**June 12, 2018 Meeting - Seattle Community Technology Advisory Board**

Topics covered included: Technology Matching Fund Grant recommendations and vote, Brainstorm for July speakers forum, Communications tools update from Smart Cities and Privacy Committees.

**This meeting was held:** June 12, 2018; 6:00-7:30 p.m., Seattle Municipal Tower, 700 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2750

**Attending:**

**Board Members:** Heather Lewis, Torgie Madison via Skype, John Krull, Steven Maheshwary, Karia Wong, Charlotte Lunday, Jose Vasquez

**Public:** Adam Owen (Century Link), Dorene Cornwell, Michael Constantine, Jennifer Higginbothem, Carmen Arcero (Century Link), Helmuth Woermann, Sean McLellan, Luis Barrera, Beatrice Len, Igul Tamrkin, Harte Daniels

**Staff:** Chance Hunt, Delia Burke, Seferiana Day, Cass Magnuski

**22 In Attendance**

**Heather Lewis:  Welcome to the meeting. We typically start the meeting off by introducing ourselves and saying which neighborhood in Seattle each of us represents.**

**INTRODUCTIONS**

**Heather Lewis:**As Charlotte pointed out a minute ago, I wanted to take a minute to congratulate her. This is her first meeting as a CTAB board member. And then, also, I wanted to point out that this is Steven Maheshwary's first meeting as a CTAB board member. He had formerly been a Get Engaged member. We look forward to getting a new Get Engaged member in the future, and we're excited to have you both. Next on the agenda is votes. We have a couple of votes. Would anyone be willing to make a motion to approve the May minutes.

**Charlotte Lunday:** I so move.

**Heather Lewis:** Do we have a second?

**Karia Wong:** Second

**Heather Lewis:** Everyone in favor, please say 'aye.' Anyone not in favor, please say 'nay.'  All right, the motion passes. Next can I have a motion to approve today's agenda?

**Steven Maheshwary:**  I so move.

**John Krull:**  Second

**Heather Lewis:** All in favor, please say 'aye.'  Motion passes unanimously. The next important item on the agenda is the Technology Matching Fund. And we have Delia Burke here to describe the process and provide an update on the Technology Matching Fund.

**TECHNOLOGY MATCHING FUND GRANTS**

**Delia Burke:**  Hi, everybody. I manage the Technology Matching Fund program here at the City.It's our annual grant program. We provide funding for Digital Equity projects to community based organizations. I'm super excited right now because we just completed an application review cycle. We have a panel of volunteers who scored the applications and we have a list of recommended projects. I want to give a huge thank you to those of you who participated this year on the panel. We had 17 members reviewing, which is a large panel, and we had 46 applications. It was a lot to sort through, and so thank you very much for your time and effort. We know it takes a lot dedication to review  these applications. So, Steven, [unintelligible], Michael, Charlotte, Heather, and Seferiana, Torgie as well, and a few other folks who aren't in the room.

The review panel plays a really important role for us because we like to have diverse sets of eyes and opinions, thoughts, and backgrounds in looking at these applications to make sure that we are applying the criteria in a fair and rigorous way, and make it a fair and open process. The reviewers were all assigned applications. We actually had five to seven reviewers per application, so there were a lot of reviews going on. Those reviewers, then, would use a set criteria to score the applications. Once we got all the scores together, we came together as a group and looked through the results, and from that made recommendations on who would receive the money.

This year, we've got a really exciting slate of projects. We have recommendations to fund 12 community organizations. It was a really tough process that we had. Again, there were 46 applications, which were requesting almost $1.7 million in funding. And the team really only had $400,000 to give out. It was a challenge. And I think through that , the organizations that are being recommended were really the best of the best. They were the ones that scored the highest and met the rigorous standards.

We bring this forth to the CTAB board at this time because part of our process is we take these recommendations from the review committee; we look for CTAB's endorsement of the slate, and then we take these recommendations to our Seattle IT leadership, and then bring it to City Council later in the summer, and they ultimately fund the projects. We like to have a lot of input from the community. The exciting part is announcing who the projects to be funded are. I won't go into detail on all of them. They are in the memo, if folks have questions. I'll just read them quickly. They are:

1.  Community Passageways

2, East African Community Services

3. Garinagu Houngua

4. Helping Link

5. Literacy Source

6. Millionair Club Charity

7. Provail

8. Seattle Neighborhood Group

9. Somali Family Safety Task Force

10. South East Effective Development (SEED)

11. United Indians of All Tribes Foundation

12. YouthCare

Part of the process in coming up with this list and who gets funded was not just looking at the scores that came in. Everybody individually did those. But we also took a look at creating a balanced portfolio of grantees for each year. We weighed whether we are reaching populations we want to reach; is it balanced in terms of geography; is it balanced in terms of old and new? I think we came up with a pretty good slate this year. In the mix of programs, we have some very large capacity nonprofits, who, I think, the team felt strongly can deliver really strong digital equity programs, like a YouthCare or SEED, large budget nonprofits. But in the mix, we also have some very small grassroots organizations, as well. For example, like Helping Link, or Somali Family Safety Task Force, which is very grassroots, run by small staff, lower budget, but also have their own unique way to deliver these digital equity programs. So, I think that was a big piece of it, reaching a broad section of the community. We also looked at who the programs were reaching. What were the different populations served. You will see some statistics in the memo--how many members reached--but in terms of the diversity of Seattle residents that will benefit from these programs, the programs for the East African community, the Caribbean and Central American population, which is a new group for us to work with, Native Americans, at-risk youth who are in the juvenile justice system. Through several of the housing projects, we have programs that are directly benefiting seniors and low income adults, and also some programs that are working specifically with homeless and marginally housed youth and adults. So, it's a really great cross-section of programs and people being impacted by the funds.

Geography was another factor that we looked at to get the best slate this year. Here is a map to the organizations that we funded.. There is a link to the map in the memo, as well. And you can see that there are several groups up in the north end and several in the southeast, one over here in Magnolia. And these are the actual organizations receiving the funds. But if you look at where the projects will be located, and where they'll be delivering training and offering computer services, you can see that it's actually even broader than that. So, for example, Literacy Source is up in the north end. They have a technology training program for low literacy adults up in the city area, but through our funding this year in this project, they are also going to be offering digital literacy training in the High Point location in West Seattle, and ACRS is southeast Seattle. Likewise, Somali Family Safety Task Force has done some great digital literacy programs for Somali women in the New Holly area, and this program was to expand on the success of that project and reach out to the West Seattle neighborhood and teach classes at a west Seattle library. So, again, we looked to have a really broad impact throughout Seattle.

If there is anyone here who has questions or comments about these projects, I'd be glad to comment.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  Overall, I was very impressed with the quality of the applications that were submitted. Every application seemed very well thought out, and had a pretty good impact, at least with applications that we were reviewing. so, it was a tough decision. It was not very easy.

**Delia Burke:** And I will say that it's always very competitive. We funded 12 out of 46. the majority of the organizations did not get funded. But, it's important to us that we continue to work and reach out to organizations that didn't get funded to help share with them what might have been a way for them to strengthen their applications, or discover different ways that they could apply again. Typically, every year we'll have groups that didn't get funded the year before continued to work on their programs and came back. So, through this process and all of the reviewers' comments, it provides lots of information to continue doing outreach throughout the year. Because, again, it's a tough cycle in that most of the groups don't get funded, but certainly, we always try to encourage those to continue with this work and to apply again in the future. In this particular year, we did have seven of the projects that have received funding from the Technology Matching Fund within the last four years, and five of them are new organizations that haven't been funded. That's another way that we try to balance providing some sustainable building capacity and building that network of community tech providers. So that's why you may see us repeat funding for an organization to help to strengthen and leverage their past grants, but then always making sure that there are new folks coming in, and that it's open each year. I look to the board to honor this amazing work that all of the reviewers did. Again, kudos to the reviewers. It was a tremendous amount of effort and we're really happy to move this slate forward internally, and we'd love to have CTAB's endorsement.

**Jose Vasquez:**  I'm wondering, since there were 12 funded, was there an adjustment to the number funded? Because I know in previous years, to include more grantees, we adjusted budgets. Or was there just a request that they put in their proposals for funding?

**Delia Burke:**  This year, I think there were some recommendations from the committee to fully fund programs and maybe fund fewer. Last year we funded 15 organizations. This year we're funding 12. that's fairly close. We actually have $30,000 less money than we did last year. This year, most of the programs got pretty much fully funded, so it wasn't a year where we were shaking bits off here and there. I think the committee felt like they made a strong case. There was one project that we did reduce funding, And we worked with the organization to possibly altering the project. So, it's always a challenge.

**John Krull:** What were the criteria that they were judged against?

**Chalotte Lunday:** I can pull up the score sheet that we used.

**Jose Vasquez:** It mostly aligns with the digital Equity priorities: pushing forward digital literacy, access to devices, reaching diverse populations.

**Delia Burke:**  And teaching digital literacy skills. There are actually six criteria.

**John Krull:** And do you score on each one? Are they equally weighed?

**Delia Burke:**  They are not equally weighed. what Jose was describing, which are the program goals, that one has one of the higher ratings. That's worth 20 points. It's pretty important that these projects align with our program goals for Digital Equity aligned with the Digital Equity Initiative. That's worth 20. the second category is the budget, which was 20 points. This is all out of a total of 100. And it's really important to understand where City funding is going, and how the programs will be looking to meet their match as a requirement, but also, have they really thought through and justified the budget, and the cost of their anticipating throughout the project. And then, there is a third category called Project Clarity, which has a higher rating as well.  Twenty points. So those three are the big categories. And with Project Clarity, we're really looking to see whether the programs are well thought through regarding how to make this program work. Are they shovel ready? If the City invested today, would they have a plan? Would they know what steps to take? Have they lined up the right partners? And can they articulate what their goals are. That's what we're looking for.

There are some other categories: Community benefit. At the end of the day, what might be the curriculum? Community participation is one. Partnerships we call it. Have they engaged with their community by survey? And then the last category is evaluation. That's worth ten points. How do they know whether their projects are working or not? What are the tools and their plans to evaluate? That's kind of a mix that everybody used to score the applications with, using that criteria. Coming together, we developed the ranking.

**John Krull:**  Thanks.

**Heather Lewis:** Does anyone else have questions? Or does anyone who participated in the rankings have any comments?

**Karia Wong:**  I just have a question. For future grants, are we planning to do any presentations on putting together a formal grant application? The reason I'm asking is I've seen -- the application is really simple, but if the applicants could choose to do either an application or a written grant proposal.

**Delia Burke:**  I think that's a really good thought. I think we will look to possibly incorporate that, because we know that not all groups may shine on a grant proposal, and other groups may be stronger. I know there are some other City departments that have done that. We, at one point, had that as a part of our process, but we found that we'd gotten so many applications and it became really unwieldy in the grant cycle. And that, when we looked at it, it didn't ultimately make as much difference to us with who actually got funded. So, that's how we went into this way that we've been scoring and handling it. But, I'll certainly look into it more. I'd be curious to know, did you participate in that?

**Karia Wong:**  I participated. I was told that the reason is that presentation is a choice. For small organizations, to hire a grant writer would be an additional expense. Instead of paying for the grant writing portion, those monies could be spent on the project.

**Delia Burke:**  Were you a reviewer or a grantee?

**Karia Wong:**  I was a grantee.

**Delia Burke:**  That's something I'll suggest looking at for next year, if there is a way that we can incorporate it. I know that some of the City programs that have done that had a much smaller group of applicants. So, we'll have to see how that might work when we get 40, 50, 60 applications. but thank you for the suggestion.

**Jose Vasquez:**  That gets me to thinking. Maybe it's an opportunity for the City to partner with 501 comments, or Nonprofit Assistance Center. [unintelligible] ...Maybe we could connect them with those resources that are already there.

**Delia Burke:**  Right. Because I know that NAC has done grant writing  workshops for people....

**Karia Wong:**  We need the support.

**Delia Burke:**  Yes, and we years ago had worked with NAC in that capacity, but it might be time to revisit that. Because I know they've gone through some changes. Those are good suggestions.

**Heather Lewis:** Are there other comments? Or questions? Delia, had you envisioned us voting on this as a group, or were you hoping that we would vote line by line?

**Delia Burke:**  As a group. I think that this is the proposed slate that the committee has put forward, and we would look to the committee and say, 'Great job!;' and the board would hopefully endorse the process, the choices, and the work that was done.

**Chance Hunt:**  The one exception is if there is anybody here who has a conflict of interest with one of those organizations, that person should abstain. Just bear that in mind.

**Delia Burke:**  Anybody with conflict of interest did not score those particular applications. They were exempt from the scoring.

**John Krull:** I'll go ahead and make a motion that we pass the recommended Technology matching Fund grantee list as presented by the review committee.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  I second. Shall we put it to a vote? If you are in agreement, say 'aye.'  Anyone who does not agree? Any abstentions? The motion passes.

**Delia Burke:**  Well, great! Again, we appreciate your input and involvement in this process. We will be bringing these recommendations to our departmental leadership, and then to City Council, maybe in the summer. So, I encourage everyone to come and see the grants get finalized. I just wanted to make one other quick announcement. Right now, we have a current cohort of grantees that were funded last year. They're in the middle of their projects, teaching classes, and in various stages. I'd like to invite you all, on Wednesday, June 20, from 9:00 to 10:00. One of our current grantees, the refugees from Burma are hosting a celebration for their ESL parents who have gone through their digital literacy classes. It would be a really nice opportunity to see the work they do, and see what skills people have gained, what they've learned and celebrate that. I would invite you all to attend if you can make it. That would be great. We can follow it up with some more details.

**Seferiana Day:**  I can send it out in a follow-up email.

**Delia Burke:**  Thank you. That would be great. The project is taking place at the Bailey Gatzert Elementary School.

**Karia Wong:**  What time?

**Delia Burke:**  From 9:00 until 10:00. It's in the morning.

**Jose Vasquez:** When did you say the City Council meeting was scheduled?

**Delia Burke:**  That is TBD. We will be moving things forward in anticipation of either a July or August date. We will definitely share the information as we get the City Council schedule. As well, we like to do a reception and an awards celebration. So that will be a fun time.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  Do you have any visibility into how the budget might change next year, if at all? Or, is it going to stay constant for the foreseeable future?

**Chance Hunt:** At this time, we don't have any information about the budget until the Mayor puts forward the budget in September. And then it goes to City Council in September until November. And that is where that starts to be more visible. So, we don't have a sense of that at this point in time. With our budget overall, our community technology budget, we have some latitude to adjust the Tech Matching Funds specifically. But then, we are also using fund for other kinds of grants for contract work doing similar types of things. As far as next year's budget, we don't have any insight on that at this point.

**Jose Vasquez:** Do you have any updates on the conversation about how to amplify the funds? Are we able to tap the private sector to bring in more resources?

**Chance Hunt:** Not on a larger scale. We do have an additional $25,000 from Facebook. That's part of that $400,000 that Delia mentioned. So, along with the cable fund, which is the primary source, Facebook has added $25,000 to the cable fund.

**Jose Vasquez:** Is that yearly, or...?

**Chance Hunt:** That's just for this year. There is no guarantee beyond with them. But we are in the process of looking at what our options are, not just for this, but other kinds of digital equity projects, how we might be able to go beyond the cable fund. So, my guess is we may have some more information about the options later in the year to talk about that funding. At this time, those are our two funding sources for this project.

**Heather Lewis:** And, can my vote be on the record for 'aye,' on the TMF slate? Next item on the agenda, then, is public comment. Do we have any items that the group should be aware of, or of upcoming events? Any thoughts that you would like to share with the group? Thank you, Delia.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Dorene Cornwell:**  There is a bit accessibility convention that happens in Washington, D.C. yesterday, Commissioner Pai of the FCC spoke. I have a copy of his remarks, which I will send -- or the link to his remarks. He had sort of interesting things to say about accessibility. He didn't really go near Net Neutrality, but it was an interesting statement. So I just wanted to share that with the group. He was talking about one of the things that happens when you build mobile devices is that there are lots more options for how to build in accessibility, and that totally widens the number and kinds of interactions you have and makes it much easier. It increases the number of people who have access to the services in an exciting way. There is still that question of, 'Well, I like this device, this browser, and this accessibility tool, but I want to get this content that is fed over here." It was an interesting set of remarks. I don't remember enough of it to summarize.

**Heather Lewis:** Thanks for sharing, Dorene. We look forward to reviewing that. Do any others have thoughts or comments, or announcements. Okay, well then, I guess we'll take a five minute break. Let's make it a six minute break. At 6:40, we'll get started again. there is food over there. Please feel free to help yourselves.

**BREAK**

**Heather Lewis:** All right! So, we're going to get started again. Next item on the list is an announcement from Dan.

**Harte Daniels:**   I sent an email to the board members and David Keyes, on events. And one of them was the Microsoft  Ability Summit. They do this every year. One day is for their employees. One day is open to everybody. they made an announcement that they are giving away $25 million total in grants for different groups or individuals developing artificial intelligence, AI for accessibility. I talked to their chief accessibility officer about the Technology Matching Fund, and suggested giving money to the TMF, as well as perhaps sponsoring the prize money for a challenge grant devoted just for team players who are otherly abled, as opposed to able-bodied people in new hack-a-thons. So she said that she would be willing to talk to a board member or whatever. There are a number of other statistics I put in there for the disability, and some applications. Some communication with autistic people and people [unintelligible], etc. And another free app for using your cellphone. the camera, the application describes what's on the camera to the person that is walking around. There is other information in there as well. Shoreline had their robotics metronics open house and on the 27th, Health and Human Services will be here talking to entrepreneurs, etc., that want to engage in how they can engage with HHS. Under the former administration, there was a high tech act, which really broke down some of the proprietary barriers and made it easier for other people to help or gain access to that trillion dollar industry. So all of the other information and statistics and what have you, including the surveillance [unintelligible] is in the email that I sent to the board.

**Heather Lewis:** Thank you for sharing, Dan. Next item on the agenda will definitely be a brainstorm for a potential upcoming panel. We notice that the Women's Commission is hosting a conversation on homelessness. We thought that that was in place of a meeting. And we thought that that would be something that we could potentially replicate. So, what we're asking from all of you is to break up into four groups and brainstorm as small groups a great technology conversation that you would like to hear of or be a  part of. And then' we'll put them on the board after ten minutes. And the idea is that we will create at least one model panel conversation. Ideally, two, between now and the end of 2018. So, in terms of groups, how about we count one-two-three-four. Ones here, twos here, threes here. Fours here. So, we are going counter-clockwise. Starting with Chance.

**JULY SPEAKERS FORUM BRAINSTORM**

**Heather Lewis:** Use your imaginations or we'll vote. We'll join back up at 5:55.

{Attendees join four groups in the corners for discussion.}

**Heather Lewis:** Can we have your representative to share your best ideas? I'll get them on the board.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  All right, our topic was automation and the impact to be job market. Along side that, what does that mean in terms of trends for low skill labor.

**Heather Lewis:** For the purposes of voting? Excellent. Can we have a representative from group number three?

**Charlotte Lunday:** Okay. Our big topic area would be techification in transportation. Specifically about connected vehicles changing roadways: New technologies and whether they improve congestion and walkability. And then we spoke a lot more in detail like Seattle's initiative putting charter stations in different areas. And we're really curious about the collateral impacts of this beyond what these projects are designed to do. What are their impacts to immigrant workers who own auto shops and neighborhoods where a charging station might increase or accelerate gentrification.  Those kinds of things.

**Heather Lewis:** Group number two? Thank you, Charlotte. Can we get a representative to share? Michael?

**Michael Constantine:** Of the four topics that we discussed, number one was blockchain. A close number two was AI.

**Heather Lewis:** Would it fit into this or would it be a different AI conversation?

**Sean McLellan:**  Different topics within AI. Like you were saying, connected buses, or connected street lights, things like that, to alleviate traffic.

**Heather Lewis:** Okay, so AI connectivity. This was number two. What was number one?

**Michael Constantine:** Number one was blockchain technology and it's applications in addition to [unintellligible].

**Heather Lewis:** Did groups three or four have a close number two that should be on the board? Assuming that we'll have two votes because we like two options. Is there one that you really think should be up here?

**Charlotte Lunday:**  I just expanded on the one topic.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  We had a spin on one of the topics. How does IOT/AI/Blockchain, how can we leverage that to help the community, or more specifically, help the homeless.

**Heather Lewis:** IOT/AI/Blockchain?

**Jose Vasquez:** Decentralized currency?

**Harte Daniels:**  Blockchain is more than crypto-currency. The largest amount of data anywhere in the United States is in healthcare. But you need it in order to run crypto-currency.

**Heather Lewis:** We had our group and came down to three: Could somebody read?  The first one was equitable technology representation. And if I have that right, that was how can we use technology tools to make sure that everybody within the City of Seattle....

**Harte Daniels:**  Currently, technology makes equitable representation worse rather than better because of what Councilmembers can attest to. So, how can we reverse that?

**Heather Lewis:** Thank you, Dan. Number two is 'Why is internet access so expensive?' Hopefully, you can ready my writing.

**Charlotte Lunday:**  May I introduce an idea that just came to me? We're going into an election year, and Washington State's voter rolls had been probed during the last major election cycle. So, election security, I think, would be a very interesting topic.

**Heather Lewis:** Nice addition. So, we have nine topics and we all have two votes. Hopefully, we can get this settled with one vote. I guess we'll see. You all have two opportunities to vote for two potential conversations. We'll start with the first one. Automation and the impact to or on jobs. Please raise your hand. Seven votes. Next one is changes in traffic rotation, which is a much more elegant description. Three votes. It wouldn't surprise me if some of this comes up in some of these other ones. the next one is blockchain,  crypto-currencies, etc. Two votes. This is another one that could come up in some other ones. Next one is AI, connectivity, etc. And again, this one could cover a host of things. Six votes. Next one is IOT, AI and Blockchain. Four votes. Next one is equitable technology access. Four votes. Next, why is the internet so expensive? One vote. Torgie? Are you hearing this? Are you voting? Are you going to participate in this vote?

**Torgie Madison:**  I wasn't going to participate in this vote.

**Heather Lewis:** Number eight is technology and privacy. Five votes. Great. Next one is election security. four votes. Based on that, we have the winner is automation and the impact to jobs. That one we will go ahead with.  I'm going to drop the ones that are threes and twos and we can have a discussion about the six and the five. Maybe revote on those. does anyone have an objection to that approach? There were some other great topics, and maybe we can figure out how to fit them in. the winner was automation and the impact to jobs, and the runner-up and the second runner-up were AI connectivity, etc. and then technology and privacy. do we want to have a final vote to figure out which one of those should be number two? Or are we comfortable with a one point win.

**Charlotte Lunday:** I want to put it out there that if we do the two top scoring ones, it's AI and AI. So, there's not a lot of diversity in topics.

**Steven Maheshwary:** Yeah, AI and automation are fairly separate topics. What I feel, personally....

**Heather Lewis:** If we include AI here, then it seems like we'd at least have a case for tech and AI. But how about we determine that with one final vote?

**Dorene Cornwell:**  Can I call out a couple of things? We have one category that's why the internet is so expensive and another one that's about equitable whatever. I would dump those two together. And the election one is ....

**Harte Daniels:**  And it can fit under tech and privacy.

**Dorene Cornwell:**  It can fit under tech and privacy. The blockchain and homelessness kind of goes with the equitable representation to me. That sort of gives us one big lush topic to have a panel about. It's a different thing, and we have a lot that sounds like it's AI.

**Heather Lewis:** I see that John has something to say, too.

**John Krull:**  I propose we just pick one for now. Because this is a new idea, to have a panel, and do a meeting. The second one is not going to be anytime soon, because we have to get the first one scheduled and planned.

**Heather Lewis:** We're talking potentially on doing it for July

**Steven Maheshwary:** I think it's good to have potential back-up topics. The board is going to be looking for speakers, and if for some reason one topic, if we don't have enough speakers for a topic, then we can move to the second topic as a back-up option. Just putting that out there, if we want this panel to be a success.

**Heather Lewis:** But, to John's point, one would be in the foreseeable future, and another would be in the somewhat unforeseeable future. So, we might want to hold it in our back pocket until we have done this one. Are we comfortable with one of these in our back pocket, and do we want to go just purely by number, or would you like to do a vote? Show of hands on 'yes,' you would like to do a vote. Please put your hands up if you would like to do a vote.

**Dorene Cornwell:**  Could we just list all of these in the minutes?

**Steven Maheshwary:** Cass, are they all going to be listed in the minutes?

**Cass Magnuski:**  They are reflected in the recording, so they will be, yes.

**TOPICS**

1. Automation and the impact to the job market. Along side that, what does that mean in terms of trends for low skill labor.

2. AI changes in traffic rotation.

3. Blockchain, crypto-currencies, etc.

4. IOT, and AI regarding connected buses, or connected street lights, things like that, to alleviate traffic.

5. Equitable technology access;

6. Why is internet access so expensive?

7. Technology and privacy.

8. Election security.

**Heather Lewis:** Okay, so then, if you would like to vote between the two, rather than ....

**Steven Maheshwary:**  I thought we just moved AI into the top topics. I'm okay with it as long as we comma separate it out. Because I think that automation and AI are separate. I'm okay with that, but if other people have issues with it....

**Heather Lewis:** After the clarification, can we vote on it so we're clearly comfortable?

**John Krull:** I think keep the first one as it is: automation and AI's impact on jobs. I think that is very specific. It's kind of narrow. I think AI in general is kind of huge, and that might be a good topic, as well, for us to get up to speed on AI.

**Heather Lewis:** So, it sounds like some people would like to see AI as a topic, and it sounds like some people would like to do something that is a little less. With that in mind, everybody gets one vote. We're going to vote between AI and Tech and Privacy. One vote each. First topic is AI, connectivity, etc., and it will not be focused on the impact on jobs. If you would like to hear about AI, please raise your hands. Ten votes. if you would like to hear something about tech and privacy, please raise your hands. Torgie?

**Torgie Madison:**  I vote for tech and privacy.

**Heather Lewis:** Ten-ten. How about we come back to it.

**Harte Daniels:**  People may want to know more about the tech and privacy issue. And by the way, for Steven and Charlotte, one of the foremost cities that has for three, four, five years, that has been working on the elimination of jobs by automation/AI, has been Pittsburgh. So, you might want to start with your research there. The Mayor has an entire board and objective for the City Council on that topic.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  If anyone has leads on speakers that would be great for these topics, or have good references like what Dan just mentioned, we would welcome that, so that we can start lining them up.

**Heather Lewis:** And it would be great to have representatives from more than one sector, as well, because these are complex subjects. Ideally, we would have someone from a nonprofit, foundation, or community background; maybe someone from government; and maybe someone from the private sector. At least it would be great, in my view, to acknowledge the nuances of these issues.

**Harte Daniels:**  So the second place that you can look, Steven and Charlotte, is your community college, particularly the one on Corson next to Boeing and Shoreline because they would be helping lower income people with lower paid jobs into automation and metronics, robotics, etc.

**Heather Lewis:** Thank you. We're going to move on to the next topic. Time is short here, but we look forward to email conversations over the next few weeks on this one. Hopefully, we will be able to set this up for July. We will let you know as soon as possible. Next update is coming from Charlotte and Torgie. They have been working together on a Smart Cities/Privacy committee. Do you have an update for the group, either Torgie or Charlotte?

**SMART CITIES/PRIVACY COMMITTEE UPDATE**

**Charlotte Lunday:**  Yes, I can get the ball started. We had our first joint meeting at the end of May. And just to remind everyone, we are going to join forces to work on a communications strategy and test it out. Try to consolidate the ways that CTAB is reaching out to people, ad figure out if we can get a two-way conversation going beyond these meetings. Can we reach people who are not attending CTAB meetings, and get them to talk back to us. Can we actually engage our community?

We had our first meeting, and we have been working on Discord. which Torgie, I think championed. What we want to do is introduce a post conduct and a welcome sheet or packet so people can know how to use Discord. Torgie worked on those and he will present. But we also came up with a general timeline and metrics, which I have photographs that I can email out to people, but I also put them on the board's Google drive and posted them to Discord, so that they can be viewable by anyone. What we have developed is that a plan to do an audit on the communications tools that we have. We should have David Keyes pool whatever viewership data on readership audience together that we have. So we will look over that and see what is working, what is not working. And then brainstorm topics for discussions, blog posts, social media postings, and identify people we want to talk to. Seattle Neighborhoods have a really great social media presence, so reaching out to someone there and getting tips for how we might be able to use our platforms better. That's our next stage. Publishing the content and figuring out how to moderate. We're gong to try to have conversations within the discord app and then evaluate how we're doing, and then iterate from there.

We're currently brainstorming topics, and we have a cut-off of June 22. So, we just came out with topics for panel discussions, and some of them got wiped away. If you still would like to see CTAB work on or have conversations about these things, email or we can send you a link to join the Discord app. You can post a topic idea on the Discord app, and we could produce the content around it. The panels are not the only way that we can be talking about these things. Ideally, we will have a lot of different conversations. So, we want to get content ideas by June 22. And then, at our next meeting, come up with a calendar and outline, kind of a publishing schedule. Ideally, we'll be publishing in July and August.

**Heather Lewis:** Is that your next committee meeting?

**Charlotte Lunday:**  Committee meeting, yes. So, we would like to have a report on how we're doing with testing this stuff out to the full board by the end of August. We've got some basic metrics that we'll be looking at, which is how many people are posting in the Discord app every day. How many tools are we able to consolidate, and streamline. Has there been an increase in communication? Is it just CTAB members talking out to a void? Or are we actually getting feedback? Are people making leaps from having conversations with us to interacting with City leaders? Are they commenting on ordinances and things like that. So those are the things we're going to try to look at and track. With that, I can turn it over to Torgie to talk about the Code of Conduct and the tutorial that he has worked on.

**Torgie Madison:** Great. I don't have too much to add. charlotte covered everything. But I do have the tutorial I created on [unintelligible] which is linked in this chat on [unintelligible]. I don't know if you can open them. There is probably more content than we can review. So, maybe we can take a look at them on our own time and come back with any sorts of corrections or suggestions.

**Heather Lewis:** Can I ask a question? I know that you were planning to discuss from a City standpoint, how this technology would work with things like public records requests. Has that conversation happened yet, or is that in the works?

**Torgie Madison:** That is in the works. I will follow-up with that. We started that conversation and I need to follow up on it.

**Steven Maheshwary:** Quick question, then, Is that one of those things where we should have communication on a platform if we don't know if we can acquiesce to a public records request?

**Charlotte Lunday:**  What we have been doing is we've been putting our documentation in two different places. Discord will actually keep the records for a really long time. But I know we already used Google Drive, and so we've been storing our stuff thee, as well. You can pull our conversations pretty easily. They haven't gone anywhere. I think the bigger issue is when multiple board members are talking to each other on the app, if you reach a quorum and are required to have it public, is by virtue of being on the app, and everybody being able to have access to it, is that a public meeting? Does it meet all of the requirements that you need to meet? Or do you need to have publicized this in any way, to give people notice. Those are the questions that I think are maybe the bigger ones that we're not quite clear on. At this point, we've just been very cautious about  how many of us are talking at any given time.

**Jose Vasquez:** I think, based on previous years, we have asked this question. We need to announce a week prior to any meeting that may be considered a public meeting, and at least have the option for somebody to show up in person. So, maybe somebody is hosting it at a library. Even though multiple people are online, at least having the option where anybody can drop in, and they know where that public meeting is.

**Charlotte Lunday:**  Because we've only been using it at the committee level, there aren't enough board members on any committee that could create this problem. But if we open it up wider, it's a question that we need to answer.

**Torgie Madison:** I think that some of the rules around public meetings weren't thinking about ongoing internet only conversations. So, we really can't announce a week in advance. Discord is persistent. So I don't know how those rules apply or can be interpreted in a way that addresses something like Discord.

**John Krull:** Email has been addressed before, so a board that's subject to public record meeting notification can't even have an email conversation. So, it's not a matter of being synchronist or asynchronist. But if it's transitory, it's okay. It's okay to send out an all-board email, but we couldn't decide on a topic via email.

**Torgie Madison:** It's kind of interesting that this technology does allow us to talk to the public and have the public see our conversations. So, my hunch is that since there is no barrier to entry. Any Seattle resident or citizen can come join this, and search the entire history of every conversations we've had, it feels like it's more public and would be approved by the City people.

**Charlotte Lunday:**  True, but if this were something that we wanted to pursue, it might be an area for us to try to try to influence policy at the state level. I actually don't know whether Washington State does advisory opinions, but seeking an advisory opinion might not be a bad idea.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  Should we just make that as a follow up?

**Charlotte Lunday:**  I'll follow up with the City Attorney's office.

**Dorene Cornwell:**  I would take exception to the assumption that because it is online and open to everybody, that there are no barriers to entry.

**Harte Daniels:** I second that.

**Dorene Cornwell:**  I don't know what to propose in this case, because I think it's fine that this conversation goes on, but I would not assume that it's a barriers to entry thing.

**Torgie Madison:** Right. What I meant by that was that we don't exclude anyone from joining. You would have to have some sort of computer. You could have a mobile device or something as a prerequisite to joining this conversation, you'd have to have some kind of access to a computer.

**Heather Lewis:** Okay, it sounds like a lot of still ongoing work. And a conversation with David Keyes has been scheduled to discuss some of the legal logistics. And Seferiana Day is reaching out to the State Attorney's office. And you will be discussing this again at the  next committee meeting.

**Charlotte Lunday:**  Yes, which is the last Tuesday of the month.

**Heather Lewis:** And that is at Montlake?

**Torgie Madison:** Yes.

**Charlotte Lunday:**  No. June is Tuesdays, and July, I think we're switching to Mondays.

**Heather Lewis:** So, last Tuesday in June is the 26th. Is that the next scheduled meeting date.

**Torgie Madison:** Let me double check. I will note, though, that I will be out of the state for this meeting.

**Heather Lewis:** Could we, for the sake of time, say that you will follow up via email with the next meeting?

**Torgie Madison:** Yes, definitely.

**Heather Lewis:** Thank you both for your work on this. I know that it's been a lift.

**Torgie Madison:**  Just take a look at the open meetings code of conduct. If we can get links sent out to the board, any feedback on that would be appreciated.

**Heather Lewis:** Okay. Can we share that with the full community group?

**Torgie Madison:**  Yes. Those are public documents.

**Charlotte Lunday:**  Yes. I think we would be happy to send it out more broadly. I do think, before we make it more official, even for our committees, it's something that the board should vote on. Because we would be speaking on the board's behalf. Before we treat these as the actual code of conduct for things that we'll be using, I think that is something that the board should vote on.

**Heather Lewis:** And it does seem like it's something that is subject to feedback from the City.

**Seferiana Day:** Yes, we should keep it internal for now.

**Torgie Madison:**  Yes. Right now, [unintelligible]. I guess I'd consider them in draft form right now.

**Heather Lewis:** Well, thank you both for that update. We are going to move on to the Digital Equity Committee update. John Krull?

**DIGITAL EQUITY COMMITTEE UPDATE**

**John Krull:**  Yes. I am the co-chair of the Digital Equity Committee. We kicked that off again last month. We meet on the fourth Tuesday of the month at the Chinese Information Service Center (CISC). Karia Wong sponsored our location and is an esteemed member of the committee, as well. For our first meeting in a while, just had a spree. A successful meeting. We just kind of kicked off ideas. Basically, our one action--we decided to keep it small--was we want to have the City broadband providers come present to CTAB in the fall. So, each of us took one of the three providers and we're reaching out to them just to get more information. We're trying to get from them how many people they serve, and what areas of the City, and get some basic information from those initial conversations. At our next meeting, we're going to try to come up with specifically what we want them to present. We're hoping to have them present to us, either individually or as a group to start with, to make sure that they're ready to present to the board, and they're going to have all of the information that we want. Karia, do you have anything to add?

**Karia Wong:**  No. I think that's a good summary.

**Heather Lewis:** It sounds like a couple of people want to know why the internet is so expensive.

**John Krull:**  We encourage people to come to the meeting. We definitely could use more input.

**Steven Maheshwary:** Should we have a broader push to have it on our Facebook  posts? Just announce a week before we have the subcommittee meetings? That might help with attendance, as well.

**John Krull:**  Sure.

**Heather Lewis:** So, you will send the day. What is the time? It's at the Chinese Information Service Center, on which date?

**Karaia Wong:** I think it's June 26th.

**John Krull:**  It's the fourth Tuesday of the month. We're just trying to make it the same day as this meeting, so people who can make this meeting might have the same Tuesday open in two weeks.

**Heather Lewis:** And, what is the time?

**John Krull:**  It's 6:00 to 7:30 p.m.

**Harte Daniels:** Is it the same date that they were having their meeting?

**Heather Lewis:** Yes. Everyone, hopefully, will split, and hear one conversation. well, both sound like exciting meetings. Thank you all for your updates. The last item on the list a summary of decisions and next steps.

**SUMMARY OF DECISIONS AND NEXT STEPS**

**Heather Lewis:** So, we have some exciting panel conversations. Hopefully, there will be more conversations coming up. The first one will be on AI and the impact to jobs. What we want everyone to do is if you are aware of a speaker, or you have some sort of subset of that that you would like to have included, please send that to us and we will try to include it. Other follow-up items: Seferiana Day is going to reach out to the City Attorney's office with regard to the technology mentioned by Charlotte Lunday and Torgie Madison. And you ar going to send an email regarding your meeting time, to confirm that it is the 26th, Charlotte and Torgie? Is that correct?

**Charlotte Lunday:**  Yes.

**Torgie Madison:**  I posted it in the sidebar area. It's June 26th, 6:00 to 7:30 p.m. at the Montlake Branch of the Seattle Public Library.

**Heather Lewis:** Thank you. And Dorene Cornwell had a link?

**Dorene Cornwell:**  I will send it to you.

**Heather Lewis:** The FCC link? That would be terrific. And we will follow  up then with next steps and updates related to the panel conversation in July.

**Steven Maheshwary:** We should also point out that given popularity, if it's a popular event, we may have to find a bigger space within the building or somewhere else. Keep your eyes peeled for announcements of where the panel will be held.

**Heather Lewis:** I saw that the City Hall has an overflow room.

**Seferiana Day:**  The Bertha Landis Room. I've never actually been to the boards and commissions room, so I don't know how big it is.

**Heather Lewis:** We will follow up on that issue, and send it out as soon as possible, within the next week or two. With that, unless anybody caught an item I missed, the meeting is adjourned.

**ADJOURNMENT**