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**19 In Attendance**

**Heather Lewis:** The CTAB meeting will be about an hour tonight. We usually start by going around the room and introducing ourselves. Please say the neighborhood from which you come.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

**Heather Lewis:** Can we get a motion to approve the April agenda?

**Eliab Sisay:** I so move.

**Jose Vasquez:** Second.

**Heather Lewis:** Everyone in favor, say 'aye.'  Anyone opposed? April agenda passes. Can I get a motion to approve the March minutes?

**Jose Vasquez:** I so move.

**Eliab Sisay:**  Second.

**Heather Lewis:**Everyone in favor, say 'aye.'  Anyone opposed? Okay, March minutes pass. Next item on the agenda is the City Council proposed surveillance Ordinance Task Force.

**David Keyes:** I'll hand out the information and the attendance sheet.

**Heather Lewis:** Thanks a lot, David. Torgie, I know you're on the line and you are the expert when it comes to anything Surveillance Ordinance-related. Do you mind if I provide a little bit of background from the paragraph in the middle? And then, please add any details. Will that work?

**SURVEILLANCE ORDINANCE TASK FORCE**

**Torgie Madison:** I think that will be fine, and also having [unintelligible] handy would be useful, too.

**Heather Lewis:** Yes. David, can you increase the size of the text? Thank you. Can we zoom? Excellent. Okay, so this is just a little bit of background. Over the last few weeks, there has been quite a bit of activity related to the Surveillance Ordinance. An amendment has been proposed by Councilmember O'Brien, Amendment One. And what it does is it proposes that a separate community board be created to review surveillance technologies. This would be the Community Surveillance Advisory Board (CSAB) A number of different stakeholder groups within the City and community groups have weighed in on this. There have also been a couple of other alternative solutions proposed, as well, one of which would be a Mayor's Taskforce, which would help address some of the backlog of technologies that haven't been reviewed yet. So, to get the City to the point where they're reviewing current technologies as they're coming in, this Mayor's Taskforce would  help get us up to a point where the workload is manageable. Another option is that CTAB could be expanded and could help take on some of this future workload, once we have gotten to the point where the workload is just the new incoming work. Jim Loter, do you have any thoughts to add, or any background that you could share? I know you had a meeting today.

**Jim Loter:** Yes. About the only background that we can share at this time is that at the Governance, Equity, and Technology committee meeting where this amendment was introduced, the chair of the committee, Council President Bruce Harrell did not put the amendment up for a vote immediately, and instead asked the Chief Privacy Officer and Seattle IT to develop an assessment of the impact that this amendment would create for the surveillance process. And so we are still in the midst of developing that assessment, as requested by the Council president. And the assessment will include recommendations for modifications or alternatives to the amendment that was introduced by the Councilmember at that meeting. At this point, we are shooting for April 17, which is the next meeting of that committee, but it is coming up very quickly. It's likely that our report back to the committee will be delayed, possibly by another week.

**Heather Lewis:** Last time we spoke, my understanding was that your concerns, or Seattle IT's concerns had to do with an additional board being created that could potentially siphon off talent from CTAB, and syphon off other types of resources. And this could potentially become another silo.

**Jim Loter:** I think that's a concern that we raised, and also just questioning, in the midst of this, what the role of CTAB really is, other than to perform this kind of function.  We're factoring all of that into our response.

**Eliab Sisay:**  Can I ask a question? Can you talk a little bit about what the intent of that board would be?

**Jim Loter:** Absolutely. From what we understand, the amendment specifies that the board would be comprised of nine members, appointed by Council, and that the board would be staffed by Council staff. And that the membership would be drawn from a community of largely civil rights concerned organizations, not so much technology. Setting aside for a minute that we are talking about technologies, our understanding is the Councilmember introduced the amendment believes that technology can be managed in a responsible way, but the deployment of surveillance technologies, especially in communities that may already be  over-surveilled, or are otherwise vulnerable or under-represented, can have a chilling effect, regardless of how the technology is managed. So we understood that to be the primary concern that this amendment was seeking to address. I think the Surveillance Ordinance, as written, is pretty technical and is focused on how the City is going to manage technologies to mitigate risks, but I think we all recognize that even is that were true, there is still a potential community impact on just having the technology in the community. So that's the intent behind this board according to what was presented at this meeting. Does that answer your question?

**Jose Vasquez:** Has there ever been a situation where two different boards and commissions joined forces in a committee like this?

**Jim Loter:** I don't know.

**Jose Vasquez:** Because that would be interesting. For example, CTAB can source the technology side, while something like the Office on Civil Rights, if they have a similar board or commission, why not establish a joint committee of those two boards, instead of creating a whole new board.

**Jim Loter:** That's a really good idea. I think, when we heard about this, we went to the web site to find out how many boards and commissions there are, and there are a lot. So, certainly recognizing that expertise and the mission of at least two, if not more, of existing boards could be combined is an interesting idea.

**Heather Lewis:**  Torgie, did you have anything to add? I know you've attended many meetings related to the Surveillance Ordinance.

**Torgie Madison:** I don't have anything specific to add. I think that what you've been saying is pretty much what I think, myself. Setting up a new board would be duplicating a lot of effort and structure .

**Jim Loter:** One other thing to point out is that the original ordinance also established a working group. It was a short-lived working group to make recommendations to the City regarding community involvement and community engagement around the surveillance technologies. So that happened, and there's nothing about this proposal that would change those recommendation, or at least, there is nothing in the amendment that would change those recommendations. So, the board would exist but the community engagement process, were w would have public meetings and give an opportunity for public comment, at least according to the amendment as drafted, that would continue. So, the timeline in which it would take to develop the surveillance impact review, have the board review it, have the community engagement process, have all of that be collected and then finally transmit that packet to Council, we think that, if everything goes smoothly, it would take about 16 to 20 weeks. Not that that is good or bad, it would just be modifying the rest of the ordinance to account for the additional time that the review and additional board would take. But the community engagement piece where we would have open public meetings, the amendment doesn't touch that, or doesn't make any recommendations to counter that.

**Heather Lewis:** Thank you. David Keyes, could you move down to the next piece?

**Jose Vasquez:**  Our committees, for example, our Digital Equity Committee, are they subject to the public meeting...?

**Jim Loter:** Yes. It would be.

**Heather Lewis:** There should be a second page. There we go. So, this may well be  premature, but this was based on conversations with Jim Loter, and conversations with Torgie Madison, and ha been reviewed by Steven Maheshwary. It's a draft letter to Mayor Durkan, and the Seattle City Council, discussing first of all, the proposed amendment for the Community Surveillance Advisory Board. Instead of supporting the proposed new advisory board, providing two alternatives. This may not be something that we want to weigh in on at all. And if we do decide that we want to weigh in on it as group, this may not be the language that we would want to go with. But, if you don't mind, I think it would be great to at least have a discussion about whether or not we'd like to weigh in on it. And then figure out how we would like to weigh in, should we decide that that's something we want to move forward with. So, first of all, as a board and as a community, is this an issue that we would like to weigh in on? Can I make a motion? I suppose that that would be the right way to do that. Actually, can I get someone else to provide a motion, if they so wish?

**Jose Vasquez:** Is this a motion to enter a discussion or to engage ...

**Heather Lewis:**  A motion to write some sort of letter to engage in this process.

**Torgie Madison:** This is Torgie. I move to do that.

**Heather Lewis:**  Thank you. And thank you for dealing with my less than succinct language there.

**Jose Vasquez:** I'll second Torgie's motion.

**Heather Lewis:** I have a motion and a second. Everyone in favor of weighing in in some way or to continue the conversation, please say 'aye.'

**Jose Vasquez:** Can we have a discussion before we vote? I just want to get more clarity. I agree with it, but basically writing a statement back to City Council or the Mayor's Office, or updating this?

**Heather Lewis:** We could entirely scrap this and we could choose to do something else. But, at this point, I think my intention was to determine whether or not we wanted to move this conversation forward.

**Jose Vasquez:** Here at the board level, or at the Privacy Committee level?

**Heather Lewis:** That's a good question. It sounded like there were some questions regarding the future of the Privacy Committee if this work were to move forward. Is that still the case?

**David Keyes:** I think that's a question on the impact, which is one of two factors. One is what is te overall scope of the Privacy and Cyber Security committee of CTAB, but then the other thing is, to what extent does the proposed CSAB community surveillance advisory board take away and make some of the intended work of the Privacy and Cyber Security Committee this year. I know that they had been moving forward to plan some of the technology assessments using the committee's meetings to do that.

**Torgie Madison:** I can speak to that. I do feel like the new CSAB would pretty much eclipse the entire scope of the Privacy and Cyber Security Committee. They'd be doing a lot of the work we'd be doing.It would be redundant.

**Jose Vasquez:** For our purposes, as it stands right now, with the Privacy Committee still standing, we're going to look at this here at the board level or at the current Privacy Committee level? I guess that's the clarity I'm looking for.

**Jim Loter:** There is a matter of timing. You're not going to have any time to take it up at the Privacy Committee if the April 17 date remains.  There is an assessment, up to and including an alternative amendment going forward. The Mayor's Office has actually stepped in and is working with us to develop that response. And we certainly presented to them our interest in taking advantage of the expertise in CTAB, especially the expanded CTAB that you have proposed separately to the Mayor and Council. The concern you're raising here and at least some flavor of the alternatives is being factored in to the development of the response. So, I'm not trying to influence or sway the board's decision around this, but just to point out that there is work going on that is largely consistent with what you're proposing, but we are pretty much moving toward the deadline of having to have something to the committee next Tuesday. It would be great if you continue to have this conversation, but I think you have t have it here.

**Heather Lewis:** This has, obviously, come up quite quickly and I know that a lot of people are getting up to speed in this meeting, so perhaps it's premature to have any sort of significant conversation now, acknowledging that the timeline is quite tight. If the Seattle IT leadership team were to put something similar together, would signing onto it, or sending a letter expressing our approval of it work?

**Jim Loter:** At this point, the Mayor's Office has pretty much taken on the assignment that was given to us at the table at a committee meeting back in March. I don't think it would hurt to decide on whether you want to send this to the Mayor and City Council members, as you've stated, because I think you're raising good concerns about the amendment and its impact on CTAB and your responsibilities. I think it would be reasonable to possible just raise those concerns without even necessarily putting forward alternatives. And maybe, just to make it clear that whatever goes forward, whether it's the amendment as it stands or a modified amendment or some other change, that engaging CTAB and recognizing CTAB's expertise role -- you are basically working within the intersection of technology and equity and civil rights right now, especially with your work supporting the Technology Matching Fund, and the other issues that you take into consideration -- I think just raising those concerns would probably be a good move, and you may not even have to submit alternatives at this point. But again, that's your call. But I do recognize the timeline is short to have a communication like this have any meaning or impact on the process. The April 17 date, I think today we acknowledged is imminent, and possibly we won't have our response ready by then, so there may be more time, but there is no decision made about that. And it's not our decision to make. It's the Council committee's decision to make. Again, this has been a journey in civil procedure and bureaucracy, which has been fun if you're kind of wonky like I am. But I recognize that I don't have all the answers, and I don't know at this point, if you submit this and convene offline and come up with a version of this that you're satisfied with as a board by Friday, I think you would still have time for this to make an impact and for your voices to be heard while deliberations are still going on.

**David Keyes:** But to vote on something and endorse something needs to happen in a couple of meetings.

**Jim Loter:**  Oh, that's right.

**Heather Lewis:** Could you define public options in this case? Is a public meeting like this the only option, or would a conference call that was publicized be considered a public option? Are there any other public options if we want to review this in a few days?

**David Keyes:** You can call a special meeting. It has to have at least 24 hours notice, so you need to make it publicly ....

**Eliab Sisay:**  The final language of the letter, or do we just need to give 24 hours notice of the meeting?

**David Keyes:** For the board to vote and make a recommendation, you have to hold a meeting and have a quorum. And your meetings are required to be open meetings. In order to be an open meeting, to be considered an open meeting, it has to have notice go out ahead of time so people know. I can double check this, but I'm pretty sure there is a requirement that at least there be the opportunity for people to attend at some level. People can participate electronically like they are today. They have that option. But people do need to have the option to attend some place.

**John Krull:**  No, honestly, I think we could discuss this for a little while and come up with a couple of edits at this meeting. I appreciate the work you've put into it, and I've already heard a good idea from Jose.

**Heather Lewis:**  Just looking at the rest of the time that we have today, we've budgeted some time for committee updates, and I see that neither representatives from the Smart Cities is here. We could allocate seven to 10 additional minutes, if that's fine, to spend tweaking this.

**Jose Vasquez:**  We have to finish the current vote on the table.

**Heather Lewis:**  Your thoughts on that? Whether it makes sense now to vote to continue the conversation before voting on whether or not to move the letter forward.

**David Keyes:** We could also suspend the agenda item and come back to it.

**Heather Lewis:** Sure. We could do that. We don't have a break today, so there won't be any time to review it. We could just jump through the other items and then come back. Let's move on for now to the Federal Lifeline broadband phone service changes.

**FEDERAL LIFELINE BROADBAND AND PHONE SERVICE CHANGES**

**David Keyes:** I sent out on the agenda because I know the board had worked with Lifeline issues before. And so I sent this out to folks. There has been email coming out of the FCC. The FCC has been considering rules around Lifeline broadband. Just some quick background: The Obama administration passed rules that expanded Lifeline so that the discount could be used to buy broadband service. They also expanded eligibility so that more than just the phone companies, the traditional eligible Lifeline providers, could provide broadband. So, for instance, a couple of examples of what that expansion of those rules would have done is that it would have enabled a Comcast or a WAVE that are not providing telephone service to offer broadband and use the Lifeline discount. It would also enable organizations like Mobile Citizen, which is reselling Sprint service for $10 a month, to be able to offer the broadband Lifeline discount also. Finally, it would also enable some aggregation, so that a group like Seattle House Authority, for instance, could decide that it wants to provide broadband to all of its residents, and could collect those monies and apply that Lifeline discount, no matter who they're purchasing from. So they could purchase from Century Link and offer that discount, become a broadband provider in essence.

With a new administration and a new FCC, they put a hold on the implementation of all those new broadband provider options. There was a comment period, and we're now in a reply to comments period, so there has been some organizations, the National League of Cities and the National Association of Telecom Officers and Advisors submitted comments. There have been a number of civil rights groups, the Urban League, different media diversity groups, have filed comments, as well.

What is linked here is there are two letters that are going in. One is specifically focused on seniors and one on veterans. It's just an opportunity. If the board wanted to sign on to comments that are going in, this is the easy way to do that.

**Jim Loter:** Is it the National Digital Inclusion Alliance (NDIA) that's doing the comments?

**David Keyes:** National Digital Inclusion Alliance (NDIA) also already did file comments in an initial proceeding around the Lifeline broadband. In this one, the National Consumer Law Center has put out something. This is a draft letter, but this one doesn't say exactly, although there are some folks that are participants in the National Digital Inclusion Alliance that are putting it in. This is what was issued by the National Consumer Law Center to encourage comments, as well, and talk about some of the issues for seniors.

**Jose Vasquez:** I think this is an alliance with our previous positions where we supported low income broadband, so it's not a big stretch in my mind to also sign onto this.

**Heather Lewis:** That makes sense to me, too. Do we want to vote on whether or not to sign onto this?

**John Krull:** Sure. I move that CTAB signs onto the petitions for the -- what are we calling these?

**David Keyes:**  Comments. Letters.

**Heather Lewis:** John has made the motion. Does anybody second?

**Eliab Sisay:** Second.

**Heather Lewis:** Great. Mark DeLoura just sent me a note again that he also would like to vote in the affirmative. Can we get a full vote? All in favor, say 'aye.' Any opposed? No? Okay, so we will sign on to the NCLC comments. Now, how do we do that practically?

**David Keyes:**  Practically, there is a link in there to go to a Google Doc form and sign on our name and organization. If you, Heather, just want to do that on behalf of the board, you can just go in and enter CTAB's name. Just sign on to that letter.

**Heather Lewis:** Sure, and I'll send out a notification to let everyone know that it has been done. Thanks a lot, David. Were there any other updates regarding NDIA?

**David Keyes:**  Next week is the National Digital Inclusion Alliance meeting conference in Cleveland. I should double check. I'm not sure if they will be streaming the seminars or not. I'll find that out.

**John Krull:** Are you going?

**David Keyes:**  Yes, some of us from the Community Technology team are going.

**Jim Loter:** All of the team are going.

**David Keyes:**  Yes, and a couple of us are presenting. Delia Burke is presenting on the Technology Matching Fund. I'm hosting a panel on local digital inclusion plans with folks from Austin and Kansas City ad a town in Ohio. I think Vicki Yuki is doing something on public housing. A good presence there. They are also organizing, I think it's the second one that they've done, a National Digital Inclusion Week, May 7-11, which also falls on the day of the next CTAB meeting. I put a link here if you want to go look at the site, but it's just an opportunity for folks to just tweet out. You could do this now, even. Hashtag out things around digital equity and just support that presence, create some dialog about that. Organizations can become affiliates of the National Digital Inclusion Alliance. It doesn't cost anything to do that. It costs something to become a subscriber with some additional benefits. So, if you have organizations that support the digital inclusion work, they can become affiliates and get linked in through their mailing list and get updates on things like that. We haven't talked about this internally here, but if CTAB wanted to do an event to just affirm something around digital inclusion, and dove-tail it and call it part of Digital Inclusion Week at your next meeting, that's a chance to do that, too.

**Heather Lewis:** I was actually going to suggest that. I think it's a really nice idea. We had talked about 2018 being the year of CTAB experimentation, where we have wanted to try different things. One of the ideas that was proposed, I think it was Mark DeLoura's idea, was to have monthly themes. This initially was going to be the Privacy month, because we had a privacy agenda. How do people feel about maybe making next month the Digital Equity Inclusion month and maybe having a couple of speakers? Making that part of the agenda in some way?

**Steven Maheshwary:**  I'm in favor of that.

**Heather Lewis:** Was that Mark? Oh, Steven.

**Jose Vasquez:**  I would also be in favor of that. I like it.

**Heather Lewis:** We also have the TMF coming up, too, so it seems time to....

**Jose Vasquez:**  Could we get a motion?

**Heather Lewis:** Sure.

**Jose Vasquez:**  I move that we declare May Digital Inclusion Month.

**Heather Lewis:** Can I get a second?

**John Krull:** Second.

**Heather Lewis:** All in favor, please say 'aye.' Any opposed? Okay, May will become the 2018 Digital Inclusion Month at CTAB. Next on the agenda, we had committee updates. We don't have any members of the Smart Cities and Community Innovation committee here tonight. Are there any Digital Equity committee updates?

**DIGITAL EQUITY COMMITTEE UPDATE**

**Steven Maheshwary:** We do have a brief update. We have elected John Krull, who will now be the chair for the Digital Equity Committee. John will hopefully be communicating what we already got done. I think that is the full extent of the update.

**Heather Lewis:** Okay. Thank you, Steven, and thank you, John, for your leadership.

**John Krull:** You're welcome. Do we need to vote me in or anything?

**Heather Lewis:** No, we don't. Mark DeLoura and I communicated by text a minute ago, and we opted to move the next item, which is the CTAB Communications Audit Discussion, to next month, so that we have some time to look at the memo.  So Public Comment, then, is the next item on the agenda. Anyone have a public comment?

**Jose Vasquez:**  Actually, can we go back to the Digital Inclusion update?

**Heather Lewis:** Oh, sure. Sorry.

**Jose Vasquez:**  I just want to make sure we state that TMF is currently open. The deadline is May 11. So I just want to emphasize if anyone knows of any local nonprofits or community groups that are interested in applying or have innovative digital equity projects in mind, please apply. Please share widely. Also, I think we're still looking for grant review committee members. I don't think that has been established yet.

**David Keyes:** I know there is a committee. A number of folks have been talking with Delia Burke and letting her know they want to be on the committee. I don't have that list. Contact delia.burke@seattle.gov or let Seferiana Day or me know, and we'll convey that to Delia.

**Jose Vasquez:**  I just want to make sure that that is in the minutes, for anybody who likes reading minutes.

**Cass Magnuski:**  H-e-y-y-y! [laughs]

**David Keyes:** We completed three workshops a couple of weeks ago. And so we've been replying to people who are interested in applying to the matching fund.

**Heather Lewis:** Okay, thanks, Jose. So, next up is Public Comment and Announcements. Does anyone have anything to announce? Anyone over the phone?

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Jim Loter:**I have an announcement. The Seattle Channel just received 12 Northwest Emmy nominations for this year's Emmy Awards. Those are usually given out in June, so we will be crossing our fingers, and hope that we stock our trophy case again. Check out our Tech Talk blog, and make sure you watch the nominated programs, because they're quite excellent.

**Heather Lewis:** Thanks for letting us know.

**Jose Vasquez:** I have an announcement. The Latino community funding young nonprofit professionals network is hosting a panel conversation around how to join a board or commission, which I think is very appropriate to this board, and also folks interested in possibly serving on a board or commission, it's going to be hosted on Monday, April 23, 5:00 to 8:00 p.m., at the Seattle Foundation offices. Reach out to me after the meeting if you have questions or want to know more.

**John Krull:** I have an update. I mentioned, I think, a couple of meetings ago, the school district is having an Information Technology Advisory Board. We extended the application process to May 11. We're really trying to get people of color and the historically disadvantaged community to apply. People who haven't normally had a voice in the school district.  That is actually right on our home page right now, at the top. seattleschools.org. We will have translations up, I think, next week.

**Heather Lewis:** Thank you.

**David Keyes:** We can send that out, or if you want to send it, that would be easier. And we can send it out from the Community Tech list.

**John Krull:** Okay. Who do I send that to?

**David Keyes:** Send it to me.

**Heather Lewis:** With public comment then concluded, can we loop back around to the memo? It looks like we have 15 or 16 minutes. If we can spend 10 or so taking a look at the language and making any updates, then we can vote on whether or not to proceed, with the understanding that there may still be a few items.

**John Krull:** Jim Loter, I was wondering what Seattle IT's role? It sounds like there is a lot of work to review these technologies.

**Jim Loter:**  Yes. The Privacy team effectively serves as the administrator and facilitator of the Surveillance Ordinance requirements. The real work of completing the Surveillance Impact Report falls to the department whose technology has either been classified as surveillance or is seeking to acquire new technology, but we work with them. We support them. We facilitate them. We help them complete the review. And we essentially steward that through the various processes to get it into a shape to submit it to Council as legislation. That's the ultimate goal of the Surveillance Ordinance.

**John Krull:** Is part of the process that the department and City IT kind of do the initial work, and then they move it along to whatever committee there is there, to do a review of your work?

**Jim Loter:**  All right. So, if I work for SDCI, and I want to buy a picture-taking robot that wanders around downtown taking pictures of people...

**David Keyes:** SDCI is construction and land use.

**Jim Loter:**  Right. Or any department. I would put that in through the traditional standard technology acquisition process. I want to buy this robot. And, as part of that process, we've incorporated a review that takes what the department tells us about the technology they're wanting to buy overlays the definition of surveillance technology as defined in the ordinance. And we flag it as possibly this may be surveillance-related. So, we have a number of questions that the department has to answer--a small number of questions--that get us to a high level of confidence that this might be surveillance technology. Then a member of the staff contacts that department, asks them a series of questions to find out more information about what this picture-taking robot is going to do. And, probably, in this case, we'd conclude that yes, this is a piece of surveillance technology. You have to do an impact review that abasically assures the City that you are aware of what the technology does, what the impacts to peoples' privacy are, and that you have taken the appropriate steps in your plans to implement the technology to mitigate those risks. So, you could state that you are minimizing data collection, we are providing people with an opt-in or an opt-out option. So, there are a variety of mitigations and controls that could be placed in that. Up until that point, it's sort of a standard privacy review, but if it's surveillance, then the next step is the department works with us to conduct, at least as we understand it now, a public engagement event. We would schedule something at a community center or at a library. We would invite members of the public to ask questions of the department. How are you planning to use this picture-taking robot? Why do you need it? Or, if I don't want to participate, those kinds of things. We take all of those comments we have back to the growing bundle of information. If the amendment goes through, then all of that would go to a separate board that would then evaluate the civil rights or other types of community impacts on it. Then, ultimately, the goal is to put all of that in the form of an ordinance and submit it to Council, and Council would than ether approve that or not. That's what the ordinance, as of right now, directs us to do. Seattle IT's role in that is to do that up front assessment and try to catch stuff that might trigger the Surveillance Ordinance, and then work with the department to move it along in the process until it's acquired.

**John Krull:** All right, I appreciate that. I just wanted to get a handle on how much work it was for whatever board is reviewing it. It sounds like it's a review and another set of eyes, but a lot of the technical work has been done?

**Jim Loter:** Yes. There would be a lot of material presented to the board. Some of these surveillance impact reports are 40 to 60 pages. In some cases, especially around sensitive technologies used in law enforcement context, for example, we're not naming names of products or disclosing any sort of proprietary tradecraft related to the technologies to the extent that we can not do that. It's really about what are the departmental policies in place that govern the use of this technology to minimize the impact to the public and to civil right concerns. In the example I love using, which is the picture-taking robot, if we somehow documented in that that this is a picture-taking robot, but we're giving people an opportunity to say, 'Yes, I want you to send me my picture,' (that's the opt-in) and if the person doesn't opt in or if they explicitly opt out, the robot deletes the picture. That would all be documented as the operating policy in the stir, so that whoever reviews it knows that that is the way that we plan to run it.

**Jose Vasquez:**  Would this board or commission have any veto power over acquisition of technologies?

**Jim Loter:** As it's written now, no. I think one of the concerning points that we raised is that there is nothing in the amendment that gives them a timeline or a [unintelligible], so there is a potential, as it's written, that they could effectively filibuster the process. We're raising that as a concern, but their analysis at this point would just be attached as a section in the surveillance impact report. And all of that would be part of what Council would consider when the package comes to them.

**Jose Vasquez:**  So, if I'm interpreting it correctly, it's just an opportunity for community to find out about the City purchasing potentially surveillance technology.

**Jim Loter:** Yes. Under the existing ordinance, that opportunity is already there in the form of the public meetings that we're already proposing to have. So the board would, I think, provide a consistent group of people that would be reviewing everything, as opposed to a series of public meetings where you might get some people or you might not, which we understood is a risk. You can't always expect people, even people who have a concern about something, to be available at 7:00 p.m. on a Thursday night at a library. So, I think that the board proposals are in addition to everything that I just explained. And one of the goals is to have a standing board, so a group that can develop historical knowledge of the City, and can develop some expertise and can develop some standard processes for reviewing that technology. I'm happy to answer a few more questions before you guys get into this, but I've got a ride coming at 7:00. I apologize.

**Heather Lewis:** Can we follow up with you if we have any more questions?

**Jim Loter:** No. I'm kidding. But, I'm done talking about this right now. I'm around tomorrow, then I'm out of town. So, if you get stuck on anything after I leave, you can call. Like I said, I think it's important that you have an opportunity to weigh in as it stands. I'm pretty sure I can say that the amendment is not going to forward as it was actually written. I just don't know what state it's going to take at this point. It will be a negotiation between the Mayor's Office and Council. We've definitely raised to everyone's attention that CTAB exists. CTAB performs these functions very well. They have expertise and can be augmented with additional expertise, if necessary. So consider that as an alternative. That's definitely going to float it out there.

**Heather Lewis:** Well, thank you for keeping us in the loop regarding this issue. In terms of process, here, the second half is where the initial recommendations are. How do we feel about -- I'll read through the first paragraph, and if there are any issues along the way, can you call them out?  And then, we'll probably spend our remaining time on the second half where the recommendations are. So, first half, if nobody objects, is:

"Dear Mayor Durkan and members of the Seattle City Council: We are writing today to express concern regarding Councilmember O'Brien's Amendment one, which would create a community surveillance advisory board." Any issues with that sentence?

**Jose Vasquez:**  Just nit-picky here. Can we switch around "express concern regarding Amendment One brought forth by Councilmember O'Brien"? We're quote-unquote attacking the amendment and not the Councilmember.

**Heather Lewis:** Okay, let me figure out how to do this. I can do it on here. "...which would create a .... regarding Amendment One?

**Jose Vasquez:**  Right. "We are writing today to express concern regarding Amendment One, brought forth by Councilmember O'Brien."

**Heather Lewis:** Right.

**Torgie Madison:**  I like that change.

**Heather Lewis:** ...by Councilmember O'Brien, period? And then, maybe, a next sentence: "this amendment would create a ...?

**Jose Vasquez:**  Yes.

**Heather Lewis:** "Would create a community surveillance advisory board. The Community Technology Advisory Board (CTAB) feels that adding another community advisory board focused solely on surveillance technologies is redundant, and takes away from the role and mission of CTAB." Any issues with that sentence? Okay. I'm going to move to the next sentence if I don't hear you. "Despite disagreeing with Amendment One, overall, we felt that it raises an important point, one with which we agree to surveillance technology process and Seattle residents would benefit from an increased oversight."

**Jose Vasquez:**  In regard to the word, 'resident,' would folks be opposed to changing that to 'community members"?

**John Krull:**  That's fine.

**Heather Lewis:** I don't hear any objections.

**John Krull:**  I would change 'oversight' to 'input.'

**Heather Lewis:** Any objections? "It is also our understanding that a Mayoral task force has been proposed to help address the backlog of surveillance technologies awaiting review, to be dissolved when the review process is caught up to present day needs."

**Eliab Sisay:**  Are those two separate things? The Mayor's task force is a bridge between what is proposed and what is in place?

**Heather Lewis:** My understanding was that, in the first paragraph, and then the one that was introduced. And the, both the Mayoral task force and the expansion of CTAB have been proposed as alternatives to Amendment One." So, they would be exclusive of each other, if I have that correct. But that is something we can certainly check with Jim Loter, before moving forward.

**Torgie Madison:**  The original amendment was calling for a CTAB task force?

**Heather Lewis:** My understanding from Jim Loter was that they were calling for a permanent advisory board. And the thinking between the task force and the advisory board is that the task force would dissolve after they caught up on surveillance technology reviews. Whereas, the board would be permanent. It would be here indefinitely. That's a big difference. Torgie, does that align with your understanding?

**Torgie Madison:**  Yes, that does make sense.

**John Krull:**  One problem I see with the task force doing a bunch of work and dissolving is a lot of that knowledge and community input in doing these reviews would be lost.

**Heather Lewis:** Yes, that's something Jim Loter pointed out, too. My understanding was that CTAB would have at least one representative on the task force. Presumably, that would be Torgie Madison.

**John Krull:**  So, I would try to have that in there.

**Dorene Cornwell:**  One concern is the continuity in the task force working short term is not preferable.

**Heather Lewis:** Okay, how could we word that?

**Jose Vasquez:**  I would add, "It is also our understanding that a Mayoral task force, including the current standing CTAB member."

**John Krull:**  I think we're confusing what they're looking for and what we're recommending.

**Heather Lewis:** Maybe we should save this language for [unintelligible]?

**Eliab Sisay:** Just to make sure I understand this: Amendment One would create CSAB in addition to a separate task force to take on that role.

**Heather Lewis:** Amendment One would create a permanent CSAB. That's what it would do.

**Jose Vasquez:**  I believe the task force is just for now, and whatever is established as a permanent solution. It's going to be an intermediary review process. Right?

**Heather Lewis:** Yes. That's my understanding. Torgie, does that align with your understanding?

**Torgie Madison:**  Yes, it does. I think it's also important to note that we are writing the note to address concerns of the response to the amendment, not just to the amendment itself, right?

**Heather Lewis:** Right.

**Torgie Madison:**  So, there are a couple of steps that happened. The original amendment called for a City Council standing group that would be CTAB. And then, the Mayor additional concerns that got added onto the amendment that I think were addressing the Durkan concerns to the amendment, not the amendment itself.

**John Krull:**  Were the Durkan concerns added to the amendment, or was that just sort of an informal discussion about the amendment?

**Torgie Madison:**  I think that's the confusion now.

**Heather Lewis:** That's probably something that we should take up with Jim Loter.  No concerns were given to me specifically as coming from the Mayor's Office. They were more summarized overall.

**David Keyes:**  Do you think it's the backlog thing? What I heard from Jim Loter is that that was a response. That was part of the response.

**Torgie Madison:**  Right. There's no Mayoral task force in the amendment.

**Heather Lewis:** Right. Yes. So, it was a proposed response.

**Eliab Sisay:** Got it. So, the way that I read this, with that context, is:  Here are some concerns we have to the amendment, in addition to commenting about how that task force is being formed. With that context, the way that I'm reading this letter is we at CTAB want to comment on Amendment One. And here is the argument. In addition to that, we have become aware that you have also proposed a task force as your response to that We have some thoughts on being included, or whatever.

**Heather Lewis:** Looking at the time, is everybody comfortable spending another ten minutes on this? Okay. From there, we can take it offline, if need be. So, looking at this paragraph, here: "It is also our understanding that a Mayoral task force has been proposed to help address the backlog of surveillance technologies awaiting review to be dissolved when the review process is caught up to present day needs." The next paragraph might address some of what Eliab Sisay was saying. Do you mind if I read that, too, and then we can figure out what we're missing? "Therefore, CTAB asks that Seattle City Council refrain from passing Amendment One, which would create a separate community surveillance advisory board, and instead support the following two counter-proposals, which we believe will better address the needs of Seattle residents.

**Jose Vasquez:**  Are we going to change 'Seattle residents' to 'community members?'

**Heather Lewis:** Certainly.

**John Krull:**  And maybe drop 'therefore.'

**Heather Lewis:** CTAB asks?

**John Krull:**  I think so.

**Heather Lewis:** Eliiab, does that link the two issues for you? "Refrain from passing Amendment One" being the first action item, and then instead "support the two counter-proposals"?

**Eliab Sisay:**  Yes.

**Heather Lewis:** And are there just two counter-proposals, or do we want to add a third, which is....

**Jose Vasquez:**  I would like to recommend a third one. I can read it out. Do you want me to? "Establish a joint committee comprised of members from CTAB and a similar committee/board, with civil rights insights and expertise that is supported by Council. This new joint committee shall serve as the community input process for acquisition of surveillance technologies for the City of Seattle."

**Heather Lewis:** How would we merge this language with this paragraph here? "So the following two proposals plus an additional third.

**Eliab Sisay:**  I would argue that number two and number three are actually counter-proposals to Amendment One. And then, number one, with regard to the Mayoral task force, is a separate issue in itself. And so, I don't actually know where we would put that in the letter, but I would see number one as being a separate issue. And something along the lines of 'with regard to a Mayoral task force to help address the backlog of surveillance technologies awaiting review, we would ask that a CTAB member be part of that task force to provide input from....;

**John Krull:**  Does anyone know how big the backlog is? I forgot to ask that.

**Torgie Madison:** There are 28 technologies in the backlog.

**Heather Lewis:** Do you have any sense of how long it takes to get through a single technology?

**Torgie Madison:** I don't think anyone does. I've heard about 40 to 60 pages each, so it's somewhere around 300 to 400 pages of information.

**Heather Lewis:** Okay. So it sounds like a significant backlog.

**John Krull:**  At that rate, it's two years at least.

**Torgie Madison:** Yes. I think they had something like an 18-month window, but knowing the way things go, more like two years.

**Dorene Cornwell:**  Does that mean that people just can't buy the technologies until it goes through review? Or they buy the technology regardless of the review? What actually happens? What if I really want my photo-taking robot?

**Torgie Madison:** That would be a question that Jim Loter would have to answer.

**Heather Lewis:** Or City Council. On item number one, Eliab, "with regard to the Mayoral Task Force..."

**Eliab Sisay:**  What was the sentence we had up there. Something like, "our ask is to include the current CTAB member."

**Heather Lewis:** "The current CTAB member be included to help address the backlog of surveillance technologies awaiting review be dissolved upon completion of the backlog of technology reviews." Is everybody comfortable with item number one?

**Jose Vasquez:** I like what Eliab was saying where we can make two and three points one and two. And the, point one, make it a separate paragraph in regards to the Mayor's task force.

**Heather Lewis:** So move this to the end? Okay. Now this reads: Item number one: "An expanded Community Technology Advisory Board to support the future technology review process. We have requested that Seattle City Council expand the Community Technology Advisory Board's membership from 10 to 15 seats. And, upon Council approval, will seek to increase the number of members with relevant skills, as well as community representatives from marginalized groups can maybe disproportionately impact surveillance technologies." Any issues? All right, we'll move onto the next one. Item two: "Establish a joint committee comprised of members from CTAB and a similar committee board with civil rights insight and expertise that is supported by Council staff. This new joint committee shall serve as the community input process for acquisition of surveillance technologies for the City of Seattle."

**Jose Vasquez:** I'm thinking there were two community involved processes. One was public forum. This is more of a standing committee that reviews, so I'm trying to see how, in the last sentence, "one of the community input processes?'

**Heather Lewis:** "This new joint committee shall serve as part of the community input process for acquisition of surveillance technologies for the City of Seattle." Is everybody comfortable with that?

**Torgie Madison:** And one and two both exist at the same time?

**John Krull:**  I think they are mutually exclusive, but it's preferred to have both.

**Heather Lewis:** What if we said, "In addition to item one establish a joint committee?" Would that make it clearer that we are looking to do two things? Or we are proposing two different things here?

**Jose Vasquez:** Or maybe, after it says, "Technology Advisory Board membership expanded to 15 seats," as requested through previous...?"

**Eliab Sisay:** And aren't we saying we want all three of these? They're not three options.

**Torgie Madison:** My question is, are these something that can be adopted as a whole, as a recommendation, or are these options where you could pick one, but not two and three, or ...?

**Heather Lewis:** We should probably make that clear in the paragraph above the numbered paragraphs.

**John Krull:**  Because my guess is if we didn't expand the board, we wouldn't have the bandwidth to handle all of it.

**Torgie Madison:** Right. That is my concern.

**David Keyes:** And you also don't want to commit the whole board to just the security.

**Heather Lewis:** Right. Or even all of the new members. So, going back to the paragraph above the numbered ones, "CTAB asks that the Seattle City Council refrain from passing Amendment One." That's the first action item. "Which would create a separate community surveillance advisory board, and instead support the following three counter-proposals?"

**Eliab Sisay:**  "Three following alternatives."

**Dorene Cornwell:** "The following three steps."

**Eliab Sisay:**  Or "the following recommendations."

**Heather Lewis:** "Three recommendations, which we believe will better address the needs of Seattle community members."

**Eliab Sisay:**  And then I would say, "expand."

**Heather Lewis:** "Expand the Community Technology Advisory Board to support the future technology review process. We have requested that the Seattle City Council expand the Community Technology Advisory Board's membership from ten to fifteen seats, as requested in a previous memo. And upon Council approval, we will seek to increase the number of members with relevant skills, as well as community representatives from marginalized groups that may be disproportionately impacted by surveillance technologies." Are we comfortable with that bullet?

**John Krull:** That's fine.

**Heather Lewis:** All right. Next one. "Establish a joint committee comprised of members from CTAB, and a similar committee board with civil rights insights and expertise that is supported by Council staff. This new joint committee shall serve as part of the community input process for acquisition of surveillance technologies for the City of Seattle."

**John Krull:** That's good. I would end bullet number one with and 'and.' And bullet number two with and 'and,' and then reword the beginning of three so it flows.

**Heather Lewis:** What if we started with, "We ask that a current CTAB member...?" "We ask that a current CTAB member be included on the Mayoral task force to help address..."

**John Krull:** Torgie, is one going to be enough for that?

**Torgie Madison:** What was that?

**John Krull:** Is one member going to be enough for the task force?

**Torgie Madison:** I'm thinking that we're going to need one or two. It is a lot of work.  I'm trying to think beyond just my involvement, because I might be able to take this myself, but the scope is a little bit larger than just one member going forward.

**Heather Lewis:** What if we ask that a current CTAB member be included, as well as an additional member, upon appointment from Council? And then we would have one of our new members, potentially? Is that feasible?

**Torgie Madison:** Yes. I like that.

**Heather Lewis:** Looking at the time, it's 7:17. Do people have until 7:20? Or should we...?

**John Krull:** Forget the time, let's finish up.

**Heather Lewis:** "We ask that the current CTAB member be included on the Mayoral task force to help address the backlog of surveillance technologies awaiting review. And thta this number be increased...."

**John Krull:** "Be increased upon adding to CTAB." Maybe just leave it open like that.

**Heather Lewis:** Or, and the representation of CTAB be increased? "Be increased upon ...,?

**John Krull:** "Expansion of the current CTAB board."

**Heather Lewis:** And do we need to acknowledge, ourselves, that the task force will be dissolved? Because that's in their original language. Can we drop that, or should we...:

**John Krull:** I would drop it.

**Heather Lewis:** Okay. "Thank you for considering our thoughts. We look forward to partnering with you in 2018." I'm happy to give it one final read-through.

**John Krull:** I think we approve it with minor additions and deletions.

**Heather Lewis:** Can we get a motion?

**John Krull:** I move that the CTAB board approve the co-written letter as written, with minor deletions and additions.

**Torgie Madison:** I second that.

**Heather Lewis:** All in favor, say 'aye.' Any opposed? All right. We will submit this letter with slight grammatical tweaks, and I can send out the final version, so that we all have a record of what was said. Thank you all for your participation and for staying an extra 19 minutes. With that....

**David Keyes:** This is worth mentioning, as I said in the beginning. Seferiana Day will be taking over as the liaison for CTAB. I'll still be engaged in digital equity and facilitating with that training, and connecting with you guys. We are excited to have her on board.

**Seferiana Day:**Thanks for inviting to this cool board.

**Heather Lewis:** David, thank you also for all of your work over the last  few months. I know that you have been doing all of the CTAB-related support work in addition to your actual job. We really appreciate you.

**John Krull:** I have one more thing before we close. I will sync up with Steven Maheshwary and Mark DeLoura just to find out what got said at the last Digital Equity Committee and I will publish when the next meeting is.

**David Keyes:** Oh yes. So there was not a meeting that was organized for last month.

**Eliab Sisay:**  Hey, Steven, did anyone respond back to those surveys that we sent out?

**Heather Lewis:** I will follow up with Steven. And I will follow up with Charlotte Lunday, and Scott Wang regarding the next Smart Cities meeting.

**John Krull:**  For the record, we will publish when the next committee meeting is.

**David Keyes:** Yes, and where.

**Heather Lewis:** Thank you all.

**ADJOURNMENT**