**March 13, 2018 Meeting - Seattle Community Technology Advisory Board (CTAB)**

Topics covered included: Delia Burke on 2018 Digital Equity Technology Matching Fund grants; Danielle Friedman, Department of Neighborhoods, on Seattle Community Involvement Commission; Tony Perez, on Competitive Broadband for Multiple Dwelling Units; Amie Thao, Seattle Innovation and Performance Team, on the City Affordability Portal; updates from the Cybersecurity and Privacy, Digital Inclusion, and Smart Cities and Community Innovation committees.

**This meeting was held:** March 13, 2018; 6:00-8:00 p.m., Seattle Municipal Tower, 700 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2750

A meeting recording is available on the CTAB member Facebook page: <https://www.facebook.com/Seatechboard/>

**Meeting related links:**

* Technology Matching Fund Grant Program: <http://www.seattle.gov/tech/initiatives/digital-equity/technology-matching-fund>
* Community Involvement Commission: <http://www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/community-involvement-commission>
* Community Resource Hub: <http://www.seattle.gov/resourcehub>
* City Affordability Portal: <http://www.seattle.gov/affordable>

**Attending:**30 people

**Board Members:** Heather Lewis, Mark De Loura, Jose Vasquez, Torgie Madison via Skype, Karia Wong, Steven Maheshwary. John Krull

**Public:** Ann Summy,Adam Owen (Century Link), Carmen Arceo (Century Link), Dorene Cornwell, Scott Wang, Tyrone Grandison, Greta Knappenberger, Michael Augustin, Lloyd Douglas, Michael Constantine, Helmuth Woermann, Alison Borngesser, Marisol Lopez, Shaila Bolger, Kaitlin Ramirez, Rebecca Rocha (Oculus)

**City Staff:** Seattle IT: Chance Hunt, Jim Loter, Tony Perez, Alice Lawson, Delia Burke, David Keyes, Cass Magnuski. City Budget Office: Amie Thao, Department of Neighborhoods: Danielle Friedman.

**Heather Lewis:** Good evening, everyone. Thanks for making out on this rainy Tuesday in March. We'll start with a round of introductions. Please say your name and your organization or neighborhood, whichever you prefer.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

**Heather Lewis:** First item then, is the March agenda approval. Can I get a motion from somebody on the board to approve?

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

**Steven Maheshwary:** Second.

**Heather Lewis:** All in favor, say 'aye.' Anyone opposed? Great. Motion passes. Next, we need to pass the February minutes. Can I get a motion to approve?

**Mark De Loura:** I so move.

**Jose Vasquez:** Second.

**Heather Lewis:** Everyone in favor, please say 'aye.'  Two abstentions. Torgie, did we get a vote from you?

**Torgie Madison:** That's an 'aye.'  Okay, so we can, in fact, approve the February minutes. Next topic on the agenda, then, is the Digital Equity Technology Matching Fund. We'll be hearing from Delia Burke, who manages that program.

**2018 DIGITAL EQUITY TECHNOLOGY MATCHING FUND GRANTS**

<http://www.seattle.gov/tech/initiatives/digital-equity/technology-matching-fund>

**Delia Burke:** Hi, everybody. My name is Delia Burke, and I'm a strategic advisor in the Community Technology program, and I'm very excited tonight to talk to you about our Technology Matching Fund. So, thank you for inviting me to spend a little time with you. I'm just learning this newfangled technology, so bear with me.

The Tech Matching Fund is our annual grant program, where we provide funds to nonprofits and community groups who are working on digital equity solutions. We're actually going on our 21st year, and the city has contributed over $4.6 million to over 300 projects since 1997. I think that really shows that the City has a very long-term commitment to digital equity and to helping folks get technology, get connected, and have the skills to know how to use it. This year, our grant program has $400,000 to offer for projects up to $50,000. Our revenue source for this grant program has primarily come from cable franchise fees, but recently, we had an exciting contribution last year from Facebook. So, as the cable franchise revenue are declining, we're looking to grow that model into the future. The purpose of these grants is really to empower the community. We like to fund community driven solutions. Each year, we have this open, competitive grant round, where we get the best and brightest ideas about digital equity solutions so that the programs are really tailored to meet the needs of our residents. So, our Digital Literacy program, working with Somali families in New Holly may look different than a Digital Literacy program in Ballard. A program is designed to really empower those community ideas.

We provide a matching grant, so for every dollar that the City invests, the community organizations also contribute matching contributions, usually in donated materials or time or volunteer labor. Even though the requirement for the match is only one half to one, we find that we get way more match from the community that can often double the City's investment.

So, who do we fund? The TMF focuses on providing resources to those organizations to work with traditionally under-served, and under-represented communities. This is a snapshot of the grants that have just recently closed out last year. So you can see that we reached over 1,100 residents of Seattle, 500 immigrants and refugees, 200 people with disabilities, and 150 seniors. You will see that the programs have a deep diverse impact.

I thought I would just share with you a few stories of some of our recent grantees. The Coalition for Refugees from Burma was one of those projects in last year's grant cohort, and they have done some really great things. They work with parents who have students in Bailey Gatzert and the Seattle World School. They provide basic digital literacy training, and most of the parents there are English as a Second Language individuals. One kind of fun story is that there was a woman who never used email before, never used technology, so they taught her how to do email for the first time in this class. And she was so excited that she went home and she sent the program folks an email that said, "I want more digital literacy classes! You've got to keep this up!"

So, I think one thing that they do well is not just teach tech skills but also help give people tools through technology for advocacy, so that these parents can advocate for themselves and for their children.

Another recent project was the Millionair Club charity. They have a center to help support formerly homeless or unemployed adults, and our grant helped to establish a computer lab with 32 work stations. The funding helped to build it and it's kind of an unofficial WorkForce site. And what's pretty cool about this is that folks can come in and get things like a shower, or a hot meal, or clothing. And there are people on staff to help them, work one-on-one, to find a job. They're also doing some certificate training. Individuals can come in and get a food handler's permit and a certificate to really boost their job opportunities. So those are great projects. Another one is Kin On Community Health Care. This is a program that works with Asian seniors in the southeast part of Seattle. One of the biggest challenges for seniors, and one of the issues is that they often face social isolation and disengagement. And that can have very negative impacts on seniors in terms of longevity and health. What you're looking at right here is a class called What's the Heck About Skype, and it's teaching seniors how to use Skype and connect with their family members.

So this just gives you an idea about some of the programs we've funded over the years, and of course, you will be thinking that this is awesome, and you will, of course, want to participate and we would love that. One great way that you can get involved now is that we just launched the open grants for this year and our deadline is May 7, so we're working with groups now and we encourage folks to apply. So, please get out the word and share this with your networks, with your friends and your family. You'll be seeing, from now until the grant deadline, we'll be putting out a blog in the social media. So please take a look at that.

I also brought some flyers for those who like pieces of paper. These are great if anybody is out and about and you want to take something to talk to people about what the opportunity is. We're also hosting some workshops at the end of the month to provide more information to the community about how they can apply, what makes a good grant program. If you're talking with a group who may not know if they're a right fit for it, direct them to one of the workshops, and we can provide additional information.

Another great opportunity to get involved is to serve on the review committee. CTAB has always played, for many years, a really crucial role in our review process. Once we get all the grants in, we work with a volunteer committee who reviews those grants and then helps to provide recommendations. I want you to think about participating in that. It really helps our program, improves it, and provides a really great base for decisions on the grants. That opportunity will take place primarily in May up through mid-June.  After the deadline is the crunch time for review, and then, once those decisions are made, they'll be brought back to CTAB at the June meeting.  What that process really entails, is first, there will be an orientation where you can come and learn what's new in the grant program this year, how you score the candidates, to get you started on that. So that would be one piece. A lot of the work can be done at home or on your own time scoring the applications. Typically, most on the committee would have like 15 to 20 applications to go over. Then, what we do is we take all of those scores and then come together as a group and sort thro0ugh what the rankings are and make the final decisions on how to allocate the pot of money that we have, which is $400,000. That's always a heated, difficult part. And then some of those applications will come back to CTAB, and then those recommendations will go to City Council for a meeting later in the summer.

I encourage you to think about it. If you are interested, I have a list from Chris Alejano, who had an initial list of folks who might be interested. If you have talked to him before this and are interested, let me know. We'll be reaching out soon to pull the review piece together. Thanks! Does anybody have any questions?

I just want to again give a big shout out and thanks to our CTAB members who have participated in the past because your insights and different perspectives on the projects are really valuable to us and it really helps our process. We know it's a lot of work, but we hope that you'll find the time again. One of our last reviewers called TMF the Too Much Fun committee. We try to make it lively, and hopefully inspiring and rewarding too.

**David Keyes:** On the review committee is both CTAB members and community members, so people who are not board members can also participate in the reviews.

**Delia Burke:** Yes. So if you have colleagues or people that you know are interested in this work, you don't have to have any background necessarily in technology, or background in community organizations. Again, a diverse background is often very valuable to our process. Last year, we had a very big committee, so we'll probably look to 10 to 12 folks ultimately.

**Steven Maheshwary:** Do you need any volunteers for anything outside of reviewers? Information sessions?

**Delia Burke:** That's a good question. I think for the information sessions, we are just there to provide input of information about the program, but there may be opportunities down the road working on some of the projects. Is there a way that you can see yourself on the team?

**Steven Maheshwary:** No, I was just curious as to whether you need translators, or people to help go through the application process one on one with the organizations.

**Delia Burke:** That, potentially, could be very useful. So, if you have any special language skills, I know that we will provide interpretation, and we often do, for sign language. That is at the request of community members. If we do, we will bring in professional translators. But sometimes it's helpful one-on-one to have somebody walk you through an application.

**Heather Lewis:** Does anyone else have any questions?

**Jose Vasquez:** I just want to add two things. One, that I really want o emphasize the whole 'community-driven' solutions, because it is the community deciding how the City allocates funds. That is power to the community. So I just want to acknowledge that and thank you, Delia, for helping every year to start a new committee, because that's a lot of work. There are new people. There are people who have done this before. There is one person who has done this for how many years? I forget. Super volunteer there.

**Delia Burke:** You join the committee. You never leave. Right? We have had many ex-CTAB members and that's the way they stay engaged with us, through the annual Tech Matching Fund.

**Jose Vasquez:** Along those lines, we can also look back at last year, and amplify those stories. Or if we need additional volunteers, to make a more sustainable project. Because this funding is for one year only, right?

**Delia Burke:** It's for one year. Typically, it will span about a year and a half, but the funding will be available later in 2018 and it will go through 2019.  We look for distinct projects that will last a year.

**David Keyes:**  Just attending the workshops is a good way to both see the range of things that people are working on and thinking about applying for project for, so it's both a really interesting  to see what kinds of initiatives are happening, how people are approaching digital equity work, but it's also a chance for you to learn what resources projects may want. So maybe your company or your organization or you know somebody that can do help with marketing or something. So, it's also a way to see the projects and link up with people that you might be able to assist and share resources with also.

**Delia Burke:** We find early on, as much as we can see what people are looking to build their programs and to match them up with other resources. If it's early in the outreach cycle, we have the opportunity to recommend another group that has done the curriculum or whatever, and can partner. I would encourage the past reviewers to attend those workshops because I do know that one thing that is valuable is for applicants to hear from reviewers about any advice that you have to give them on their applications. That's why it's always been helpful to have that perspective for new applicants.

**Steven Maheshwary:** Is there a way that we can accept donation from individuals who might want to donate to the fund?

**Delia Burke:** You know, that's a question I'll have to investigate.

**Chance Hunt:** That is something we're willing to explore.

**Heather Lewis:** Anyone else with questions for Delia? Thank you so much for coming to speak to us.

**Delia Burke:** And thank you for your time.

**Heather Lewis:** Next up, we'll hear from Danielle Friedman from Seattle's Department of Neighborhoods.

**SEATTLE'S COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT COMMISSION**

Related links:

Commission site: <http://www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/community-involvement-commission>

Community Resource Hub: <http://www.seattle.gov/resourcehub>

**Danielle Friedman:**  Thanks for inviting me. I think there are a lot of opportunities to collaborate. I don't have a presentation, but I'll talk just a little bit about what the Commission is up to. I did bring a hand-out, a blog post hot off the press. It was just published today from the Department of Neighborhood's blog. It's about the progress of what they've done so far.

The Community Involvement Commission is a brand new commission. They've met about seven times, so it's been about seven months that they've been together meeting. They were formed to help advise the Mayor and departments on creating more equitable outreach strategies in the City, trying to reach out to communities that are under-served, and traditionally haven't been a part of the conversation. In the first six months or so, they've been standing up the commission, creating bylaws, adopting a decision making process, electing co-chairs. And their knowledge is starting to get into a place where they're looking at what they want on their work plan. A couple of the big areas they're looking at is creating a best practices document that highlights what are some of the best practices around, equitable outreach and engagement throughout the City. It would be an internal document mostly, for different departments to use. They're really interested in building partnership and alliances, and they want to try to be a bridge between different commissions, between the community and the City. They're really thinking about having one foot planted in the City process and the other one planted in the community. They are interested in figuring out how to engage communities through innovative methods. And I think that's where discussion with you might come in, figuring out what are the best practices around digital engagement, what tools are offered at the City, and how can we push some new areas forward that maybe haven't been tried before, and specifically get more equitable outcomes in terms of who they're reaching. And then they also are tasked with looking at the grant making process and the effect it has around community involvement and grant making.

Those are some of the high level areas of interest to them. The will hopefully have a work permit completed by March 31 for the year. There is still lots of opportunity, though, for the details to be worked out. They are a a 16-person commission. There are seven representatives from individual Council Districts, seven representatives from the Mayor's Office, and then there are two people that are picked by the commission. So there was a detailed process where they looked at who is not represented on the commission, and who would best be at the table. Two people just got confirmed to complete their commission. There is also one Get Engaged member, as well. That's a young person working on this.

So they're really in a time when they're just looking for ideas, looking for partnerships, looking for how they can best serve the City and the community. One of the things that I'm doing is collecting community involvement plans. All departments in the City. An ordinance was created to create the Community Involvement Commission. They also had all departments hand in community involvement plans. So, I'm looking at those. I think the commission is going to be looking at those, seeing where there are things that are working, things that have common threads, common barriers, and use that kind of as a baseline to figure out how they can make recommendations. Any questions so far?

**Heather Lewis:** It sounds like there's more coming, so I can hold my questions until the end.

**Danielle Friedman:**  I was looking at the things that you sent me that you wanted to talk about. I'll talk a little about the Department of Neighborhoods approach to community outreach. I'm not the person that does it. His name is Sam Reed. I actually asked him if he could come, but he couldn't come today. But he does Facebook and Twitter. And then, there is one other person. They do really amazing graphics and they're really creative in the way they do outreach. The use tools like Consider.It. I haven't used it before, but it's a way to have conversations online with people. They just launched last week this Community Resource [unintelligible]. At the top, there's a link for it. It's a really exciting new initiative. It's broken into three categories: Get Informed, Get Engaged, Get Organized. It's really supposed to be a one-stop shop for people coming to the City to be able to find out information. There's an outreach engagement calendar, which has evens all throughout the City. Community Connector has a bunch of organizations. It's open source, so people put in their information about different organizations. Pretty soon, there's going to be a Space Finder, which will help people find meeting space in different neighborhoods. There are issues, how to get involved. There is a page that they have called Add Your Voice. When you go in here, you can search by issue, you can search by neighborhood, you can search by organization name.

**Jose Vasquez:** I have a question. This is great. And I know we've had conversations about translating City web sites and the breadth that will take, but this in particular, being a community facing page, I would raise that up as far as priorities go to translate it. What are the current plans to translate it?

**Danielle Friedman:**  Sam Reed, who worked on it, came to the Community Involvement Commission's last meeting and presented it. And the number one issue that came up is how can this be translated, and made recommendations for looking into software that can automatically translate pages into different languages, figuring out if there i a focus group that can be had with people who don't speak English, or even people who are elderly and haven't used computers that much before, how it would be easier to use. Maybe having a line that people could call to get it translated. Like at the bottom have a phone number that says just call this number if you want a translation. So they gave a lot of recommendations about that. One of the things that a staff member at the Department of Neighborhoods says it's really hard, so the Community Involvement Commission thought maybe that could be something we could recommend, increasing budget for language access. I know all the partners now do have to put language access money in their budget. That's an initiative that's moving forward. There could be some overlap with that, but yes, that's a major concern about how people would be able to access this. It's a good start, I think, in terms of having a place to go and having all the information in one place. But there is a lot of improvement that could be done around reaching people who aren't normally reached.

**Jose Vasquez:** Yeah, just some quick feedback. Consider, instead of just translation, co-creation. That's more meaningful. If you have somebody who, if they're co-creating the content themselves--because it's one thing to create content from one perspective, and translating where it might lose meaning in the translation.

**Danielle Friedman:**  Absolutely. That was brought up, too. This has been in the works for over a year. And it was before the Community Involvement Commission was formed. And I think if they had input at the beginning of this process, they probably would have suggested that, too. But I agree that that's really important.

**Karia Wong:** That looks really great. I'm just wondering if there is any plan to print it out so it would be easier for new immigrants or newcomers. Because a lot of them might not have access to technology, or they don't use technology at all. That would be really handy.

**Danielle Friedman:**  They do have a printed version that isn't exactly the same, but is for community members getting information on how to get involved in what City government does and things like that. And it's not officially released yet. But that's coming.

**Karia Wong:** That would be translated, as well?

**Danielle Friedman:**  I don't know. I'd have to find out.

**Jose Vasquez:**  You got me thinking about this. Not just having printed materials, but I know at least in the Latino community, when we go find resources, it's a trusted nonprofit or a local small business. Have you considered partnering with key targeted small businesses in key neighborhoods to become hubs for information, opportunities, or resources. How would the City be about supporting especially minority owned businesses that have connection to those communities.

**Danielle Friedman:**  I think that's a great question. They just started rolling it out, and a newsletter went out today online. And they have a couple of videos that are in different languages that talk about getting involved in the City, They are stand-alone from this, but you can find them on there. But I think that a best practice, too, is really partnering with those community groups. I'll recommend that to them and see if they have the capacity to do it.

**Heather Lewis:**  Does anyone else have questions for Danielle? We're so excited to have you here, and your advertisements have been popping up on Twitter and on Facebook. And over and over again, we're seeing these great tools being advertised that seem to be releasable to other boards and commissions, and also to the residents of Seattle. Thank you for the work that you're doing.

**Danielle Friedman:**  Thank you. I'll be looking for ways we can work together.

**Heather Lewis:**  I would love to keep that conversation going. Is there anything we can be doing in the near future to support your work?

**Danielle Friedman:**  I think, right now, what they're looking for -- I don't know if you have any recommendations or things that they can use to engage -- digital tools that you would recommend for them, or best practices around that. I don't know if you've done that kind of work before, but I think that would be some starter information on where we're at and maybe what's out there that we might not know about would be really good.

**Heather Lewis:**  Is there a contact for that?

**Danielle Friedman:**  You can send it to me.

**Heather Lewis:**  Is it okay if we send your email address out with our notes?

**Danielle Friedman:**  Absolutely. It's everywhere. Thank you very much.

**Heather Lewis:**  Next up, we have the City Affordability Portal.

**Amie Thao:** That's me. But I still don't have a connection and I still need just a moment.

**Heather Lewis:**  While that's happening, I saw one new face over here. We did a round of introductions at the beginning, along with their names and neighborhood or organization.

**MORE INTRODUCTIONS**

**David Keyes:** This will take a few more minutes. Maybe you could do Public Comment?

**Heather Lewis:**  Yes, let's do Public Comment. We'll come back. Does anybody have any upcoming events that they'd like to share, or anything else that you'd like to share with the community?

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Greta Knappenberger:**   On March 29, we're going to be hosting a Smart Cities blockchain event. I'll send out all of the details, but it's going to be looking at what is blockchain, and if the City of Seattle wants to talk about new technologies, looking at it from citizen engagement, I could include your perspective. What are some of the applications that are meaningful beyond cryptic currency. So, if anyone is interested either in attending, or someone from CTAB or the City of Seattle is interested in speaking, along with myself, I will have Joseph Williams, who is Governor Inslee's ICT, as well as Mike Cartwright. I encourage you all to attend, and if anyone wants to participate, come and talk to me.

**Heather Lewis:**  I'm helping put together an event with MIT Enterprise Forum, which is a nonprofit in town, next Wednesday. I'll send a link as well. But they are putting on an event focused on AI automation and its effects on society. There is going to be a deliberate equity focus to the event, and I will send a link. Any other events? Jose?

**Jose Vasquez:**   Right now, it's just save the date, because we're trying to confirm the location, but Thursday, March, 29, we're having our next Latinos in Tech mixer. We're trying to focus around green technology. That's kind of a thing. You will be networking with other Latinos in the tech industry and talking about green technology, 6:00 to 9:00 p.m. Once we have the location confirmed, I'll be sure to share that.

**Heather Lewis:**  Are you looking for a location?

**Jose Vasquez:**   We're in talks right now. If that falls through, I will be.

**Heather Lewis:**  Terrific. Any other events?

**John Krull:** I have one. Seattle Public Schools is starting an Information Technology Advisory Board. Information is going to be out for that in the next week or so.  Contact me if you're interested.

**Heather Lewis:**  May we share your email address with the notes?

**John Krull:** Yes.

**Heather Lewis:**  Any last events or other pieces of information to share?

**David Keyes:**  Tony, can you cue it up so we can flip that order?

**Heather Lewis:**  Let's flip the order. Great. Tony is speaking on Competitive Broadband for Multi-Dwelling Units.

**COMPETITIVE BROADBAND FOR MULTI-DWELLING UNITS**

**Tony Perez:**  Competitive Broadband for Multi-Dwelling Units is another name for condos and partner buildings, as opposed to single dwellings. I'm Tony Perez, of the Office of Cable Communications. I'm going to talk a little bit today about a kind of a different form of digital equity. digital divide. City policy is that we want to ensure equal, affordable access to broadband services for all of Seattle residents. One of the things we want to avoid is the creation of a new kind of digital divide where some residents have access to gigabit service, while others may be limited to old DSL 7mbps type service.

Over the years, we've gotten a lot of calls from residents of apartment buildings and condos, wondering why the City only allows a certain cable operator to serve their building. We've had to answer those inquiries and say, 'Hey, talk to your landlord.' Why did your landlord enter into a long-term, exclusive agreement with your cable operator. But those are more anecdotal. We wanted to take a deeper dive and look at some of the data to see if the problem is real, and to try to quantify it to some extent, and then if there is a problem, take a look at possible solutions.

First, if you look at this map--I know it's not that clear--but we have three cable franchise operators here in Seattle: Century Link, Comcast, and WAVE. All of them are capable of providing gigabit service. WAVE provides gigabit service over its cable facility up to gigabit. So does Century Link, via fiber, and Comcast. If you look at this map, the greenish area is parts of Seattle where both Century Link and Comcast are available. The yellow area is where residents of that area have a choice among all three providers. Purple, over here, is where WAVE is the only option for cable and thus, internet service through a landline provider. Basically, this suggests that there is choice in high speed internet service throughout Seattle. Again, I should have mentioned at the beginning that we wanted to get to competition between and among providers that can offer internet speeds at a minimum of 100mbps to avoid a new form of digital divide. That's our goal.

There are new choices emerging. WAVE G--I don't know how many of you are familiar with that--provides fiber to large apartment buildings and they serve over 100 large apartment buildings in Seattle, and provides gigabit service for about $80/mo., which is not bad. And now we're seeing the emergence of fixed wireless providers that are coming to serve in the area. And we also have 5G emerging, and there is going to be some opportunity for some fixed broadband at very high speeds. By the way, I don't know if the City has been here to talk about some of the ongoing work on mending City codes to accommodate placement of small cell antennas for provision of 5G service.

Having these choices coming for 100mbps service and more is available all over the City, but we'll see in a minute that that is not quite true. Fifty-one percent of residents in Seattle live in apartment buildings or condominiums of various sizes. I already mentioned this at the beginning. By the way, some of the research that we have is available on our web site and we're going to be publishing more over the next week. The research we've conducted is a statistically valid survey of residents. That's available right now on the web site. We interviewed all of the ISPs in the area. And we also had extensive interviews with property owners and managers that together represented buildings with about 40,000 tenants. I think it was a good sample.

What we learned is that, despite this broad coverage and availability of 100mbps-plus service, in a way, many of these buildings represent islands of only one provider, for various reasons. But one reason could be that the building manager made some type of sweetheart deal with the ISP in return for part of the revenue, they've become the exclusive internet provider. That's more anecdotal, but we know  it's going on.  So these dots represent various building locations, in our follow-up research where in these buildings, despite single family residents having access to three providers capable of providing 100mbps service or more, if you live in that building, you don't have that choice. We feel that that is not good and we want to learn more about what we can do about it. About twenty percent of residents who live in apartments or condominiums have choice among at least two providers offering 100 megabit service. So, we have an issue. We answered that question.

We learned, of course, that it's important to everybody. No surprise to people here at CTAB. The inverse correlation between income and internet speeds and the average cost to users is about $62/mo.

Now I want to talk a little bit about why this exists. What are the barriers in the market? There are a number of things. In some parts of the City there is only one wired ISP. There are parts of Seattle where Comcast is the only option. It's a structural issue there. There's not that much that can be done. The good thing is they're starting to overlap. Comcast is building out aggressively in the area I showed earlier where WAVE is the only choice, we're beginning to see some movement there. Thankfully, fixed wireless options are becoming available. And I talked a little bit about 5G earlier. We don't know exactly what 5G is, standards are still being developed. You can't develop the equipment until you have the standards. And once the equipment is ready, then you know what the capacity can be.

The other thing we found--and this was a big issue, and I know we've heard it from Century Link before--a lot of buildings' internal wiring is too old to accommodate higher speeds, particularly buildings with CAT 3 wiring or below. It doesn't matter if a Century Link wants to bring fiber to the building, it can't really route the signal within the building at 100mbps or more. So, that is a huge barrier in Seattle. The building owners don't want to upgrade. I think for an average building, it's probably about a $40,000 cost to rewire the building. And in many cases, providers aren't willing to rewire it for you unless you give them an exclusive deal for a long-term contract. So, it's a real issue.

Another thing is that the telecom closet where the lines come in from the street into buildings, and where the providers need to place their equipment in these central locations in order to serve the building, in many places, there is just not enough room. Because this wasn't anticipated back when the buildings were constructed. In addition, you have to have adequate space for what is called the risers, the vertical space where you can run wires and conduit, both vertically and horizontally down the hallways. There is not enough space.

Exclusive business agreements: We talked about that earlier. This is kind of a tricky issue. You would think we should just eliminate this outlay. And I think, in most cases that will make sense. But there are times where an ISP serving a building under a bulk use agreement, will lower the price significantly because they have 100 percent of the coverage. So, particularly, if we're working on trying to find a solution for lower cost internet service to Seattle Housing Authority buildings or something, that's going to be a policy call for somebody. Is that okay, then, to have an exclusive agreement under those circumstances? If you can provide 100mbps service for $40, $30, whatever the case may be. It's something that will need to be addressed.

We're also looking at exclusive marketing agreements that were allowed under FCC rules, at least for cable. But we think that this is also limiting competition, where only one provider gets to have access. We also found that a lot of times--and we've had a couple of training sessions, Alice Lawson coordinated one. We've had two of them over the years.--trying to apprise the building owners of the FCC rules as they relate to making these types of agreements. Who owns the wiring? Who owns the internal wiring within the units? The ISP comes to a building, and says, "Here. Sign this contract." And the contract usually says 'This is not an exclusive agreement because those are not allowed by the FCC. But when you finish reading it, it basically is an exclusive agreement for exclusive use of the wire. That has become an issue. So we found that we need to do more training for building owners and managers so that they understand their rights and don't unwittingly sign an exclusive 15-year agreement barring your tenants and our constituents from obtaining services.

Potential next steps: One of the things we're talking about that's not listed here is just convening another meeting among the stakeholders, the property owners, the ISPs, tenants, architects, staff from Seattle Department of Constructions and Inspections, and to see what can be done. These slides are from a presentation we made to a stakeholder group on February 13.  What I don't have here, because it would take too long to go through, but we'll make it available on our web site and Cable Office can follow up some time if you have questions. We brought some experts to talk about best practices in the industry for ensuring that your building can accommodate at least two wired broadband providers and also wireless providers. Again, especially among the property owners, a lot of lack of knowledge. Some people actually thought that if we do WiFi, we don't need any wires. We can just serve the building through WiFi. Just put an antenna on the roof and that's going to be good. So, there is a lot of education that needs to take place.

One of the barriers we have found is service from the telecom closet to the street. What this means is right now when there is a new building being constructed, there are conduit that are placed from the street to the property line. Usually in that conduit, one is for electricity, one could be for gas. One is for cable. One is for telephone. What we find is that often, whoever uses that conduit doesn't want to share it. So, now there is only one conduit for internet to that residence. It makes no sense at all. So, one of the potential mandates, in looking at potential legislation, requiring the placement of the additional conduit at that time.  The conduit from the street to the property line. The conduit is cheap. It's a piece of plastic. And it could save a lot of headaches down the road. And again, I should mention that we're looking between recommendations and incentive and maybe more prescriptive approaches in terms of legislation. Those decisions have not been made. This is very preliminary at this point. The second one, we really can't force providers to serve parts of the City. That authority is long gone. We never had it when it came to internet, but we can take a look at what kind of incentives an be provided, and also work closely now with the emerging fixed wireless providers, to see what can be done to expand the reach of a high speed internet service. Talk about antiquated interior wiring, which is, in my view, likely the biggest obstacle right now. We're looking at potential for building code amendments. Within a substantial remodel, this is the time to wire up. Get wired for the 21st century.

Training, of course. We're training for how we address the lack of knowledge, both technical and business and negotiative knowledge that a lot of the building owners have. We also found that the different providers want their own wiring schemes. So how does someone prepare the closet, the risers, conduits? All of this to accommodate that. So we need to work there to see if we can revive, and that's going to be one of the points of this stakeholder meeting that we're going to have. Is there a common solution for all of this? That's a tricky one. I'm not sure which way it will go, but one solution is like San Francisco did where it's just not allowed anymore to have the excuse of ignorance. The same thing with exclusive marketing agreements. We talked about this. For some reason, it doesn't show. I may have accidentally deleted it. But again, there's probably a building code requirement.

Finally, one of the things we've found in our research is everybody familiar with leads certification or doing some type of broadband ready certification or broadband competition within the building, some kind of acknowledgement, formal acknowledgement. There is an international body that does that type of acknowledgement, so we would work more closely with them. I talked about this earlier: Make the necessary from the right of way to the property line.

We're looking at potential incentives on the soft side of things, and then if that doesn't work, we will move towards a legislative fix. We think something needs to be done when you have 20 percent of the 51 percent is something like 700,000 or so. You have 350,000 living in the environment, and only 20 percent of those have access to more than one provider. That makes no sense, so something needs to be done. Questions?

**Heather Lewis:** Can you tell us a little bit more about that stakeholder group that you're trying to put together, and if anybody in the room or anybody else in the community is interested in participating, is that an option?

**Tony Perez:** Sure! We haven't set a date for that yet, but the next follow up we need to do. I'll mention that I'm retiring next month.... (laughs) but you can bet I will attend once that's set up. The natural stakeholders, obviously, are going to be the property owners, architects, developers, City staff who are interested in this issue, tenants. And the whole purpose is some kind of engagement. We need to figure out how to address this disparity. We need to figure out how to overcome these barriers. Help us do it. How can we create a plan together to do this. I think it's fair to say that this is another option that we're looking at. We're either going to arrive at some kind of private market based solutions for this, or we have to regulate a solution. And it might be a combination of both.  But it's an opportunity to influence that conversation. Does that answer your question?

**Heather Lewis:** Yes, thank you. Does anyone else have a question for Tony?

**Question:** Will your group be looking into collaborating with folks that are trying to bring Google fiber to Seattle? They are a much faster internet provider.  Would that be something you guys would be doing?

**Tony Perez:** We welcome any provider that wants to do fiber here. The City is not barring anyone from coming in. that's a popular misconception, that somehow we limit competition. It's just a market-based decision. It's a very capital intensive thing, and not an easy thing to do.

**Jim Loter:**  And, in fact, Google fiber is not building out anymore. It's just too expensive to build out fiber, even for Google, who create their own money.

**Tony Perez:** And they think, perhaps, getting through with a wireless solution is the better way. Anybody else?

**Jose Vasquez:**  Thank you. This is really informative. My perception, and correct me if I'm wrong, is this is targeting condos, the new developments. I heard a little bit about old multi-dwelling units, and we're talking about equity. How are we supporting these older buildings that are mainly in lower income neighborhoods?

**Tony Perez:** This is the big issue in low income neighborhoods, the issue of antiquated interior wire. I don't know how many of you live in older buildings. That is a problem. It's hard to say to the owner, "You have to spend $30 or $40 thousand." That's, I think, the biggest nut to crack. And in the research we did, we did speak with Seattle Housing Authority, and they are aware.

**Jose Vasquez:**  Maybe we can invite SDOT to help facilitate 5G?

**Jim Loter:**  On the small cell? CTAB is definitely on the schedule. There are a few more state gates that need to happen before the changes to the code that Tony talked about are ready to come here. But, I've been directly involved in that process, and CTAB is on the list. We're definitely going to bring those changes here and talk about the potential impacts.

**Tony Perez:** I think you'll find that really interesting.

**John Krull:** Has the City thought about providing fiber to housing authority buildings or other buildings?

**Tony Perez:** We have, and from a technical perspective--maybe you can help me understand it--we're not an ISP.

**John Krull:** We can become one, though.

**Tony Perez:** The policy decision has been made. The City is not going to become an ISP. Now, the City does have a lot of public fiber. The problem is that the public fiber is basically a consortium of 16 or 17.... So, in a sense, the available fiber is very fragmented throughout the City. It was never designed to serve individual apartment buildings or for the general public.

**Jim Loter:**  It is something that we are opening up, I think, to explore. Even if the City doesn't become an actual internet service provider, as Tony said, we have  a lot of dark fiber, but the business model that it's locked up in makes it very difficult to bring in another partner to the table. We're definitely interesting in looking at way to make that easier.

**Tony Perez:** We're also looking at the possibility for an existing ISP--a WAVE or something may need a connection from point 'A" to point "B." We're not serving anybody, but if they can avail themselves of a certain strand of fiber, that's a possibility.

**Heather Lewis:** We have time for one more question for Tony.  Any last questions?

**Karia Wong:**  I heard that a lot of the housing apartments might need rewiring internally for faster internet. Is the City going to support any plan to support that rewiring somehow?

**Tony Perez:** We haven't figured that out yet. There could be something. I don't know. Does the City do incentives for other types of building remodels?

**Jim Loter:**  Yes, I think, for energy upgrades there is a history of the City supporting upgrades that are deemed to be in the general public interest. So, I think under antiquated interior wiring, the third item on the list, is maybe what you're talking about, Karia. We could take the carrot approach and develop incentives. We could take the stick approach and go so far as to implement building code requirements. We would have to weigh very carefully anything that imposes costs, especially if those costs are ... there are building owners for whom additional costs would represent an economic burden, too.

**Karia Wong:**  A lot of clients who live in the ID were actually stuck at 7mbps as a max. That's because they basically have old  phone style cables in the building, and that's all they've got.

**Heather Lewis:** Thank you, Tony.

**Tony Perez:** It's a complex issue, and I think it will take a year or two to sort itself out.

**Heather Lewis:** Thank you, and we'll miss you.

**Heather Lewis:** We're going to take a seven-minute break and be back at 7:20.

**BREAK**

**Heather Lewis:** All right. It's looks like Amie and the technology are ready.  Thank you for coming.

**CITY AFFORDABILITY PORTAL**

**Amie Thao:**  Sure! I'm Amie, and I'm from the Mayor's Office and I'm working on a project on affordability. I'm going to do a really short presentation and hopefully get some feedback from all of these wonderful people in the room. My team is the Innovation Performance Team. Our vision is to have a more collaborative, innovative City government. We have a lot of different expertise on the team, but I am focused on design and my team's focus is on using data analytics and design to make better decisions.

The project I want to share with you today is about how might the City of Seattle better connect low income housing residents to City services. It was borne from an executive order that Mayor Durkan put out last year. It was the Seattle Rental Housing Assistance program, and in Section 3, a policy analyst just sort of slipped in and said we should do an affordability portal. So, they put the solution in the executive order, and then they gave the project to us. As you probably know...who thinks web sites are the way people find information? [laughs] Exactly. So, luckily, they gave it to us and we have ten weeks to make a recommendation. So, we started out with doing research; we did about two and a half weeks. And we synthesized the research. We brought people together, including the people we were doing research with, to generate ideas. Now, we're prototyping ideas and testing them. And that's what I'll be showing you. And now we have a couple of weeks to make our recommendation. And then, after that, we're going to continue working on affordability. This is sort of a little pilot project for a more human centered design process.

So, our research: We went out into the field and we talked to frontline staff at community centers, libraries. We talked to Karia at Chinese Information Service Center, at El Centro, and we interviewed residents. So, here is an example of quotes. So, "I would like a go-to person, instead of talking to different people and explaining my situation every time. I wish I had a personal social worker that can oversee my account, who I can connect with right away." We did about five hours of these interviews. We also just observed how people did their work. This is an example of a City employee that had a hackneyed do-it-yourself resource book, since the City lacks a centralized place where you can get information. In total, a team of four in two and a half weeks, half a team talked to 14 departments to learn about current processes. My team did 11 locations, contextual research, and we interviewed 10 people for five hours.

From that--I think David Keyes sent you these things ahead of time-- but, things around 'meet people where they are to give them the information they need; people find things through word of mouth; many people preferred accessing information through other people; people need ease of access, security, clarity, to successfully navigate services. We found out that our communications unintentionally scared people, or at the very least, made them very frustrated. An additionally solution, if executed well, benefits people who already access web services. A lot of people don't access information that way, or they don't have access at all. We also found that there is really a limit to our current programs and services. Even if someone got all of the benefits, it may or may not help them stay in Seattle. Part of my team is working on programs analysis, but I'm working on the digital part.

Innovation Lab: We wanted people to find their inner designer by thinking big picture, what if, as tactic. We brought together 31 people from 10 departments, and then a few residents and community organizations. This is a map of our participants, with red being residents of Seattle, orange being people who provide direct services, blue being the people who support them, and the outer ring is people like me or people who do work that eventually result in how services are delivered.

Ultimately, we had six groups that resulted in 275 ideas or so. Each group selected their favorite idea, and presented it out.  Here are some examples of ideas. The first ones--this person worked at the animal shelter, so we had a lot of animal metaphors that had a centralized place where people can come. A resource menu. People talked about having a concierge service, or ambassadors working with community based organizations to reach their communities. Things like that.

Those ideas are in these three areas. People do want a digital portal, but maybe more for service providers or internal City staff. Or it can help with accessibility, if you're a new immigrant, let's say, or a young person who is excited with the internet. Maybe you don't have language skills, but if a portal had your language, you could actually gain the benefits on your own. Part of my team is working on process improvement. The other part is working on outreach and marketing.

I have four prototypes, for which I'm going to split you guys up and have you guys look at them. The first one is  the 'Am I Eligible.' This is just to address the need that we heard that no one actually knows how many programs the City has to address affordability. There is a benefits pre-approval. People were really frustrated and they had to talk to many different City departments to submit their benefits. So, this is a way to centralize the income verification process, the identity verification part, maybe even have CBOs, community based organizations be able to do it. And then, by the time someone hits the City, the program staff can just take it from there. The next one is 'My Benefits Status Check.' A lot of people don't know where they are in the process. If they call a City employee, that person also doesn't know what the person needs to do. So the status check is just to help people figure out where they are in the process. The last concept is around 'Finding What Savings You're Eligible For.' We heard that some City programs--like you can get a $20 car tab--the saving is $60, but you have to submit all of this paperwork. So, a lot of people said it's totally not worth it. This little calculator lets you put in your family size, your income, and it will tell you how much you can save.

I had another deck that I made up because I felt we all needed to stand up a little bit. But, I want everybody. Who here considers themselves a low income resident, or are here to represent low income residents? Anybody? Who provides direct services? What about people who support or manage people in programs? And what about people who support policies or programs that eventually trickle down and drizzle direct services? What I would love to have you do, is let's count off into fours. I'm going to assign each group a prototype. And, I'll look at each prototype and get some feedback.

[Attendees were grouped into four corners of the room for discussion.]

**Heather Lewis:** We're going to do a quick report out on committee activity from February, starting with Steven Maheshwary.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**DIGITAL INCLUSION**

**Steven Maheshwary:**  Digital Inclusion: We met in January and we had a digital survey go out in February. We had a great turnout in January, and the idea was that we were able to suss out a lot of projects in areas of focus that were new for 2018. And we wanted to triage those projects through a survey that was sent out in February. We're still collecting the results. We're still determining when our next meeting is going to be.

**Heather Lewis:** Scott, do you want to do a report on Smart Cities?

**SMART CITIES**

**Scott Wang:** We had a kickoff meeting in February. We divided the committee into three general work groups along the lines of autonomous vehicles, legislative tracking, and community building. We're still waiting for more clarity from the Mayor's Office about their priorities for the year. But, to give you some color on the direction we're going as a committee, the early think is the priority will focus on one, really working with the City; two, ask the City to articulate why we need an autonomous vehicles pilot in the first place, how it fits precedence and the social and economic impact. And the second is, assuming it moves forward, what are the requirements that could inform the pilot. More to come once we have the list of priorities.

**CYBER SECURITY AND PRIVACY**

**Heather Lewis:** Great. Thank you for being understanding as that information moves forward. It sounds like Mark De Loura, Steven Maheshwary, and I met with a couple of members of the Mayor's Office. Sounds like they should have more detail in the next 30 days. And, I am representing Torgie Madison and the Cyber Security and Privacy Committee. He has a meeting coming up on March 27, and we'll send out the detail, because I don't have a time or place. But, we'll be sure to include that. Torgie? Could you speak on behalf of the committee?

**Torgie Madison:** Yes, absolutely. This is a great opportunity. The meeting is on March 27, and it's at the Montlake Branch of the Seattle Public Library, at 6:00 p.m. This is a great opportunity to basically inform the City on all issues pertaining to privacy and security. We have this review process happening to assess surveillance technologies.**....** I encourage all of CTAB and all community members to join us.

**Heather Lewis:** Thanks, Torgie, for your leadership there. And we have about two minutes to wrap everything up and adjourn out meeting. So, thank you, everyone, for staying right until the end. We usually give you a couple of minutes back. In terms of next steps, we have a number of presentations and a few email addresses to send out. I am also sending out a survey. We'd love to hear from you regarding meeting format, types of speakers, and other topics that you would like to learn more about. That will be coming out at the same time as the rest of the materials we just discussed. It's already on our Facebook page. You can get it there, if that's more convenient. Otherwise, David Keyes, did you have any thoughts on last minute next steps.

**David Keyes:** No I do not.

**Heather Lewis:** Well, then, this meeting is adjourned. Thank you for coming, everybody.

**ADJOURNMENT**