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**Steven Maheshwary:**All right, everyone! Welcome to the February CTAB board meeting. We're going to get started. We are waiting for a few members who may be coming in late. We really appreciate everyone who braved the snowstorm and were able to make it out today. I know that the schools are closed and the roads are slushy, so I appreciate everyone's dedication. Just to start it off, we will go around the room and do introductions. Typically, we just say our name and what area of Seattle we live in. If you want to add a comment about how you've been affected by the snowstorm, you can as well. So, we can get started on this side.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

**Steven Maheshwary:** All right. So, we do have a quorum today. We have myself, Smriti, Torgie, John and Karia. And then, Mark DeLoura has passed me his proxy voting ability, so we can now vote on approving the February agenda. Does anyone have a motion approving the February agenda?

**Torgie Madison:**   I move that we accept the agenda.

**Steven Maheshwary:** Is there a second?

**John Krull;**   I'll second.

**Steven Maheshwary:** All in favor of approving the February agenda, please say 'aye.'  Motion carries. And can we get a motion to approve the January minutes?

**John Krull;**   I move that we approve the January minutes as written.

**Steven Maheshwary:** Can we get a second?

**Karia Wong:**  I second.

**Steven Maheshwary:** Awesome. All in favor, please say 'aye.'  Any nays or abstentions? Motion passes. Just before we move to our next item, we did have an announcement that Delia Burke has passed through. The 2019 Technology Matching Fund grant cycle is now open. The deadline is going to be on March 26. and  they will be hosting information workshops on February 27, March 2, and March 5. There are postcards here, in case you want more information about the Technology Matching Fund. And, as usual, we do encourage CTAB members to sit on the review panel, as we have in the past. And if there is any other information or questions that you have, you can reach out to Delia Burke, delia.burke@seattle.gov. It's on the white board. Thanks, Seferiana. And now we would like to welcome our new CTO, not just to Seattle, but to Seattle IT. Welcome, Saad Bashir.

**Saad Bashir:**   I'm glad to meet everybody. We had a similar kind of a group back in Ottawa. We used to call them something else, but it was a similar group of community folks who had an interest in IT. We were able to do some wonderful things with them. So, I'm hoping to do the same with you.

Just very briefly about myself: It feels like I have been boasting about all of the things that I can do, because I've been meeting with a lot of counselors, and meeting with my own staff, sometimes they want me to talk about myself. So, I feel like a bit of a broken record. But I will do it again. For the last three years almost, I have been the CIO for the City of Ottawa. It's a very similar sized operation, like Seattle, but a very different government structure. Right before that, I was the Economic Development Director of Development for the City. I worked closely with the Mayor of Ottawa to do a number of things around getting investments into the City, and helping local small businesses mostly in high tech all over Ottawa. I don't know if you know that it is a very high tech center. I've had three years with Calgary Economic Development, where I did a lot of international energy business development work, nothing to do with IT, but everything to do with creating relationships with business development. I was with Nortel Networks as product manager. I was with Citi Bank in business planning work. I was with Flextronics. You may have heard of them. They are a $50 billion company that most people in the world don't know about. They are the ones who make our equipment. I wouldn't be surprised if they are the ones that built that television, that screen over there. They are manufacturers of big electronics products.

My background is that I have all of these different companies, but in most cases, I am the one who has been involved in a lot of change management. That seems to be a specialty that I have acquired over the years. At Citi Bank, I was part of a team asked to acquire a big banking issue. So there was a lot of risk, the kind of things a company thinks about when they are risking a few billion dollars.

The IT shop back in Ottawa was one that was very [unintelligible]. They had a revolving door there. They had many CIOs and CTOs over the last ten years before I left. So there was a lot of change management. I would find something that's not working that should be working and I was asked to come in and so some fixing. I would say that my last two weeks at the City of Seattle--almost three weeks--was to try to meet with as many people as I can. I have met with maybe 120 people so far. My goal is to meet everybody. Everyone has a perspective about IT. Lots of teams are emerging in terms of what my focus should be. And I would love to share those ideas with you maybe at your next CTAB meeting.

But just to give you a sense, there are processes that should be looked at, there are structural issues in the way the organizations have captured, systems and technologies that need some road mapping. Sometimes, I think, we are doing some great things, and I think we are not telling the stories. Those are things we should be looking at as well. Skills development is a huge area, something that maybe in the past we haven't taken as seriously. But when somebody joins the world of technology, they don't join because they want to do exactly the same job, and use the same tool for almost 20 years. It's a certain type of individual who gets attracted to IT, who are always wanting to be in constant learning mode. That is something I think I can do in this organization. I could keep talking on and on, but I would like to meet on the spot with you if you have any questions about my staff, I would be happy to take your questions.

**Steven Maheshwary:** You mentioned scaled improvements. Are there any other passions that you have that you are bringing over from Ottawa that you would like to focus on?

**Saad Bashir:**   You know, one area that is near and dear to me is data analytics. The City of Seattle, as I am finding as an outsider coming in is almost structured as independent business organizations. the public utilities and City Light and everybody else, they have everything that they need almost to behave like their own organization. Nothing wrong with that, but I think what then happens is that there are certain parts of the organization is if they miss something, they're going to miss out. With data analytics, how do we have visibility of our operations in the City, end to end, so that we can make some good decisions. That's something that we were able to put into action back in Ottawa, that I would love to bring here. The other is platform approach. Many decisions in a large organization like ours I can say what our business needs and I will procure a particular solution, but then we sometimes have similar functions. So the integration among them and how can they provide an organization in view of the operation doesn't happen. So, encouraging people to think platforms versus specific individual applications sometimes make perfect sense, but sometimes it is better if you have a platform approach.

**John Krull:** I know the City has finished a digital Equity survey across the City. I'm curious about when that's coming out, and what are some early thoughts on how the City can approach Digital Equity.

**Saad Bashir:**   I have not seen the survey results from that, and I don't know what the timing is. Was that survey done ...?

**Seferiana Day:**  It's City-wide, and composed of 20,000 people. Four thousand people responded, but then also Seattle Public Schools, SHA residents--that's Seattle Housing Authority--and we also did a really tiny sample of the homeless villages. It was a City-wide mail-in survey.

**Saad Bashir:**   Without knowing exactly what the survey output is, but just generally speaking, if I were to put a couple of slides that I will bring to you next month, one of the things that I want to focus on is Digital Equity. Throughout my interview process, what was made really clear is that is something by which we measure successful criteria for IT. There are some initiatives that are really small underway within Seattle IT. the grants that you talked about are one of those.

**Harte Daniels:** I, too, have a lot of experience with IT integration [unintelligible]. It's a really big job that you are taking on. Initially, there are a number of organizations that would be very helpful for your employee development. I can talk to you about that at some other point. There is a lot of change management, the [unintelligible]. The one difficulty that I've had in proffering that offer to City employees is that they don't want to do anything after work. They want to just go home. We might have to consider methods that are more engaging for them. And again, I'd like to talk to you later.

**Saad Bashir:**   My experience is if you can connect whatever activities you ask, even if it's over and above the job, they can affect their career progression. I think most people don't take that seriously. But if you just make it about [unintelligible]. On your point about connecting with the open system, I wouldn't be a bit surprised at how disconnected. Back in Ottawa, I remember sending people from Ottawa to Seattle to hang out with people who are from Amazon and other companies, so I am hoping that we do that in a much, much bigger way.

**Steven Maheshwary:** Well, thank you so much for your time and for speaking at our meeting, and hopefully, we can hear more updates from you as you progress.

**Saad Bashir:**   And I promise you I will stay for the entire meeting next time around. But, if you don't mind--and I'm not going home, just going back to the office--to finish up a couple of things for tomorrow morning.

**Steven Maheshwary:** Just for everyone in the room, we are re-welcoming back Julie Pham from the Washington Technology Industry Association (WTIA).

**ION COLLABORATORS**

**Julie Pham:**   First I want to just start with three questions. My first question is, "Raise your hand if you ever left a job that you loved because you didn't like the people you worked with."  Just one person. All right. "raise your hand if you've ever stayed at a job that was so bad that you probably should have left a while ago, but you stayed because you loved the people that you worked with." All right. "Raise your hand if you think that to get things done, sometimes you've got to know someone."  We have asked these questions hundreds of times. And what we've found is that who people work with can matter more than what they work on. And who people know can matter more than what they know, in terms of getting things done. I work at WTIA, which advocates on behalf of the tech industry, and my background is that I am trained as a researcher; I ran my family's Vietnamese language newspaper; and I got into the tech industry about seven years ago. Working at tech companies and now at WTIA. So, I have this wide experience in media, small businesses, arts and culture.

At WTIA, what we keep hearing is that the tech industry is responsible for both a lot of economic growth and economic disparity. What we often hear from our technical employers is we want to be part of the solution, we just don't know how. So we asked how do collaborations fail?  How do we actually get tech to work with community and with government. And it came back to who they work with matters more than what they work on, and who you know can matter more than what you know. So we had a huge focus on well let's think about actually doing more of the people first approach while we try to experiment with the nature of cooperation. So, two years ago we started this program, and I'm going to talk about the three ways. You can understand it as the people, the process, and the projects. At the heart of ION are the people. These are three cohorts of three or four collaborators. By the way, there are two in the room, if you can identify them. We have one-third from tech, one-third from community based organizations, and one-third from government. And we try to recruit teams that are incredibly diverse in terms of not just being [unintelligible], but also cross-functional, and cross [unintelligible]. So on any given team, we may have an engineer and a fundraiser. We may have a CEO and a coordinator. Demographically, we are also very diverse. Like we have one team that had a 21-year-old, and a 71-year-old.

We think of ION as a platform for individual learning and experimentation. We want people to come in with a good mind-set and a lot of curiosity. The second way we think about ION is the process. So, the collaborative committee goes through a six-month process. They come in and they don't know what they're going to work on. We didn't want to call out people who don't want to just talk, who want to do something. And it doesn't really matter what they want to do; it matters more who they are doing it with. The first stage is called exploration of their community. Then we go to ideation and that's when they actually choose the community challenge that they want to work on' and then there is the creation of a project that addresses that community challenge. With this exploration period, we have them go out and interview a whole range of organizations and companies. And there doesn't seem to be any pattern. And the reason why we do that is because we want people to understand that there are lots of ways of doing good in our communities. So, they might interview a funeral home in Seattle, a Chinese seniors home, the Microsoft envisioning center, the Seattle Public Library. There are all of these different organizations where they can that there is so much going on. And we have them ask what we are you hearing that the general public doesn't know? What resources are there that the public doesn't know about? What resources do you have to offer that people don't know about? Also, from this, we ask that they share what they're learning with their team mates, so they can also see the different ways that information can be interpreted differently. And then we also ask them to examine their own biases and assumptions.

Then they go into the ideation stage. Ideation is after the exploration stage, which is where they're learning and building trust along side one another. They are actually ready to engage in this creative struggle of choosing what they're going to work on. That can take one to two months. But by then, they've built that trust and they're willing to engage. And then, after that, they realize that they only have one to two months left. We give them no budget and we say, 'You've got to rely on your own resources." This is actually when they really create something. The result of this process is the projects.

These are the nine different projects. There's a whole wide range. There is a tech talk held at the Department of Corrections. There is an online portal that helps people find affordable housing options in different neighborhoods.There is a short documentary on community building efforts around public murals, which I'll show you later. All of these are super different from one another, and they represent how collaboration is the expression of people coming together and creating something that they wouldn't have thought of on their own.

And all of these people leave behind their personal agendas, leave behind their title, and spend lots of time together. This is the time it took over three different cohorts to get to those projects. We are constantly iterating and rethinking about what we are learning from this collaboration process, because we, by no means, think that we are the experts. There is no prescribed  curriculum. This is us co-creating along with the collaborators. What does it mean to collaborate? What does it mean to work together in the community. So, rather than saying we've got lessons learned, I'd prefer to say these are the questions that we have asked and are still asking.

Those questions include how do we make it possible for people from very different backgrounds to create something together? How do we get people to acknowledge their part in creation, and what are their assumptions and biases that they have about those in other sectors? How do we move collaborations from being transactional, that is every sector's predetermined roles, to being relational.

A question I get asked a lot is how do you measure success. How do we measure relationships? How do we measure the value of relationships? Because we give them no resources, how do we learn how to ask for help? How do we learn to ask for help as individuals and also as communities? These are questions that we keep thinking about.

What's next? It's 2019. We are now in recruitment mode, and so we have two cohorts. We will have our spring cohort, and our summer cohort. As I said, we like to experiment. So, with the spring cohort, we are partnering with the [unintelligible] program at the Seattle Foundation, and we are going to create a cohort focused on belonging. That's the general theme. Belonging is a very big theme. but we're doing it through a hyper-local plan. That means that the three teams will focus on different neighborhoods. So, we'll have Skyway, Crossroads in Bellevue, and South Park. We actually have a private sector. If you know of anyone working in government, or CEOs, any of those areas, then they get special priority.

And in the summer, we are toying with the idea of trying new combinations. So, we may do tech and government, or tech, labor, and government. The idea there is to see how different groups of people come together and create something. To get more information, just go to that link, and I think it's also included on the page, too.

Next, what I want to show you is this short documentary that I mentioned that one of the teams did. They had no resources and they did this in two months. To just give you a taste of what a team is able to do with no resources. They borrowed a lot of things. This is the livability team from cohort  three. They come from a 200-person tech company, a two-person start-up, the Office of Economic Development at Snohomish County, Casa Latina, and Lifelong. So, all of these different organizations on one team. Their original question was how do we get people to think about public art and technology? And then it started evolving, and then there are some interesting murals, and the Office of Economic Development, which is putting money into some of these art projects. How do we share that? In the end, they created a documentary where they borrowed equipment from a local radio station from the OD office and they created this. So, I wanted to show that to you.

**Seferiana Day:** I can pull it out so you can present it.

**Harte Daniels:** Can you stop presenting and show what we might be able to do at the link at the bottom?

**Julie Pham:**   Yes. I put it in the text box. In the meantime, are there any questions that people want to ask me while we're finding this?

**Harte Daniels:** I couldn't contact Skyway because they didn't have your information, and some of the comments that you made are very ...and I really like the question list that you have, but on Cross Communications and working with that, there has been recent work by other community organizations in the Seattle area that you can check into that deal specifically with that issue. If you've heard of emotional intelligence, they are working on diversity and cross-cultural emotional intelligence on their projects. There are people who are working on that you could check in with.

**Julie Pham:**   Thank you. Yes?

**Maitreyee Joshi:** I moved to Seattle not too long ago, and I was wondering if, from the past cohorts that you guys have had. do those relationships continue even after the cohort is done.

**Julie Pham:**   Yes! A lot of this is very anecdotal. At the end of every cohort, we do a network analysis. So we ask, and we have team projects that have emerged from that. I know that in cohort three there was someone who was working at Farestart, and someone who was working at Amazon are now working on a project together. Actually, one person in cohort one ended up hiring his team mate, who was working at a different place at the time. There is a story sharing that came from cohort one, and they have been sharing that with 80 people.

**Camille Malonzo:** This is all on a volunteer basis. Is there any effort to draft those who wouldn't be able to afford the time spent? And secondly, [unintelligible]....

**Julie Pham:**   That's a good question. One of the things when we first designed it, we don't have a program fee, but we say we're bootstrapping, so we do need volunteer time. But we're not asking you to take time off work. There are some programs that require you to take time off work. So we do a survey asking when you are available to meet, and let's meet when you are available to meet. A lot of the meetings are in the evening. What we do have with this particular cohort coming up that is in partnership with the Seattle Foundation, is that they have created a small fund for us to give some stipends to those who find it difficult to participate otherwise. And we are giving priority to those who are in those designated neighborhoods. We have also worked on getting transit subsidies and other subsidies,as well. In terms of the students, the first cohort--in our original plan, we were actually going to bring on students to help with the creation part of it, and what we found was in the first cohort, two teams did have some students, but by the time in cohort two and three, they said, no, we just want to work on this. We don't want to go through the trouble of also recruiting a student to help us on this. So, we've actually lost that part of it, just because it wasn't something that the teams through was useful.

**Harte Daniels:** I agree with your first question about inclusion of people and think that might be one of the questions that you add to the list of questions. People who sign their identity [unintelligible] don't realize that it's not just volunteering, etc., Plus, Seattle is so unaffordable on one income that you are actually privileged to be able to work in one place consistently and be a cohort within Seattle. Find a way of incorporating or understanding those other people beyond and maybe add that to your questions. Because those people have a vibrancy of knowledge. I have been working with them and the knowledge and ideation and imagination that comes out of those neighborhoods will blow your mind. But they're really not organized, and the City doesn't really have a way to break that. You really need something imaginative to engage that beyond the obvious answers that you gave to her..

**Julie Pham:**   Thank you.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  In the interest of time, would it be possible that we send this documentary out?

**Julie Pham:**   Yes. We can do that.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  So, we can send the link out. Thank you so much for your presentation. We will also send out more information about recruiting. We can send that out with the minutes. Without further ado, I will introduce Paul Alley.

**SEATTLE OPEN DATA UPDATE**

**Paul Alley:**   I'm not thrilled about following that PowerPoint presentation. That was very good, well designed. You're about to see my design skills on full display here. Okay, without further ado, thanks for having me, everybody. I am the Open Data Manager for the City of Seattle, relatively new. I started in October. I was previously at King County, doing similar sorts of work. But I'm very excited to be in Seattle because thee just seems to be a lot more backing behind this open data effort. It's part of the City fabric that appears to be woven into the City here. It's been a great three months, and I'm learning so much everyday. It's semi-tiring, and then, to come in every day, and think everything I've learned is just deprecated with what I now have learned. I think I'm kind of reaching a good pace and getting to where I'll start getting ahead of that curve.

That being said, I'll do what I can to explain what the open data program is here in the City of Seattle, how it works, and then some of the efforts that we have done to reach out to the community, and work with community organizations and basic and general outreach. I designed this PowerPoint. No, I didn't. I'm basically going to be talking about first, what is open data, how it works and who is involved with it. Then I'll get more into how we're reaching out to the community. Another round of questions: How many of you have been to http://data.seattle.gov? All right, that's great. That's a better response than I've gotten at other community meetings I've been at. does anyone want to venture a guess? What is open data? I think every single person has a different interpretation.

**John Krull:**  I was going to try. Data that is able to be shared with the community that....

**Paul Alley:**   In a common thread, data to be shared. In another common thread to what is open data, is without restriction. So, typically, it's data sets that we're putting out there that are not restricted for--don't use this commercially, or make sure you cite us, that sort of thing. We really just put it out there to be used. We have recommendations on citations and things like that, but it is really just free to use. That is essentially what some of these different organizations define open data as. I won't go into those, but generally, I think you nailed it, John. Here at the City of Seattle, we are actually driven partially by an ordinance that has been passed. Under a previous administration, there was an executive order that the City's data would be open by preference, meaning that, if at all possible, the City's data should be evaluated in terms of can it be released to the public. Are we doing a terrific job of that? One hundred percent across the board, no, I don't think so. If you go to [http://data.seattle.gov](http://data.seattle.gov/) what you really see is kind of a small sliver of what is out there and what the City has behind the walls. And what our job is on the open data team, is to work with departments to uncover that mountain of data that can be released, but isn't. We are here because we want to be, but also because of an ordinance. "Open by preference' within the ordinance   doesn't really give us a stick to go compel departments to release their data, so we really are in a mode of marketing ourselves to the departments, trying to help the departments figure out the benefits to releasing data.

To accomplish this throughout the huge City--some of the departments here have budgets that are larger than small countries--so we can't do it just as a team of four people.  We rely upon this network of what we  call open data champions. We have identified a person from every department in the City who is our open data champion. And again, we don't really have money or a stick to make these people do this, so our open data champions are volunteers, staffed from departments, who have an interest in coordinating the public data needs. These folks have a lot on their plate. As volunteers, they provide technical guidance. They help identify and prepare data. They review it for quality and meta-data, and make sure that privacy protocols are followed. They really do wear and lot of hats, and we rely on them immensely for the success of our program.

I am part of the open data team at the City, and there are five of us on the team right now, including myself, and we are within Seattle IT in the Digital Engagement division, and we are open data team. Other members of the Digital Engagement are the Privacy Team, the Digital Services who run the web site, Seferiana's group, Community Technology. So, there is a good diverse group of us. I was just talking to Maitreyee. She was asking what is your interest in analytics and things like that. Great question, great segue. One of the things we're really trying to do as a program is get beyond just putting out rows and columns of data. It's kind of this new revolution in open data across the country. Programs like this one are starting to realize, hey, when we throw spreadsheets out at the public, there's not much value there. But if we can help give context and meaning to that data through visualizations, through stories and maps, and other types of data product, it really gives more value to that. So, we are trying to expand our services as an open data service team to provide more of that  to City departments, to help them not only release data, but to release the meaning behind that data. It's a pretty exciting effort that we are starting to undertake.

About 22 departments are represented in our inventory, roughly 500 data sets, about 200 of those are map data sets that are actually pulled from our portal, so it's a good mix. Two to three hundred of those are actually native data sets.

**John Krull:**  How many of those data sets are up to date?

**Paul Alley:**   That's a great question. We are actually chasing that down right now, because up to date can mean different things to different data sets. Some data sets, just by their nature, are are one time, just a one time thing, like a survey that goes out, and we want to put that data up. Other ones are data sets that we need to keep down to the minute. And in between those are data sets where the publisher said, you know what--and they tell us when they put that up here how often they're going to publish. We're going to publish every month. We're going back right now and doing analysis on all of our data sets and their update frequency to try to basically find out who isn't updating at the schedule that they basically promised that they would. And I can say right now, it's about half are not meeting the frequency targets that they meant to. We're chasing those down as we speak.

**Harte Daniels:**  How is your data cleansing coming along? The previous person in your position--data cleansing meaning that if they're calling things by the same name and manner is one important way to keep things apples to apples. So data cleansing in addition to taking your inventory, how does that come about?

**Paul Alley:**   That's actually a good question, and I will say we're not doing a great job of chasing that particular issue of schema model similarity across various data sets. Right now, we're really focused on curating the inventory, meaning that we're looking for data sets to take off the inventory because they're old and stale--that kind of thing. Another big effort we have right now is to improve our meta-data. Sixty percent of our data sets have empty meta-data fields, in critical meta-data field, like descriptions and key words and titles, that really prevent them from being found, and prevent people from understanding them. I'd say from a data quality perspective, we're really right now focused on curation and removing data sets....

**Harte Daniels:**  Is the other aspects of digging up old data overwhelming your staff so that you can't get to that part of the project? Because until you do, no matter how much data you put out, it's almost useless.

**Paul Alley:**   I don't necessarily see those as mutually exclusive. I don't think our efforts towards curation and meta-data clean-up are necessarily affecting our lack of attention to coordinating model consistency across the inventory.It's just something that we're not focusing on. But you bring up a good point. That's something that I'll take back to the team.

We have a few departments that stand out in terms of visits and downloads. Typically, our most popular data sets are in the realm of transportation, and then our construction and inspections group with their permits are very popular, and then the budget office is also a very popular one. I really love outliers. One of my open data idols is out of New York. The guy in charge said 'Outliers are your interesting stories or bad data.' And bubble charts are the best way of finding these things. I love bubble charts. So, what we see here are some outliers that are interesting stories. These are departments that are really doing a great job of publishing data. And what we see here are some outliers that are actually bad data. And we see that Seattle IT is a pretty prominent publisher of open data. I just thought it's kind of a cool story to tell because actually, Seattle IT is not a big publisher of open data, but just because of the history of how data sets have been published by staff in IT, the meta-data populated for that says that it was published by IT. It's something we're trying to clean up, so that we can attribute these data sets to their correct departments so that they can be found.

**Question:**  [unintelligible]

**Paul Alley:**   These would be publishing departments. So, these are departments whose data sets are popular. This is the popularity of data sets broken down by department, in terms of visits. This is showing that Seattle IT's data sets are getting tons of visits, while the story under that is Seattle IT really doesn't have a lot of data sets. This is actually incorrect data here. This tells us that we need to fix this, and attribute these data sets to the right publishing department.

Some interesting data sets. We don't have to go into that. You can actually go to our page and see the most downloaded data sets on http://data.seattle.gov. Real time 911 calls continue to be our most popular, and as we mentioned, construction permits, that sort of thing. Some of our upcoming data sets that you might be interested in are unclaimed checks. So if any of you are owed a check by the City of Seattle, you might check this data set. It's coming soon. Paid occupancy parking: This is the biggest data set that has been released in Socrata's history. Socrata is our vendor that provides our open data portal, and portals for open data across the country. And this paid occupancy data set is the largest that they've ever dealt with. It is actually going to help consumers of that data to be able to hopefully develop models to help understand the availability of parking, predict the availability of parking. So, that's really exciting.

**Steven Maheshwary:** Do you want to quickly go back and talk about the Technology Access and Adoption Survey? Is that upcoming, or is that something that's a raw data set that's available now?

**Paul Alley:**   Technology Access and Adoption Survey? That data is not on the portal, but it's waiting to be switched to public, essentially. We're basically waiting for the approval. We're excited for that, too.

So, what can we do about it aside from model consistency across our inventory, which is a great point? Two big themes are providing a single front door, so that when people go to http://data.seattle.gov, they find the data they're looking for. Like all open data programs, in big cities, there are a lot of different ways to get to data. And departments have their own web pages. It's kind of proliferating like the wild west. So, what we're trying to do is, instead of saying that all of your data has to live in our inventory, what we're doing is saying that data is available and can we point to it from our inventory?  At least provide some meta-data about that. So, we just continue to try to sweep up data that---even if it's not going into our portal, at least we're referencing it and describing it so it can be found at http://data.seattle.gov. So, we're reducing some search noise by curation, improving meta-data, and then federating to make it make sense.

One of our big challenges, and not just here, but everywhere, is really focusing on the City's most pressing challenges. A lot of times that's not the data that ends up in open data portals, because of sensitivities, or because the departments have their own ways of doing things. So, it's just this tension where we really want to release the most pressing and important data that we can, but a lot of times what ends up in these portals is the low-hanging fruit, the easy to publish data. So, a lot of times, the most challenging data doesn't end up there, and that's the most valuable data. We're really working on and focusing on that.

Another area of challenge for us is just mitigating risks around privacy and equity, and we do have some processes in our publication work flow.  New data sets do go through a privacy review from our privacy team. That's great. But what we're lacking a little bit is more of a review of equity and fairness and looking at data sets for possible unintended consequences, or unintended harm in releasing data sets. We want to be transparent, but we don't want to cause harm to under-served populations by releasing a data set that could potentially--I'm just thinking off the top of my head here--give real estate agents a way to maybe negotiate prices down on houses in already depressed neighborhoods. That's kind of a classic unintended consequence of some open data sets. We are working with the Office on Civil Rights here in the City of Seattle to come up with ways of mitigating those sorts of things. We just started those conversations, so I'm really interested is seeing how we can formalize that and get more process.

Civic tech opportunities: This is where we are getting into more of the outreach, what we're doing with outreach for this. We've got a nice little logo there. Essentially, we're kind of a pass through. The Seattle departments are really the ones that own this data. What we can do is help facilitate a relationship between the tech community and the departments that want to release that data. That's one of the roles we have, engaging with our civic technology partners to understand what they need, meeting with essential projects, say at Democracy Lab which has interest in the project but say, "We really just need this data set from the City to do this.' Well, it's great for me to be able to attend these things and find out about the data needs that are out there, and try to bring that back to our partners.

Another really exciting thing that we've been doing lately is supporting student teams who are taking our data sets and doing cool things with them. Right now our partners in this are from the University of Washington's Information School. We have two student teams right now, working on projects that we are helping to coordinate. One is developing this parking prediction model. Really cool! Hope that we can learn where to park. And another team is actually looking at our Google analytics data for seattle.gov to help us understand what and where demand for open data sets. We might go an mine that data to figure out, well, if people are looking for this, maybe that's something we need to chase down from an open data perspective.

And then, Codefellows is on here because, talking to Elizabeth Skutchfield about possibly partnering with her. I'm going to go with that organization. I'm excited to go talk with them, in a couple of months about what we do in the City with open data. And then, maybe weigh extending some of those project models to some of their programs as well. That would be really exciting. And there are other student organizations which interact with us across the country. Grinnell College is not even in Washington, and we have a partnership with them, or we shared some data with their students, actually. It's a testament to our inventory that it's being used not just in Seattle but beyond. For contacts, if you want to get hold of me, if you have any questions, concerns about the program, if you have suggestions about how to do things better, we would love to hear it. So, please check out the inventory. Send us an email at open.data@seattle.gov, or just send me an email directly, and I'd like to get your ideas, needs and whatever else. So, that's my bulleted list assault. Now if you have any questions?

**Harte Daniels:**  I'd like to see what Mr. Bashir said about communicating out of the City of Seattle. This was a great presentation, and a lot of work that you have done [unintelligible]....and things of that nature. To your issue of sensitive data, etc., instead of going after analytics, seeking the questions you're going after, you may not know what those questions are by going at it from a Tableau perspective. You have to know what you're asking them. Instead, perhaps, the graphical database. You're working off the edges, close to the edge. [unintelligible]....I do have people that have offered to show how to do a case study for free and to teach others doing that. The other is on sensitivity, I have mentioned in the past the effort by the Department of State on the World Wide Geography data. They have a webinar coming up on modeling to understand human dynamics and social systems. There are people in the Seattle area that are members of the worldwide group. It's sort of like cutting edge. It's a way of answering some of those sensitive questions and things that the Mayor and others wish to address.

**Paul Alley:**  Okay. I'd be real interested in hearing it. If you wouldn't mind, I'll put the burden on you to send me some information?

**Camille Malonzo:**   [unintelligible]

**Paul Alley:**  Good question. Who else is using this stuff besides these groups? There are a couple of drivers.  One of them is that we know that some of the users of this data are people who would have been calling public information officers and asking for the data. for a lot of these data sets, that's how they come into being. We'll get a call from a department's public information officer that says, "I'm getting calls for this data three times a week.My staff is spending five hours a week on this. Can't we just put it on open data?" And so we do that and it drops their labor around serving those data sets. So, that's one group. It's just people who are calling public information officers at City departments. That's kind of a concrete example. In terms of who else is using it, it gets fuzzier and fuzzier, as we have to then start diving into say, Google analytics and the analytics around the requests of who is coming to this data, and which data sets are getting more hits than others. It's this huge body of circumstantial evidence, where we have to kind of say, we think these people are using it, or these constituents. A lot of our evidence is really circumstantial or anecdotal. Some of the reason why we're so excited to have this UW team starting to go into our Google analytics data in deeper ways to see if they can uncover more patterns and more evidence of who is using the data and who is requesting it. It's a big challenge for us.

**Steven Maheshwary:** In the interest of time, can we save additional questions for the break period? If you guys don't mind, we can take a break for five minutes. Paul, thank you again for your presentation. Help yourself to pizza, if you haven't already.

**BREAK**

**Steven Maheshwary:** All right, guys, if you wouldn't mind taking your seats. We are a little bit behind schedule. Make sure you grab a slice of pizza, and we'll give the floor to Mark Frischmuth from DemocracyLab. He's going to be talking about some of the work we've been doing online and events for the City of Seattle.

**DEMOCRACYLAB**

**Mark Frischmuth:**  Thanks, everybody. I will try to go fast and get this back on schedule. I'm going to talk a little about DemocracyLab. DemocracyLab is an organization that I founded way back in 2006. It was the day after the 2004 election to create an open source online platform to crowd source public policy. I spent some time working on that, talked to everybody I knew about it, raised a little bit of money, built a web site that absolutely nobody wanted to use. It was a very humbling and disheartening experience. It took some time to bind my wounds, and came back in to the space a few years later, and found that the civic tech landscape had changed a lot. Back in 2004, crowd sourcing wasn't a word, Facebook only existed at Harvard, and there was nothing like that idea out there. My return to the space--about 2011, 2012, there were hundreds of iterations of the same idea out there. And what I started to think a lot more about was not how to build the best platform to outsource public policy, but why are so many smart people trying to accomplish the same thing and nobody having any success. There was no traction in the space, no impact, that was actually taking place in the world. So I really started to pivot to how to solve that problem. How do you create more connectivity in the civic tech eco-system so that more civic tech projects can launch successfully.

Fast forward to 2017, which was really the year that DemocracyLab really started to get traction. A big event for us was the Seattle Social Good Series, which started in the summer of 2017 and went on to the fall. What this did is it was brought on by IXTA and Open Seattle, and it was a multi-step process that walked social entrepreneurs through the process of researching a problem, doing some design thinking work, program typing, and then it culminated in a hack-a-thon. We had a lot of high hopes that we would build an MEP in the hack-a-thon, and didn't even get close, but we learned a lot of really important things over that cycle. And the biggest thing that we learned was the critical importance of talking to users. We went out and interviewed 24 different stakeholders of one kind or another to understand what was working for them, what challenges they were experiencing, what frustrations that they had. And we really internalized those lessons and used them to relentlessly and ruthlessly prune the scope of what we were trying to do.

What this diagram shows is both our big picture vision. At the start of 2017, we imagined we were going to build a platform to connect projects with volunteers, with donors, with government institutions, with citizens, and they were all going to work on the same platform, this magical marketplace for civic tech, where all of the actions of these stakeholders would inform the decisions of all others. That's still our long-term vision. But we made the very smart decision to limit the scope of what we were trying to accomplish to just one thing. So, what we've built now is a platform to connect projects with volunteers. We're giving this our proof of concept. We're focusing on the local Seattle market. Because all of the ingredients for this to work exist in Seattle. We have a vibrant tech economy. We have a very progressive City, very civically minded citizens. If it's not going to work here. it's very unlikely to work anywhere else.

So, what we've built to date is a platform that occupies the connections between Tech for Good projects and skilled volunteers. One of the things that we heard from the people that we interviewed was from the project's standpoint, if you are a for profit company, you can come up with a good idea, go pitch a bunch of VCs, get funding, build it, and you're off. It doesn't really work in the Tech for Good space, because most of the benefit that is created accrues to the caller. And so there is a dependency before funding can happen that these projects need to be able to prove their concept. And without funding, they need volunteers to help them prove their concept. But the frustration that many projects had is the cost of trying to onboard a new volunteer often exceeded the benefits. They would invest a lot of time and energy in getting somebody up to speed, and that person might not ever contribute to the project. From the volunteer's perspective, what we heard was that lots of projects were too disorganized for them to be able to step into and start contributing to effectively. So we took this and designed our platform around those lessons.

So this is a project profile page on DemocracyLab. We're eating our own cooking, so this is our own project profile. And what you can see maybe from there is that we've encouraged radical transparency. So, you go to DemocracyLab and any of the projects that you click on, they've been encouraged to have an open link to their messaging team, to their Google drive, where they're storing all of their work, to Trello, if they're using that for  project management. We've got here our design file; we've got a meet-up room, all of the different things that people who want to kick the tires are going to want to dig into and use to learn about a project before they actually commit. And what we found with our own project is the amount of unproductive time we use talking to prospective volunteers. Now, when talking to a volunteer, they've already dug into our project. They know what it's about, and they're already at least 90 percent of the way there towards deciding that they want to start making a contribution. And that has been, I thin, critical insight for us; helped our team and helped a lot of the teams that are using our platform.

2018 has been a great year. It's been DemocracyLab's best year. We launched our MEP platform in August. We made what, in hindsight, was a very good decision, to incorporate hack-a-thons with other local civic tech organizations as a way to create some urgency for projects and for volunteers to get involved and to drive traffic to the platform. We have done four such events. We've had approximately 300 people show up and contribute at least a couple thousand volunteer hours to the projects during the actual days of the hack-a-thon. We don't have a good way to measure all of the work that's been done outside of the hack-a-thon. How we position these events is not as you show up, you try and solve and problem in a day, but rather this is the entry point for an ongoing volunteer engagement with these projects that are going to take a lot longer than one day to make any substantial progress on the difficult problems that they're trying to solve.

We just finished filling out a grant application last night, and listed 26 different contributors to the project. And what we've been able to do is get those teams, the research, design, development team on a regular two-week sprint cycle, so that we're continually learning from the way users are using our platform and making improvements to the interface. And we are starting to see impact for projects that are using our platform. One example is OrcaSound. They are a project that's been around almost 18 years. They deployed hydrophones into the Puget Sound to measure sounds in whale habitat, in orca habitat. And then, they've created a web app using the volunteers at DemocracyLab that allows people to listen in real time, and then collecting that data. Something that was a real pleasant surprise was to see a tweet about their kickstarter campaign, where they, without any solicitation from us, attributed DemocracyLab for helping them launch that we b app, and for helping them grow their volunteer team to 50 people working on the project.

Another example is Ready, Set, Vote. Some of you may be familiar with this. It's a customizable voter's guide that has been created in partnership with the Municipal League. Works great. I use it when I vote. You put in your address, and you indicate media sources that you trust, and it shows you your ballot and how those media sources have endorsed every race. So, what I do, I know who I want to vote for at the top of the ballot. I don't generally have a real clear idea for the down. If every media source I trust has endorsed the same candidate, that's an easy choice. If there's disagreement, then I take the time to learn more. It's a great platform. I think it will help to drive voter turnout. But it only works in King County. That is because when they built it, they hard coded too many aspects to their web site. through DemocracyLab, they've got a team of developers to rebuild the back end of their web site, and now are ready to make it available in other counties in Washington, and nation-wide. The next challenge for them is figuring out how to have machines figure out who is endorsing whom.

And then another is Seattle VolunTech. This is a most recent project of the ION cohort. They are building a platform to help Seattle businesses avoid being gentrified out of their neighborhoods by improving their web sites and other technology needs. This has been the example that one of the members spoke about is an Ethiopian restaurant whose web site looked like it was from 1995. People who go to that web site aren't likely to then show up at the restaurant. It's the platform that they're building that's designed to help south Seattle businesses to update their technology, so they have a better chance of prospering in the neighborhoods as they become more affluent, rather than being driven out.

So, in 2019, what we're looking to do is to prove and document the impact that we're having, to expand geographically. We need to become more sustainable, and to do that we need to achieve a scale that we don't have yet. While Seattle is a great place to prove our concept, we as an organization need to be working in more places if we're going to take this very narrow market segment that we're serving and create a self-sustaining business model out of it.

The next big event for us is St. Hacktrick's Day. On March 16--we embraced cheesy names for our hack-a-thons--We got to enjoy Paul's company at Hacky New Year a few weeks ago, and it was great having him there. So, that's DemocracyLab in a nutshell. I don't know if you have a few minutes for questions?

**Steven Maheshwary:**  Sure!

**Harte Daniels:**  I'd like to see more people that are not privileged developers, etc. Another thing is your so-called hack-a-thons don't end up in one day, but when you still continue to use that term, people who have been discriminated against physically and otherwise, hack-a-thons are notorious for being discriminatory. If you  still use that term, people who look at the web site other than you're playing to the same crowd, the privileged and able-bodied. etc. So, I'd like to see, and I know it's a large stretch, to move more towards instead of doing things to and for people, instead doing things with people. Trying to break down that lack of cultural competency that exists within Seattle developer society.

**Mark Frischmuth:**  Maybe we can talk afterward about what needs to happen to be non-exclusionary.

**Harte Daniels:**  Yes, well there's lot of research on it, but you can look instead to challenge grants and start switching--what was it Nissan and Datsun?--they used to put both their names on it. Start slowly moving over until you use language that is not, that people don't associate in such a derogatory manner. That's the way people who handle brands do it. And then the other is to actually be inclusive, and teach your developers to be inclusive and break down that identity that the tech community has in Seattle.

**Mark Frischmuth:**  I think that as I looked upon every crowd that showed up to these events, we're a reasonably inclusive crowd. And I think that challenge, when you're doing things like this without money is that it is difficult to devote resources that don't exist to solve a problem that isn't obvious.

**Harte Daniels:**  Yes, because when you look at that crowd, what you're  thinking of is diversity. When you go down that list, you'll probably find that it's not so diverse. Number one, I also understand this excruciatingly since I worked for a long time with NGOs and non-profits that use volunteers for lack of money. I apologize if it sounds too cruel what I said, but it is a huge task and it is the most desperate thing that Seattle needs right now is to change its culture to be more inclusive and to recognize that. For example, Digital Equity. When you're creating these apps, do they realize that not everybody can afford a data point on their phones. No. They just go ahead and do what they and their household can do. Things like that. Lazy math. You can't do it overnight. I can't ask you magically. I know it's a huge ask. I just want you to keep it in the back of your mind.

**Mark Frischmuth:**  I think a really important thing that you mentioned is the importance of talking to the people and working with the people.

**John Krull:**On the hack-a-thon, is this different than regular hack-a-thons where--I'm looking through your web site--do people post the ideas on your site and sort of build the team ahead of time, and then show up at the hack-a-thon?

**Mark Frischmuth:**  It's a mix. The projects do list themselves on the site ahead of time. The projects often have an existing team that will come to the event. And then there are also lots of people who will come to the event looking for projects. So, they're going to show up here with one-minute pitches from each of the projects, and then go around the room to talk to people that they're interested in learning more from. And then, generally, after 20 or 30 minutes of giving people that opportunity, everybody breaks up into their teams, works through the day, and then comes back and presents what they've accomplished at the end of the day.

**John Krull:**  Is there an initial voting on anything, to limit the number of projects at the hack-a-thon, or pretty much everybody who shows up for the project is expected to work on their project?

**Mark Frischmuth:**  We haven't run into a problem as of yet of having too many projects. There have been a few instances where projects didn't get teams formed around them, and they really weren't ready for a team. People kind of voted with their feet. And they weren't jazzed about that.

**John Krull:**  Did they then join another team?

**Mark Frischmuth:**  Yes. They'll join another team and I or one of the other organizers will sit down with them and talk to them about where their project is and what they need to do to be more ready. Because what needs to happen is there is some preparation that needs to be done by the project, so that  they have actual tasks that people can dig into.

**John Krull:**  And then, on the other hand, you end up with teams that are too big, like if someone has a really good pitch, and then all of a sudden a bunch of developers flock to it along with their skill sets.

**Mark Frischmuth:**  Yes. That was the seattle VolunTech team at the last hack-a-thon. They had more than 20 people show up, and they managed it pretty well, but what you do have also is that people vote with their feet. If they're not having a rewarding experience, because the project leaders don't have enough tasks, they just go to a different project. We've seen that happen, as well. People re-allocate if they're not getting what they want.

**John Krull:**  Is the hack-a-thon just one day?

**Mark Frischmuth:**  Yes. we're doing them every two months. That's t he cadence that we've tried to establish. It's not that they're going to give up a weekend and sleep on the floor to work on this project. You're going to go and spend a day, move the needle a little bit on this project, hopefully stay engaged in the project over the next two months, and then come back again at the next hack-a-thon where your team is going to get refreshed by some new talent, new energy.

**Steven Mahesdhwary:**  And a lot of the projects, if I recall, are repeat projects. It is kind of punctuated. Show up online, working on DemocracyLab, and then showing up at the hack-a-thons.

**Mark Frischmuth:**  Yes. One of the knocks against hack-a-thons is they're like Las Vegas. Whatever happens there stays there. Nothing lives beyond the hack-a-thon. What we want to be dramatically different about these is just having people show up and feel good about working on something that never amounts to anything. There's some value in that. There's value in the friendships, the skills, but what we really want is for these projects to have real world impact, as well.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  All right. That's all the questions. Thank you, Mark. We really appreciate it. I have had the privilege of being able to attend the last few hack-a-thons, and we've kind of enjoyed an unofficial relationship with this series of events. I have helped to sign registrants, help Mark and Jenny, and Open Seattle, help organize and keep people informed and interesting, scripting opening events for the hack-a-thon. I've been generally very impressed by how they're run. It looks like a well-oiled machine. And I'm impressed with the impacts. What I was hoping to do with this meeting was to formalize a relationship, at least just as a co-organizer for the hack-a-thons, just so that, a.) it allows us to add a more inclusive lens, and market or let people know and also be able to get feedback where we think it's appropriate, and make sure it's community-oriented. So, I would like to make a motion to be a co-organizer of the hack-a-thons that are hosted by DemocracyLab and Open Seattle, with the intent that we can show up--at least I'll show up--and help people sign up and help make sure that we're providing perspectives and helping you shape these hack-a-thons. Can I get a second for that motion?

**John Krull:**  I have a question before we second it. I'm wondering whether you are a nonprofit?

**Mark Frischmuth:**  Yes. We are a 501(c)(3).

**John Krull:**  I was just wondering if as a different type of organization than a 501(c)(3), we would be on the same level of co-organizers?

**Steven Maheshwary:**  I think with the designation as 501(c)(3), we are allowed to partner up with and work together on events as we have in the past. I don't think that's a conflict of interest. If you were a business, I think there would be questions there, but I think that there are other organizations doing the same thing. That's why I wanted to co-organize. We speak to a lot of the same people that would also be interested in coming to CTAB.

**Harte Daniels:** So you checked that with the City Attorney?

**Steven Maheshwary:**  To be fair, no I have not.

**Harte Daniels:** The second thing is if you do do this, and the advisory board is to represent the community. If they come up with ideas--for example, I have a quadriplegic who--I already went through with improving the concept of hack-a-thon, etc.--we come up with that format, etc., do we have the right to ask them to join in a partnership or whatever it is that you're bringing up that you have impact on DemocracyLab as well, or are you just rubber stamping? [Unintelligible] In return you have to listen to those comments and work together to find a way to solve that problem and crack that nut.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  So, Mark and I have had discussions about inclusivity in the hack-a-thons, and ot his credit, he has asked for feedback, too, about what we can do to make this hack-a-thon better and accessible. And I think you would be open to feedback that would come from CTAB and the people who attend CTAB meetings. We could figure out a way to formalize that feedback, or at least make it provide a more constructive set of actions that we would want.

**Mark Frischmuth:**  Yes. Everybody would be involved in doing so, because they believe that there is public good to come from talented people working on difficult problems. Nobody, I think, has any illusions that they have the right answer. All we're doing is trying to get better at it all the time. It's a learning experience. It's also something that if at any point it stopped making sense, it's not that there's a contractual commitment that anybody is making. It's just an agreement to help mobilize the people who want to do good things and take on difficult problems.

**Harte Daniels:** I look forward to seeing an MOU. I've seen how it works at Open Seattle. And there's that thing they do, the Seattle thing and th e cultural things. It's just benign neglect. So, if somebody raises something and it doesn't fit their able-bodied project, they just listen and then there's no action. So, more than just listening to feedback, and action on it. If that's a cultural thing, it's very difficult for a leader to handle that, I know, but that has been the pattern at Open Seattle where they have that activity and benign neglect going on with other less privileged groups. Are you not on the board?

**Steven Maheshwary:**  I am on the board. This is why I think it's a valuable but kind of an informal partnership, and all we would do is continue what we usually do, but actually provide feedback. So, I would like to move to be a co-organizer for the hack-a-thon. At this point, is there anyone who can second?

**Torgie Madison:**  Hi. This is Torgie, and I'm online, and I don't want to second that motion. I do think that that was a good point. I think we should get something formal written up as far as roles and responsibilities might be useful. We could cross-pollinate some of these ideas. With regards to the feedback [unintelligible]....

**Steven Maheshwary:**  We can caveat the motion to make sure that we're in the clear. I just checked with Seferiana. She said it's not an issue, but we can double check with the right resources within the City And the idea about the roles and responsibilities, this is a good one. And I can write something up on seeing what we have done. And if there's anything else that we should be doing, or that you think would be beneficial, whether it's more feedback, or other types of rules, and we can talk about that.

**Torgie Madison:**  As it is, then I would feel comfortable seconding that motion.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  Great! So, all of those in favor, say 'Aye.' And I'm voting with Mark's proxy, so he is an 'aye.' So, that's Torgie, myself, Mark. I think we would need two more to pass the motion. Is there anyone else?

**Smriti Chandrashekar:**  Hi, Steven, this is Smriti. I vote 'aye.'

**Steven Maheshwary:**  Great! We need just one more. Are there any abstentions or nays? Let's put it that way.

**John Krull:**  I would be a nay until we're clear on the commitment on it. Another comment might be that maybe we could partner on one of them, and see how that goes, before committing to an ongoing partnership, to see their general mission.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  Does that sound fair to you, Torgie and Smriti? If we were just to limit the motion to co-organizing on the St. Hacktrick's Day on March 16?

**Torgie Madison.** Yes, that sounds fine. [unintelligible]

**John Krull:**  Yes, I'd maybe table that motion and maybe make a new one?

**Steven Maheshwary:**  Okay. So, let me move to volunteer to co-organize the St. Hacktrick Day hack-a-thon with DemocracyLab and Open Seattle as a way to kind of figure out the right working relationship that we would want to have with DemocracyLab, if at all, until we have something that's fully defined, and a relationship that is fully approved by the City of Seattle. can I get a second for that motion?

**Torgie Madison.** I will second that motion.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  All those in favor, please say, "Aye.' With that, the motion passes. Mark, we can be in touch with the rest of the board to figure out what we want to do after the hack-a-thon. Just in the interest of time, Torgie has said that we can sort of table the recap of subcommittee expectations. We can do the committee updates now. John, do you want to give the committee update for the Digital Equity Committee?

**COMMITTEE UPDATES**

**John Krull:**  For the Digital Equity subcommittee, for which Karia is co-chair, we teamed up pretty well. What we're trying to do is get more people to attend our meetings. The next one is in two weeks. Remember that those are on the calendar. We haven't been that great in getting reminders out but we've committed to do that. I think there's a great opportunity. What we decided at our last meeting was to really use this survey. That's why I keep bringing it up. We're thinking that our committee can do a community look at the digital Equity Survey results, and then maybe put together a position and CTAB could then represent back to the City on how to use that data. That's our big thing that we want to do this winter and spring. Karia, do you have anything to add?

**Steven Maheshwary:**  Great. Torgie, do you have an update on the Privacy and Surveillance subcommittee?

**Torgie Madison:**  Yes. We held our first meeting. I made a mistake and held the meeting right in the middle of downtown at 6:00 p.m. So, I wasn't able to make it at that point. Smriti was able to make it and she chaired the first meeting, and I really appreciate her help with that. The updates that I have are that the public commentary for the second round on surveillance technologies is back open. It opened up  February 5, and it will be open until March 5. The first public meeting is actually tomorrow at 10:00 a.m.  at City Hall. Kind of a rough time to get people to that meeting. But that's happening. And the other news is that Washington State is coming out with new privacy laws similar to the TPI in Europe. It's sitting in committee right now, so there might be room for the Privacy Committee to make some comment on that, as well.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  That would be awesome. It could be an opportunity for the CTAB board overall to support that comment, too.

**Torgie Madison:**  The last update is that the next Privacy Committee meeting is going to be, hopefully, on the 26th. We plan to meet on the last Tuesdays of the month. We're going to try to do this one online, so that people don't have to try to fight traffic. Those with mobility issues don't have to be in a physical place for it, so we're trying an online one.

**Smriti Chandrashekar:**  This is Smriti. do we have a date for when the comments are due for surveillance technologies?

**Torgie Madison:**  Yes. The close of the comment period is March 5.

**Smriti Chandrashekar:**  That might be before our next meeting, so we and the board will have to work on that. We might have to work it in with the WSDOT.

**Torgie Madison:**  Yes. That's a good point. I'm going to be asking for volunteers from the CTAB privacy list to get people to support some sort of [unintelligible].... We were caught a little flat-footed for the first round, but hopefully, we can get ahead of this one. If we need to hold a special meeting to review those notes, they could be submitted along with the public comment during this round of public comment period.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  Is this an opportunity to collaborate with the Surveillance Advisory working group?

**Torgie Madison:**  I don't believe that Joe Wooley is in the room right now. He is our Privacy Committee liaison to the CSAB for it's community surveillance working group. Hopefully, we'll be able to have some communication and get some feedback on how his meetings are going, what topics are covered, and what's going on with these technologies.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  Perfect.

**Joe Wooley:**  And, Torgie, I'm on the line, and [unintelligible]....

**Torgie Madison:**  Is there a way to view the surveillance working group meeting online?

**Joe Wooley:**  That has not been communicated.

**Seferiana Day:**  There is not. It's being held in the Boards and Commissions Room, and very low tech. So, I might suggest that we hold future meetings where we have this system. But tomorrow is not going to be broadcast.

**John Krull:**  Can I just give the date? The date....

**Smriti Chandrashekar:**  [unintelligible]

**Steven Maheshwary:**  Smriti, do you want me to write your email address on the board? Or is there an email address that would be better?

**Smriti Chandrashekar:**  Steven, thank you. That would be wonderful.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  Okay. Got it.

**John Krull:**  And I just wanted to tell people that Digital Inclusion meeting is the fourth Tuesday, so it's always two weeks after this meeting. Fourth Tuesday, so it's February 26, at 6:00 to 8:00 p.m., at the Chinese Information Center. Like I mentioned before, often we have really good food and drink there. So I hope you can make it.

**Maitreyee Joshi:**   Would the Privacy Committee or the Digital Equity Committee be handling this group's work on Census 2020?

**Steven Maheshwary:**  That's a good question. It would fall under the Digital Equity Committee, but I don't think we've scoped any work streams or put some thought into it. I know that we have been invited to write a guest post about the importance of Census 2020, and that's something that I, personally, have been trying to make some connections so we can understand a little bit more about the Digital Equity impacts of having Census 2020 online for the first time. If there are things that you would like to take on or things that you would like to contribute. One avenue is we can talk. Another avenue is coming to the Digital Equity Committee meeting and talking with John and Karia, if it is of interest to you.

**Maitreyee Joshi:**   We can take that outside of this group. Can I give the update for [unintelligible]?

**Steven Maheshwary:**  Yes,

**Maitreyee Joshi:**   Okay, so Rene and I have been meeting and we are hosting the next meeting on Wednesday, February 20th. It would be great if you guys could come. Tell your members to come. There are a lot of great ideas that have been proposed. We are looking at affordable housing, looking at private data sharing, and [unintelligible]....  The location is not decided. If you guys have any suggestions [unintelligible]....

**Harte Daniels:**    [unintelligible]  The other is that Privacy is now Privacy and not Privacy and Security. So if you're looking at Smart Cities, you're looking at IOT and all the rest, you might start considering the role of security in this. We can do it offline.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  Congratulations on the new subcommittee leadership. I think, in the interest of time, we will cut public comment. I think it has been interjected throughout the meeting. So I think that should capture that.

**Harte Daniels:**    I just have three announcements. the Alaska Airlines environmental renovation challenge is due February 19; a cyber security workshop in Seattle in March of 2019; the [unintelligible] ... joint interagency field experimental proposals are due by March 15. They will be focusing on autonomy, artificial intelligence, machine learning, autonomous systems, and cyber security. And the Worldwide Human Geographic Data webinar is February 26. I think it's at 3:00 p.m. Modeling to understand human dynamics in social systems.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  Great. Thank you so much, Dan. And that will also be sent out with the minutes. With that, we will adjourn our meeting. Thank you, everyone, for coming.

**ADJOURNMENT**