from cameras to site meters, from people using electricity who shouldn't, to listening devices. It's a wide range. We will have that on our web site, so you can take a look and see where they all reside.

**Jim Loter:** It's important to know, too, that those are technologies that met the criteria for conducting the impact review. And the impact review could determine that there is little to minimal of concern. If it does reveal a concern, then our response would be to come up with a mitigation to that concern.

**Ginger Armbruster:**  Absolutely. There are pieces to this review, and the first is the privacy impact assessment similar to the ones that we do all the time for project that have technologies that collect data that are personally identifiable. We do a privacy impact review on all of them. The SIR--what we're calling the Surveillance Impact Report--has additional pieces. It looks at financial stuff, it asks for community engagement, it looks retroactively how this is used, and what were the benefits of surveillance if it's a technology that's already in use. All of those pieces go together with comments from the community. And that's t he whole package. We will identify risks or concerns along the way. We identify inclusion criteria, civil liberties concerns. We identify those risks and the mitigations against them. Some of that will be policy. Some will be training. We will come up with what those are so we can identify them. Any other questions? No. There will be more, and we will be happy to make tht available through our contact with CTAB so you can help us figure out the best way to engage the members. Thank you very, very much.

**Mark De Loura:** Thank you very much. We're going to put the comment period after the break. Let's move into the break, and come back at 7:15. Then we'll do a comment period right after that.

**BREAK**

**Mark De Loura:** I promised a public comment period. Are there any public comments?

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Dorene Cornwell:**  I have two pieces of public comment. There is a piece of legislation in the statehouse regarding public standard [unintelligible]. I'm really embarrassed. I don't even know the bill number. I have read it. It's worth supporting. And the other one is the disability advocate pack. There is this terrible revolution in Congress, HR 620, that basically rolls back the Americans With Disabilities Act. The Seattle reps are all against it, but if you know anybody anywhere, have them contact their representatives, because it's a terrible piece of legislation. One of the things, from my perspective, is people invest all of this money in learning how to do the technology, whether it's things to do with standards, or how you build buildings, or how you build roads, and now they're kind of blowing that out the window. Parallel with that, there's how are you supposed to magically get jobs. Everyone who wants to do that should stack their offices with people with disabilities.

**Mark De Loura:**Thank you, Dorene. I will track those down and post them onto our Facebook page, which is a lovely place to hang out and meet other CTAB people. Any other comments?

**Amy Hirotaka:** I have something to share. This will be my last CTAB meeting.  I have sadly decided that I need to resign for personal reasons, mainly because I don't have time. This is my third year on CTAB. I chaired the board for a year. One of my favorite memories is co-chairing the Broadband Committee that Karia Wong co-chaired for quite a while. It's now part of the Digital Equity Committee. I have so valued my time here, and that is one of the reasons why I decided to step down, because I can't. Really, I've just been coming to the board meetings, and I firmly believe that the real work happens in committees. I applaud all of the committee chairs, because that's where the rubber hits the road and the real work is done. I hope to still be engaged with the Technology Matching Fund, and don't be strangers.

**Mark De Loura:** Did you say why it was that you suddenly have a lack of time?

**Amy Hirotaka:** I have a little five-month old and my job is pretty demanding with work travel and the baby. So a couple of things had to go.

**Torgie Madison:**  As chair of the Privacy Committee, no further questions. [laughs]

**CTAB MEETING FORMAT EXPERIMENTATION UPDATE**

**Mark De Loura:** All right. The next item is CTAB meeting format experimental update. What is means is we've been discussing--Heather Lewis and I were talking about the fact that we were looking at the agenda. We were looking at the way meetings were run, and kind of cloning them from meeting to meeting, in terms of just the structure of it, not really with an understanding of the DNA, why they were created like that with the purpose of looking at where the inflections are, why the format is like it is. So, we're going to screw around with it and if we don something and you hate it, if you have seen other ideas that you love, let us know. The intent is for it to be clear and for there to be ways for people to engage not just here in the meeting but after the meeting. Conversations through action. So, to the greatest extent that we can do that, that's our goal. So let us know how we can do that.

To that end, one of the things that Heather is going to do is start sending out surveys at the end, after the meetings. So, she may send something to your inbox. I'm not sure if she was intending to send that out to the mailing list or using the sign-in sheet but we'll try to do both, just to maximize our exposure.

**David Keyes:** As part of that, too, if you have meeting topics, things that you would like to see at the meeting. I know there was an earlier solicitation that came up from that. Folks are free to let Mark De Loura know, or send us a note.

**Mark De Loura:** Just ot put an exclamation point on that, I feel like it's easy for us to have meetings every month, and I appreciate that people come and spend time here in the conversation. But, I think to honor the time that you spend with us, finding ways for your to engage and feel like you are able to contribute, your unique expertise, that's our responsibility to try to figure out how to do that. Just know that that is our commitment. And if there are ways that we can help, let us know.

**MOTION TO ALLOW TORGIE MADISON TO CONTINUE AS CTAB REPRESENTATIVE ON THE SURVEILLANCE ORDINANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Mark De Loura:**Great. So, we're supposed to talk about Torgie Madison as the official Surveillance Ordinance Review Committee CTAB representative.

**Torgie Madison:**  For a few months, I was attending the Surveillance Ordinance--it wasn't a committee, but it was a task force designed to establish what process would be followed to get these technologies reviewed, and get community input. This would be continuing that representation.

**Mark De Loura:** That sounds good to me. My only question is that we may not have enough board members left at the meeting to make a quorum.

**David Keyes:** We do have three votes by proxy, so Heather Lewis, John Krull, and Jose Vasquez sent in affirmative votes by proxy.

**Mark De Loura:** Great! Now, would someone like to move that Torgie Madison be allowed to continue as our special CTAB representative on the Surveillance Ordinance task force?

**Karia Wong:** I so move.

**Amy Hirotaka:** Second.

**Mark De Loura:** All those of you who agree, say 'Aye.'  Awesome. Motion passes. Congratulations. All right. Now we have  a period of time for each committee to have five minutes to talk about what is happening. So, we'll kick off with Cyber Security and Privacy.

**PRIVACY AND CYBER SECURITY COMMITTEE UPDATE**

**Torgie Madison:**  We had our first meeting on January 27, and we had five people turn out. Mostly, it was administrative, trying to figure out our mission statement and our roles on the board and how we can best work with Seattle IT, and specifically, the Chief Privacy Officer Ginger Armbruster, who just talked. One of the first things we did was elect a vice chair. Christopher Sheets, who used to chair the committee in 2017, has come back on board as vice chair. Hopefully, he will be bringing along any topics that were meant to be discussed in 2017 but never got full attention. We're looking at maybe revitalizing that and taking a look at what worked and what didn't in 2017. I'll put this on the board, but we are meeting on the 27th of this month at the Starbucks on Olive Way, 1600 Olive Way. The Montlake Branch of the library has been booked for all of February, for whatever reason, but we are going to be resuming at the Montlake Branch. I've booked it for March and April, and May, at this point. It's the last Tuesday of the month from 6:00 to 7:30 p.m. All of this will go out to the CTAB privacy mailing list, also on Facebook, to try to advertise it as much as possible. It will also be available to the Seattle Privacy Coalition. I think the main topics we'll be covering this month is how to help Sarah Carrier and how we are going to be working with the Surveillance Ordinance.

**Mark De Loura:** Thanks, Torgie.  Next up is the Digital Inclusion Committee. I'll cover that.

**DIGITAL INCLUSION COMMITTEE**

**Mark De Loura:** The Digital Inclusion Committee typically meets the third Wednesdays of the month. That third Wednesday is next week Wednesday.  Steven Maheshwary and I share that committee. We're both going to be out of town.

**Karia Wong:** Is it Wednesday or Tuesday?

**Mark De Loura:** You know, I think it used to be Tuesday and now it's Wednesday. I know that it has changed. We'll post it out. That was one of the conversations we were going to have. So Eliab Sisay was there. He's going to host the meeting this month. And he's going to figure out the details and broadcast it out to the network. So, while we don't quite know what the heck we're doing, we'll get the word out. The intent of the meeting, really, is to figure out what we're doing. If you're interested in the conversation, we'd really love to have your contribution to help figure out our work plan. That's it.

**SMART CITIES AND COMMUNITY INNOVATION**

**Charlotte Lunday:**  Our first meeting will be next Wednesday, February 21, at the Olive Way Starbucks. I'll put that on the board. We're just going over and trying to figure out our strategic plan and what projects we want to work on. It will be from 6:00 to 7:00 p.m. I think the address for the Starbucks is 1600 Olive Way. That will work for Privacy, as well. I feel like a grade school teacher and it's very quiet.

**David Keyes:**  Heather, I don't know whether you want to chime in here. Heather was just mentioning that for the next meeting, there has been an invitation that has gone out to Mayor Durkan. So, she may be attending the next board meeting. So, just an encouragement, as much as the work plans can get done, get those topics down. That would be helpful in terms of having those summaries ready by next month. Heather, are you there? Do you want to chime in at all? Okay. She says she's in a loud place.

**Mark De Loura:** She says she can hear us. Is the audio on on that?

**David Keyes:**  It should be. We heard her a moment ago. I should have tried to do that in Heather's voice.

**Mark De Loura:** Heather says thank you for saying what she was going to say. I think that that's it. Nothing more to say or do, except to thank you for being here. If you have any questions about the committees, you know who to talk to.

**David Keyes:**  We'll send out the notes about when the meetings are happening to folks on the committee lists. Let us know if you want to receive those committee notices.

**Mark De Loura:** We're using the Facebook page as home base. We're slowly trying to populate that with more and more information. This is going to make it easy to find.

**David Keyes:**  And if anybody hasn't signed in, please do.

**Mark De Loura:** That's it. Meeting is adjourned.

**MEETING IS ADJOURNED**