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**Torgie Madison:**  Welcome to the March CTAB board meeting. We don't have a quorum, but we can optimistically move forward and w can save motions until another CTAB member shows up. In that case, we can move right along to the long-awaited Technology Access and Adoption Study results.

**TECHNOLOGY ACCESS AND ADOPTION STUDY RESULTS**

**Chance Hunt:**   Good evening. I'm Chance Hunt, manager for broadband and community technology. And yes, we finally have released the study. I'm going to do a real high level orientation to the findings tonight. There's a lot of information, a lot of data here. We won't possibly get through everything all at one time. But, hopefully, it will prompt some questions and CTAB can consider how we might like to engage with this information at a future meeting or future opportunities.

What I have to pass out here, around the table, are copies of the final report. That's a high level summary of the findings. And then, I'm going to jump right in. The City is a long-time promoter and doer of digital equity's work. This is our mission. We envision Seattle as a City where technology opportunities equitably empower all residents and communities, especially those who are historically under-served or under-represented. And for that reason, we focus and have been focusing for a number of years now on really three areas of work around internet connectivity. Can people get online, and how are they doing that, what are the barriers to that, computer devices. You need a computer device in order to get online and use the technology, and the variety of devices more and more, and then the skills that people need in order to access.

This is the fifth city-wide survey that the City has done since 2000. This time around, we heard from over 4,000 residents. And it really helped provide us with a very large, a holistic view of digital engagement across the City. Tonight, I'm going to highlight just a little bit of that for you, and also show you how you can start to dig a little deeper, if you'd like to do that. The study also uncovered barriers that prevent residents from fully utilizing digital technologies. The point of the study was to understand what people are doing, and what is stopping people from doing more, or accessing technology even at all, in some cases.

In the full report, what I've provided you, there's a whole host of other aspects. It can be found at http://seattle.gov/2018techsurvey.

So, a little bit about who responded, and our part in it, who we reached out to. We did an overall mailing. About 20,000 surveys went out to what we call the general population deployment. And then we did some targeted deployments of the survey, as well, targeting certain parts of the City, so that we could over-sample in parts of the City in order to get responses from harder to reach and harder to get to respond populations, low income populations. We also partnered with both Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) and Seattle Public Schools to reach into their client databases, their client groups. and through their support, really encouraging residents as well as parents of kids in Seattle Public Schools to participate in this study. And then we also did some work in two of the tiny home villages. I and some of my staff went and hand-delivered the survey and received them back, so that we could reach out into the homelessness and poorly housed population, as well. And so, each of these really represents how we tried to get to as many people, different types of people, people with different backgrounds, people with different levels of access, income, etc., across the City. And this gives you some sense of how much we heard back from each of those groups. We are quite pleased with the overall response. We were able to do a lot of good work with our consultant that did the research with us, Pacific Market Research. In order to deliver what the intent was is a population level survey. And population level findings.  Also, that could be divided and considered within the Council Districts, as well. Council Districts didn't exist four years ago, when we did the last study. So, we thought there might be some people interested to know about this data at the Council District level.

In terms of whom we heard back from, how do responses from over 4,000 people add up? Almost 250 people, who said their primary language at home was not English; over 900 people identified as ethnic minorities; the insecurely housed along with the tiny home villages. We also heard from people through those other means that told us they were homeless or insecurely housed in some way; older adults, almost 900 folks 65 years and older; 400 or so low income living at or below the 135% federal poverty level; over 1,500 residents in multi-dwelling units. These are people living in apartments and condos, etc. About 50 percent of the Seattle population overall lives in that environment. And this was important to us not just to know the kind of places people were living in, but we also know through some other work the City has done is that if you live in Building A versus Building B, your availability of internet and options can be very different, depending on what's going in the MD building, and what the owner of your building does. Households where people are living with a disability; and then households with children under 18.

Again, we felt pretty good about the spread of responses, as well as the variety, kinds of living situations and characteristics of people here in Seattle, and how that response ended up.

This slide, I would say, is the big headline. If you've seen any of the tweets or posts that have come out around this, this site is speaking to that. Back to 2013, when we did the last survey, we could tell that 85 percent of households had some level of internet access. And in 2018, it is now 95 percent. So, as a city, our households are connected more as a percentage of overall household residents here in the City than they were just three or four years ago. That's really good! compared to other cities, that's incredible that our households are connected in the ways that they are.

As you look at populations in different ways, you're seeing different percentages. This is population overall. This is looking at people who are insecurely housed or low income, where you see only 75 percent are connected. That means 25 percent of those people may not have internet access at their homes or the place where they live. We're seeing people with lower education levels. So, people with only high school or lower had a lower rate of connectedness, and on down through the other populations.

This is just a sampling of all the different ways you can slice and dice this data. But, in these sort of groupings, you're seeing something that looks different than what it looks like at the population level. So, that is why it was so important for us to see it. The way that we see using this information, though, helps us think about that next set of programming, or the way that we want to reach out to our communities, it provides some target populations to begin to work with. More may need to be done. More creative or different types of work may be needed to be done to get people connected. And this is just speaking to internet connectivity. There's a heck of a lot more data about people and their ownership of devices, as well as their skill levels, and the things that they'd like to learn.

It's something I think it's really important to think about and that we have been talking a lot about as we've been looking at these results, because when it comes to whether you're connected or not, that's a kind of on/off switch kind of question. And it really doesn't tell the whole story. Even though 95 percent of households are connected, we also know, through the data that people shared with us, that means different things for different people. It does not mean that what people have is adequate. When you start looking at -- and in our questions, we asked people the levels of adequacy for their internet connectivity, the three factors that seem to start to play a real role in that, well, what are you trying to do. If you're somebody that's emailing, and that's it, you probably don't need a lot of internet access. But, if you're streaming, and you're emailing, and you're downloading, you're doing a lot of activity. You need a lot more speed and bandwidth. What's the cost of the service. There's a direct correlation between how fast it goes and how much it costs. So cost is huge. And how much are you willing to pay for that service? And then, income. Income is another factor that really helps, along with the other two, determine if that level of connectivity you have. Is it fully adequate for your household? If you're a household of one, versus a household of five, it makes a huge difference. Those pieces are things that we are trying to explore a bit further. So, when we talk about connectivity, we're also thinking about what is it people are trying to do and how do these other factors  really play a role in is it adequate for people who live here in Seattle.

Now, I'm going to take this off into another land for a little while, where you can really get lost. It truly is down the rabbit hole. but, along with the study that I passed down the table--and this is fully available in a [PDF] form online--we also have a very robust interactive dashboard, which I will pop up and we will get to look at here for a minute. Along with these products is a full data set, which is housed on our open data platform. We also have variations on that data set, cross tabs and other tools to help you access or work with the data, if you'd like to do that for research or others who may want to look at that. We also have a full technical report that's behind both of these, and a couple of slides I was just showing you, about a 200-plus slide deck. It really gets into the intricacies of the data and how it relates to, or what the responses were that relate to specific questions that we asked. A copy of the questionnaire is up there. All of the past studies are now up there. So, there is a lot of really helpful information, not just for us today, but for those who would like to take a peek back, or do some other kinds of comparing. We see the work that we did as being of value and a valuable service for the work we do in digital equity. but it really is a product and a service in and of itself, in that we're providing all of this data out. It's open and it's available for researchers, for others to take a look at. More and more cities are doing this kind of research for communities. To be able to do those comparables, to trade and look at what other people are doing, what are the questions that people are asking, will give us a better way to understand what's unique to Seattle and where we have something in common with other communities.

I'm going to pop out of this real quick, and this is the web page that you go to to access all of those pieces that I was just talking about. On the tab where you can explore this 2018 data and the dashboard. The dashboard is not 100 percent of the data that we collected. It's a very giant subset of all of the data. The types of data that I think most people are going to be interested in. And if you really want it, you can play around and see what's going on in different parts of the City, with different age groups, different demographics, this is the tool that you're going to want to use. As you can see, we had 4,315 respondents there. Across the top, you can select by gender, age, education level, income, housing situation. Here, you can start to look by children in the household. You can also look by Council District or zip code. So, there are a lot of different ways, and as soon as you start playing with these levers, everything is going to change on this dashboard.

In this middle section here, we asked a lot of questions about what are you trying to do on the internet. And, as I was saying earlier, it's one of those factors. What you're trying to do determines how well whatever you're using is working for you. We were able to get a sense, as we look at different graphics, and different parts of the City, are the activities, themselves, the same? Are they different? Are people doing them less or more frequently. This middle chunk here, as you play with those levers,  this will also start to change. So, you can get a sense, again, of what we all have in common, as well as where some of the differences might be.

And then, this bottom portion, the red portion, gets into more individual data. The upper portion is really about what's going on in the household. This gets more into what's happening to individual people. Here' you can start to see what the primary language is, or ethnicity, whether you're employed on not. Those factors are individual factors versus household factors. In this area, you start to get to find out what is of interest or concern for people. What are the barriers that are stopping you from using the technology more? Across the top, across that 4,300 people, number one, 79 percent of the people said, "ensuring the safety and security of my personal information." So, that was number one. As you play with these levers and change things up, these do change, but that particular one stays at the top for every single population that you're going to talk about or look at. So this idea that, not only am I online, but my concerns about what happens when I'm online, is definitely speaking loud and clear in Seattle. Also, as I have told people, this survey was being conducted about the time all of the Facebook stuff was starting to blow up in the news and all that last summer, so it was starting to be on peoples' minds in a much different way than maybe it had been before.

Reasons why you  don't use the internet more, and here we were asking what training topics were they interested in. What would you like to be better at? And again, that's the kind of data that's helpful for us as well as our community. Providers, when they're trying to decide what class to teach, or how does this align with my clients that I'm trying to serve. We have an opportunity to take a look at that again as a whole City, or again, to begin to condense that into particular parts of the City, or particular demographics.

So, there's a lot here. And this is really small from where you all are sitting, so I'm not going to play too much with this. But I encourage you to go on and play with this. There is a heck of a lot here, and it really does tell. Every time you choose something different, it starts to tell a very different story about what's going on in this realm of digital engagement and the use of technology here in the City.

So, there is my high level, very quick overview, without diving too deep into the data. But the impression I'm hoping to leave you with is that there is a lot of good information here that gives you those headlines, but there is even more and better information, if what you're really wanting to find out is what does that mean for me, or what does that mean for my client group, or what does that mean for the City's next investment. We will be spending the next several months, if not years, playing with this, working with it, to help us make decisions. And we're also hoping it helps a lot of people make choices, or at least inform the choices that people might make, as they're trying to serve the City. I'm going to stop there. I want to see if there are questions that come to mind. I'm curious to get initial impressions that any of you have at this point. We're certainly willing to come back and dive deeper into pretty much any aspect of this. That way, we can dig deep into any particular part of this work. But, any questions before I turn it over to the next presentation?

**Charlotte Lunday:**   You had a footnote about an insecurely housed sample of people, but most are living in tiny home. I was wondering if the City hooked those with internet access.

**Chance Hunt:** When this study was being conducted, no. There was temporary access, typically, the library was the primary provider. Since we've done the study, the library is actually equipping-I don't know if they've gotten them all out at this point--but at least a handful of those went to tiny home villages with internet hotspots. So, in those cases, we would see a different response probably today.

**Charlotte Lunday:**   Okay. The other question that I have is maybe a little bit deeper, and it's compound. Sorry. But with all of this information that Seattle has collected, what would you all like to do with it? What is the impact that you want to make with it? And how would you see CTAB being involved?

**Chance Hunt:** The impact of the data, itself?

**Charlotte Lunday:**   Yes. If you're pulling insights from this data, what are particular things that stand out that you would like to make movement on, any problems that you can solve. What kind of impact would you like in pulling these insights?

**Chance Hunt:** I'll answer that in a few ways. On page 19 of the booklet that I handed out, is a page that indicates what's next. This is where we see some specific initiatives heading in the next couple of years. It talks about continuing to provide public access to internet. One of these, we learned, has a low level of awareness of discount programs or other opportunities or options for people. So, how do we raise that awareness. We're also learning, as I mentioned, that people have real concerns about security and privacy on the internet. How might we start to engage with residents, equip Seattle with the tools they need in order to be not just safer online, but better consumers of this work? Everything we're talking about costs somebody money. There is no free in any of this. The City invests money to provide pubic access so you don't have to pay for it, but most of the access is happening because somebody has a contract with a cellular provider or a broadband provider, or some type of provider. How do people make choices, even know what they're buying, even know what their needs are? We should find some areas for equipping people, because more and more people need to be online. The reason why we're connected has as much to do with 'I have to be, otherwise I don't get to ... fill in the blank.'My job application, my school registration, my FAFSA, where the  bus is, whatever it is that is your need. So I think we can do a better job of helping people in that way. That's generalities. Specifically, and we're just really starting to launch this, we will be having conversations, both locally and nationally, with people who are focused on this work. That could be at the national level, working with National Digital Inclusion Alliance, or other cities. But it's also working with human services department, or departments of education and learning. We did a little presentation and talk with the Office of Immigrant Refugee Affairs to try to understand from them--we can give them data, but how is it resonating with them? And what are the issues, or what are they seeing that they can use to help us further. So, it's really starting to engage in those kinds of conversations. We also--and Seferiana is leading this work--are working to develop a digital equity network here in the King County area, so that we can work with other providers to understand this information, but also, again, be learning with each other as we go forward. We haven't talked with City Council yet about this. I'm sure they're going to have some very interesting questions or interests there.

So, I can't give you a specific way to say to CTAB, this is what we need from you today. What I would encourage you to do is take a look at this and see what's coming up for you as you think about your committees, as well as the work at the City, and how might we work together moving forward.

**Charlotte Lunday:**   Yes. Tech Matching Fund is something that CTAB is deeply involved in. Potentially, this information could become part of the process where we are reviewing grant applications.

**Chance Hunt:** Potentially. It's not going to be explicitly a part of the reviewing process in this round, because it was literally released two weeks ago. But I would say it is in many ways affirmation and confirmation of where those investments have gone previously. They have helped contribute to the types of access and certainly the digital skill building that people are speaking to their needs.

**Charlotte Lunday:**   Is that something that's directly tracked?

**Chance Hunt:** Not in this survey: Did you get skill building from Technology Matching Fund. That wasn't asked. But to the reporting and the value of the information we collect with that grant, we can see where there is alignment. This is something that Delia Burke and I talked to you about, and David Keyes working with the team on the way we're trying to improve. Improve is not entirely the right word. It's improve and elaborate on the impacts of those grants. as we see what impacts are being made in those settings, is it really starting to address some of the needs that are shown here. It's an iterative process. We're probably always going to be chasing each other to some degree. But how that might inform the next round, or the different ways that we make those investments available, yes, definitely. This is something we're starting to talk about now.

**Harte Daniels:**  Did you say that the entire data set is available, or just the subset?

**Chance Hunt:** The entire data set is available. You can go right here. The full data set is here, off of our page. And there are several cross tab options here, some pre-searches. The dashboard is not 100 percent of the data. So that's a subset. But the full data set is available.

**David Keyes:**   I would also just mention that there is a code book for anyone who wants to use the data that points to the code book that specifically identifies the fields in it, and also has instructions about use of weights and stuff. So, it's important to use them together.

**Chance Hunt:** Right. Because again, the data you're going to find, the weighting that was done so we could accurately track at a population. As David just mentioned, that's in that data set, is built into the dashboard. But, if you're doing it on your own, you might want to take a look at that. It will help you see how we got some of those same numbers as you go forward with the raw data.

**David Keyes:**   Another quick comment: I think also there's an opportunity, here, because we, as a 'small c' City, are working on digital equity. As you guys see opportunities for groups, whether it be companies, or professional associations, or meetups or something, to also share the data, so that you become champions of the conversation about how to apply it, as well.

**Chance Hunt:** And we're happy to come talk to them, happy to do this kind of presentation, sitting in a conference room, walking in and really looking to see what might be pertinent to their particular client group.

**Charlotte Lunday:**   My thinking is that this is quite an accomplishment. Thank you for putting it together. I think if we have time to review it, maybe inviting you back to go a little bit more in depth in some of the particular areas that scanned out as maybe being things that we can collaborate on.

**Chance Hunt:** Yes, definitely.

**Torgie Madison:**  I'm sorry. We might have to ....

**Harte Daniels:**  This is very quick. To David's point, This presentation should go out to [unintelligible]...a no-sell zone. I think the two or you would work well together. I can talk to you off line.

**Chance Hunt:** Okay. Any last minute questions? We'll be back. It's all out there. I would also thank CTAB because you have been at different stages and been informed at different stages along the way, ask really excellent questions, I think helped push us into some spaces hopefully to deliver better and hopefully, useful set of data. I would say product, but it's more than a product. It's really becoming more and more of an experience. I think we're still getting our arms around what this can help us do. And, as I mentioned, there are other cities that will be releasing similar data hopefully very soon. So, we can start to see some other comparable pieces to see how unique are we, or how special are we. Certainly, it speaks to what's going on here in Seattle. We do know that King County has an RFP out on the street to do a very similar kind of study for parts of the county other than Seattle. The hope is that more and more of this data will be collected, but also be made available so we can work across all of those geographic boundaries to get the work done and help people out.

**Torgie Madison:**  Thank you very much. I encourage everyone to go onto any interactive dashboard and take a look, because you never know what you will find. Now that we have a full house, let's circle back and do some introductions. Usually, we say our names and where we're from, and have some sort of topic that we say a sentence about. But we're a little bit behind schedule, so just name and where you're at in the City. And we can start with you in the corner.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

**Torgie Madison:**  I was thinking really hard about the people on the phone. Can we get the two people on the phone? Thank you. Now that we have enough members present, we can do the meeting minutes and agenda approvals. So, can I once again get a motion to approve the February meeting minutes?

**Charlotte Lunday:**   I so move.

**Torgie Madison:**  Can I get a second?

**John Krull:**   I second it.

**Torgie Madison:**  All those in favor, say 'aye.'  Any nays? Any abstentions? The motion passes. And, can I get a motion to approve the agenda?

**Charlotte Lunday:**   I so move.

**Torgie Madison:**  Can I get a second?

**Mark DeLoura:** I second.

**Torgie Madison:**  All those in favor, say 'aye.' Any nays? Any abstentions? The motion passes. Great. So, now we'll get back to the agenda to talk about the Digital Skills Framework and Competency Standards.

**DIGITAL SKILLS FRAMEWORK AND COMPETENCY STANDARDS**

**David Keyes:**   The Stacey and David show. Stacey is here from the UW Information School, and specifically their technology and social change group. Stacey is a former CTAB member. The City has worked a long time with the Information School on a variety of projects. They are part of working on our Digital Equity Initiative. We worked closely with Stacey on the development of indicators and measures for the digital equity work. And now we have this skills set comparison to present. We're just going to go through a little bit of that just to kind of recontextualize how this ties into the Digital Equity Initiative and what it is. And then, Stacey will talk more specifically about some of the different frameworks and curricula out there, skills and categories. Then I'll come back and talk a little bit more about conclusions on that and how we're thinking about how this gets applied and how you might also be able to apply it.

In our digital equity work, we had this vision of digital equity in a City where technology opportunities empower all residents and communities, especially those who are starkly under-served or under-represented. That same mission and drive also helped inform some of what we wanted to make sure was represented when we did the Technology Access and Adoption surveys. It also traces some of its roots back to previous work by CTAB. In the Digital Equity Initiative, we had four strategies around skills training, connectivity, devices and tech support, and then we've also been looking at applications and online services. How is the City helping move equity forward through those?  As we were working on that, and as we developed the indicators, and as we've looked at what's come in from the grant programs and so on, we started looking across the board and saying, we get these projects and we have done basic training for people. How do we have a way to compare what basic training is across organizations. If you're doing a curriculum, how do you know what that covers, and is that the same thing that somebody else covers? And then, as a City, in the grand scheme we want to talk about moving the needle forward on digital equity, then we do want to be able to say, yes, 2,000 or 3,000 people have now reached this level of competency. Or if an organization is saying, 'My niche in providing skills training is here. This is where I'm an expert in doing that.' I might then pass that off, or part of what I understand is the pathway as a provider, or even as a learner is to say I've got this level here. I can go here for this next level. So, in doing that, we started looking at what are these learner types. In the Digital Equity Initiative, we got these identified communities--and you'll see this directly in our Digital Equity Initiative plan. And we'll talk about it more in here.

We looked at gateway skills. What are those foundational ones? We wanted to look at life skills, how does applied technology work, and what are some of the skills embedded in that; transportation and finance, or trying to find social services, or looking for housing. That's how we contextualized life skills. Really big bucket. We need to expand that one.

Youth Education: For purposes of this analysis and looking at skills standards we just focused in a took the benchmark of high school preparation for college and career. What are some of those foundation to lead you to the next step in learning or in work? We didn't tackle the full range of K-12 skills standards and STEM prep for K-20 education. And then we looked at parent engagement. Do they have the skills necessary to be able to help their kid learn, and to be able to find resources for their kids in school, and navigate the school system.

Work: We just looked at employment and foundations. That was our goals. Again, we know beyond employment foundations, resume, job search, finding a job, having a basic job. The next level is, one direction we look at is applied work. So, I might become a dental assistant, or I might become an Uber driver, and need to have a certain amount of technology that I apply to that specific career. Or I might go into the technology field, and there's a whole set of buckets that go out into the technology field. For this, we didn't go down that whole rubric. We also recognize that small businesses and entrepreneurs have  a specific set of digital literacy skills that are needed, and often, particularly small businesses, are under-served, vulnerable communities. themselves. We represent that. So, I think much of what the work that we did will apply some of those foundations, but we didn't look at that in a lot of detail.

**Stacey Wedlake:**  I'm going to give you an extremely high level overview of the research that we did. We can do an question and answer session to dive down into a particular rabbit hole, if you would like. I did bring some handouts. I don't think there is enough for everybody. I put them on the table late, so if you wouldn't mind passing those around? It supplements what I'm talking about here with supplemental charts that may or may not be [unintelligible].

Our approach was that we wanted to look at existing digital literacy frameworks that exist in the world. There is a whole lot of high quality stuff that is out there. So what we wanted to know is how are these existing resources and what skills do these existing resources identify that people need. We also looked at a few resources from Europe. The EU has done a whole lot of research and inserted resources at a multi-national and a national scale around digital skills and competencies. So, we wanted to make sure we captured their work and their approach. We also did look at a couple of local organizations in the curriculum, Literacy Source and Seattle Goodwill, to try to understand what skills they were teaching. Something about this that I want to make clear is this is not a quality assessment. These are not recommendations, as in this is the best framework, this is the best curriculum, this organization teaches these skills the best. Basically, all we are looking at is does this framework, or does this curriculum capture and teach this skill, or identify this skill as people are needing to learn.

**David Keyes:**   In that sense, we know that we did pick things that we know are being used and fairly well recognized. So, in that sense, we know that there is some level of quality and adoption of them. We know that Literacy Source works a lot with immigrants and refugees. They teach language literacy. They teach a lot of ESL, and have a well integrated digital literacy curriculum. So that  was a way to capture some of that. This is Goodwill foundation.

**Stacey Wedlake:**  Another way to know this is that we wanted to look at -- especially when we were looking at the curriculum was to think about resources that an organization could take up and use. There are tons of tutorials -- how do I do this in Word -- and so we put all of those aside for resources that are tailored and instructors.

As we went through each of the resources, and we looked through all that was available to us in documentation, whether it was lesson plans or whatever, we ended up putting all the skills intended for categories. And some of these categories are based on some of the work. It came from the digital equity plan, in other words, these just needed to be identified. those are those foundational skills, and what we saw as the basic skills that really everybody needs to know to be able to use a device. Those would be things like everything from using a mouse, doing a basic web search.

The communication bucket has more things related to social media, or even digital collaboration. Creation includes multi-media and coding. the Information School is thinking about how people do research online, whether that's a big research project for school or just wanting to learn about a topic that one heard on the news. Mobile was also a category that we identified that seemed important. Those are skills for being able to do something specifically on a mobile device, which includes either a phone or a tablet. And ,based on some of our previous research, those are really distinct skills that someone, in order to be able to use it effectively, they need to know.

On my right is a bucket that includes everything from transportation related services to being able to access your health provider.

We did have a distinct education category at the very beginning, but we saw that those skills were not mutually exclusive. They crossed over all these categories, and so what we did is we [unintelligible]...in addition to whatever category they fit into.

Just to give a view of what we found in some of the frameworks, here, the frameworks are done in this structured way of looking at digital skills and competencies A lot of times there is large research behind this or very large committees. And so we wanted to see what their viewpoints of them are. Frameworks tend to be much more broad and encompassing. These are all of the skills that someone needs to know. The Washington State Teachers College education standards, more targeted at K-12, or ICDL, which International Computer Drivers License certification that exists, is more focused on the workplace.

Some brief take-aways here, those gateway skills that you get in those basic ones you can see it varying quite a bit across the frameworks, so even [unintelligible], which has the most number of skills covered, they barely cover any gateway. The consider that you have those skills before you go through these other ones. These are the central digital skills, which is also very comprehensive, but covers the gateway ones very broadly. To contrast the curriculum, it kind of makes sense that they are much more narrowly focused. Overall, they cover fewer numbers of skills, and again, that's not saying that they are missing those skills. They've just have chosen to focus on a particular skill set. I should mention that Northstar is unique among frameworks because Northstar actually an assessment that's tied to it that anybody can take. You can go onto the web site, and see how you rank in being able to do those skills. they also offer, through their network of centers, you can take a proctored exam and get a certification. We can talk about that later. One of their findings is that there are not that many assessment that exist out there to gauge your skills.

So, the curriculum is more narrowly focused. You can see this development gateway. Again, there's more coverage here; there are more basic skills. And you have something like Microsoft Imagine Academy, which is a free Microsoft Office certification from the pubic library. It's very narrowly focused on running Microsoft Office. So you achieve those workplace skills and  a few others, but not much else.

Some of the conclusions that we've gotten from this, and there's a whole bunch here. Again, this is just the surface, is that we hope this will provide another way of looking at skills. As David was talking about before, if an organizations is wanting to teach and do some training of skills, they can think about things skills related and teach about communication-related skills, email, social media, and they can look at that skills bucket and identify some of the skills that they may or may not be teaching, and it takes it away from the idea that 'let's teach this particular product, or this particular service, and hopefully getting towards more the ability for people to take skills that they learn in one setting and use them in different places across different technologies.

As I mentioned earlier, there's not that many assessments that tie to a particular framework or curriculum. There is also not that many curriculum that tie directly to the frameworks, either. So, a lot of frameworks to get made, and then that's it. Curriculums get made in their own vacuum, based on their needs. There are also emerging areas where there is not a lot of coverage, a lot of mobile skills that a lot of frameworks don't really talk about mobile at all. It is assumed that you will get those mobile skills along with the other tech skills.

The big thing with this type of overview is that we've done it, but it's really only a point in time. These frameworks and especially the curriculum are constantly changing. So, if this is seen as a valuable resource, then it's something that will need to be figured out in the future. This is just a point in time.  David, do you want to wrap up?

**David Keyes:**  Yes. Here is how I think people can use this and  what some of our initial thoughts are. We identified 76 different skills through this. That is mapped in the handout. It ties that back to that earlier piece that I mentioned in terms of work skills and so on.  I think what it does is it provides an opportunity to create a check list. One of our potential uses, as we have the Tech matching Fund applications come in, we could look at grant applications and peoples' curriculum, and say, "What are you covering in your proposed curriculum that you're seeking funds for?"  We're not at a point and not intending right now that we're going to dictate what that is that people should do, because we want to work with providers in the community to help move that field forward and that articulation. But also it does enable a provider organization--I'll pick on Karia Wong, here, because she's right here from Chinese Information Service Center, to take a look at that and look at what curriculum they're providing. It also helps map what else they need to fill in, and how well they're covering that, and how it ties to different international frameworks. And for a learner, for a user, if I'm an individual that comes in for training, it could also be a potential tool. To say, look at all these skills that I recognize as being the whole fluent digitally fluent person looking for opportunities, and to say I can do this, this and this, we could start to use that as an assessment tool also.

We're starting to look at it to use it with different departments, different organizations, for them to say what skills are required. If I'm rolling out a new application, say today I've been communicating with Seattle Public Utilities, for instance, and they're doing a web site redesign. This is a chance to look at the applications that they may put on their web site, and say what are my expectations of users in terms of the skills that they will have to be able to interface with our public utilities web site, or a particular application.

We're gong to present this at the Digital Equity Network meeting in April, but I think in general it's an opportunity to use this as a tool to continue to share curriculums and assessments. That's part of it for us, to get on the same page. The other thing that I think is exciting is that this comparison provides a platform for us locally, nationally, and internationally, to be able to put curriculum up and have an additive body of knowledge. So, whether it's Microsoft or Google or Comcast or university developing a curriculum, they can add this to the matrix and be able to see where they're specializing and for us to be able to communicate that also. If you're looking for a training that concentrates in this area, here's where you can look.

We identified these needs that people have spoken about, but now we can really see that there's not much about being an online learner in there. Maybe that is an area that we want to embark on, or encourage others to embark on. That kind of what we think this will do, and what we're learning from it. We will also continue to grow that as go, to test that out with some of our community providers to learn more about what it's like to actually use this as a tool, and help gauge where people are on those training pathways, or providing training and help students in their learning pathway.

**Torgie Madison**:  If there are questions, we're going to have to keep them very short, because we are behind schedule. We have one more piece to cover before the break.

**Harte Daniels:**   David, do you want any connections to professional organizations, such as ASPM or others that could help you with some of those vision things?

**David Keyes:**  Yes, I think right now we are interested in, like in our Tech Adoption study, trying this out with different groups. I think once we do this checklist, there will also be a nice piece to work with people. So I welcome folks from CTAB and if communities want to help with that or others, too.

**Harte Daniels:**   I'll get you the connection.

**David Keyes:**  What is also provides is the opportunity to link to other specialized curriculum. We talked about some of the Workforce things that we don't have here, but that may also be a particular curriculum, like putting digital and financial literacy together, or other elements. They can be linked in those frameworks.

**Karia Wong:** Quick question. How many of those curriculums are available in different languages?

**Stacey Wedlake:**  Great question. There are basic listings. About six of the nine, I think. We need someone to go through, and a few of them have some other languages, but [unintelligible]....

**David Keyes:**  The international drivers license.

**Karia Wong:** I think it would be helpful to put it in a list so that it will be easier for us to look for curriculum that we can use.

**Stacey Wedlake:**  I can identify all of those. I don't know [unintelligible]....

**Karia Wong:** Thank you.

**Torgie Madison**:  Thank you very much. Now we have a presentation from the Samaritan App overview. We talked a little bit about housing insecurity earlier, so this will be a good topic to explore that.

**SAMARITAN APP OVERVIEW**

**Charlotte Lunday:** This is Jonathan, Janice, and Raven.

**Jonathan:**   Hello. Thanks for inviting us on such short notice to come and share with the Community Technology Advisory Board this evening. It's cool to see some familiar faces and friends from over the last months and years working to help people who are experiencing homelessness. My name is Jonathan. About two years and some change ago, I stood on the corner of, I think, 6th and Cherry, right around here, watching a guy beg with a sign that said, "Need medication for diabetes in my feet."  I was on a lunch break and I had nothing better to do, so I just observed him for about 20 minutes. I saw countless cars and passers by pass him by without really even looking at him or acknowledging that he existed. He was an imposing figure, African-American, tattoos. I sort of mustered up the courage to go up and talk to him myself, and I said, "Excuse me, sir, do you mind if I ask you what you feel your challenges are in terms of raising this money?" Too few people carry cash these days, and he cut me off, basically. He said, "I've got the wrong look for this, the wrong clothing, the wrong skin color. Nobody actually believes that I'm homeless. And I realized that beyond the financial need that drove Edward to the point of needing to beg from strangers, he was also experiencing this form of racial poverty, where people couldn't cut through their biases or perceptions to get to this person's true identity, his true story, with a simply act to meet that need.

Fast forward to two years later. We have Samaritan, which started providing these Smart Wallets called Beacons to people who are without a home. Basically, we provide these Blue Tooth low energy necklaces called Beacons to nonprofit agencies, LiHi, Compass, Salvation Army, Mary's Place, different organizations around the City, and provide this Beacon as a tool for outreach, a tool for relationship building. Basically, if someone has a Beacon and you have the Samaritan App, free app, you can use the app to learn the stories of currently homeless individuals in the City, and act either emotionally or relationally into their lives, towards finding a home.

You can learn the story of Raven, who is with us today, if you have the app. Or you can learn the story of Janice, who is also with us today, and was courageous enough to come with us to answer some questions you may have. Basically, if you decide to invest into a Beacon holder, the Beacon holder has a couple of ways of spending the money. They can first go to any of the merchants that are using Samaritan, places like Grocery Outlet or Goodwill, and the Beacon is good as a form of payment. They can use it to refill an Orca card. They can get coffee, groceries, a hot meal down the street. If they have a need that's not on their list of merchants, they can actually go back to the nonprofit, and the nonprofit has access to a discretionary fund to be used towards a Greyhound ticket, a check to a landlord, to refill a phone bill. In some cases, they can even provide a Visa pre-paid card or cash to an individual, if that's what they feel is most appropriate.

Once a month, to keep their Beacon active, Beacon holders have both the opportunity and responsibility to have what we call a life care visit with a counselor at the nonprofit. That maybe 15-minute conversation just goes into what the person's greatest needs are for the month ahead, as well as goals that they'd like to set. And we've seen that when you combine this new access to capital and provide a lot of dignity as to how it's used, coupled with the hope that everyday Samaritans are providing in the form of whether it be $10 donations, or messages of encouragement, or offers to make introductions to an employer. And when you tie that in to this consistent access to care with the incredible nonprofits that are working in this region, we're seeing some pretty incredible outcomes.

Homelessness grew by four percent, as was reported by the Times in December. We've seen 90 percent of Beacon holders report some kind of life changing outcome, whether it be accessing rehab or getting a permanent house. We have been operating a pilot with 500 people over the past 24 months, which was funded by Vulcan. And we have heard from several nonprofits' demand for more Beacons to provide outreach to people that they serve, and we're in the process of potentially petitioning the City on April 2, to provide access for 2,000 more people without a home to have a Beacon in the next two years.

So, that was a ton of information. I would be glad to answer your questions in the remaining time. We have Beacon holders here. Their experience about what the Beacon has meant to them or how they've used it....

**Charlotte Lunday:**  About petitioning the City, we were at a hearing recently. That's how we met. there's going to be an upcoming hearing regarding that petition. Can you speak just a little bit about that?

**Jonathan:** Sure! I think that both the City Council and the Mayor's Office are committed to solutions. This is something, I think, has attracted the attention of Council President Harrell as well as Councilwoman Bagshaw, in particular. They're excited to see more people get access to Smart Wallet. And we will do everything that we can to show what those expected outcomes will be in terms of housing or employment, access to health care. We will look to create, basically, a contract that would be the go-to that nonprofits use, technology or it would come to us directly. It doesn't really matter.

**Charlotte Lunday:**  And so that hearing is still on April 2? Do you know if they have set a time for it, or....

**Jonathan:** I think their regular meeting is at 9:30. I believe we're just one item on the agenda.

**Jim Loter:** I wonder about the development of the technology. Was it developed here by you, by your team? And then, you said something about 2,000 additional Beacons would be the sort of sweet spot. Do you have any idea and can you speak about what the approximate cost of employing 2,000 Beacons would be?

**Jonathan:** Yes. Beacons, themselves, are off the shelf products produced by a company in San Diego called Gimball. These Beacons are typically used in the context of shopping malls or parks. So, you might have the Nordstrom map and you walk into Nordstrom and they'll say, "Welcome back, Jim. You can have 30 percent off jeans for the next 30 minutes, something like that." So, we're just basically reusing the technology, nothing too novel. Our team is nine people, half technical, half non-technical. They developed the app, programmed it. We have been talking to nonprofits about how quickly and how many Beacons they would like, and how quickly they would be able to distribute them to more people, either through outreach to people who are panhandling at off ramps, as well as people who are stuck in the system, who have been stuck in shelters for multiple years, as a way to accelerate their outcome into housing. And it seemed that about 1,000 this year and 1,000 next year was about the right growth rate.

The mentioned the cost. The majority of the cost is actually people cost. We are looking at about a $175K budget for this year and next year, to be able to provide access to 1,000 more Beacons this and next year.

**Question:**  Two questions:  One, [unintelligible]. You said the word, 'pilot.' Is there some kind of growth model for other regions?

**Jonathan:** Sure! We are structured as  a public benefit corporation. We have a fiscal sponsor in Survive the Streets, which is a Washington based 501(c)(3). We can take donations through them. But we don't have our own 501(c)(3) entity yet. We're not opposed to that idea. We are ultimately interested in providing access to capital and access to relational guidance to people experiencing homelessness across the state. We think that through commercializing the technology we might be able to actually  get there faster by staying a public benefit corporation versus converting to a nonprofit. The goal is to see this technology in the hands of people in 99 more cities over the next five years. We think we can do that faster potentially as a corporation versus a nonprofit. Any nonprofit that gets contracts from the City, that would be a significant revenue source for us, licensing it to municipalities or healthcare.

**Maitreyee Joshi:**  I'd like to hear your stories about Beacon.

**Jonathan:** You can check out the stories on the app.

**Raven:**  I met Jonathan at a feed on a Saturday. I've known him now I don't know how long. The Beacon has helped me pay phone bills. It has helped me get supplies that I use. I make arrowhead necklaces. I make wired ring with stones. It has helped me get instruments. It has helped me to get a cot to sleep on that folks up like a chair. I like it because I have to check in. It's good if I have to get a new battery or whatever. It's been helpful for me. I think it's a great idea. I think it's unique. I've been on the streets for 15 years. I've seen almost everything. Beacon is something that is actually new, and I think it actually does its job.

**Jonathan:** We talked about some of the people using the Samaritan app....

**Raven:**  There are too many people to name, Dude. Everyone I've met through it, whether it's your team or not your team, all of them have been amazing people to hang out with, help out. That, to me, is a big thing. Having the funds to do things is great, but it's the relationships. It's the interaction. Them remembering who I am. That, I actually like the most.

**Janice:**  Let's see, where do I start? I started to begin with, somebody kept telling me about it. I was on Sixth Street, under the bridge, at mealtime. They had a place there for the Beacon, where we could go in and talk and discuss things. I actually showed them some of my artwork at the time. It took me a long while to get started on the Beacon thing. Things that are different or you're not familiar with, and get close to the people that are running it, and you can interpret and understand it better. It really takes mentorship or advocacy. Pretty much, that's what I became, not just to administer to my needs, bus passes--oh, my goodness! That little bit of extra help, taking a bus to the ferry. You know, taking the ferry once in a while, out there across the water is a breath of fresh air. But the communication between people is great for businesses. I was on podcast for homeless people, and I actually shared the Beacon, because in Tacoma, there, in that area, that's where I started as a homeless person. I came here to help my son get through a pretty difficult time. And I've been here for four years. He's still going through a difficult time, but I became a stronger advocate. Not just my own experience. I say stuff naturally that just is a common good, a common sense. I realize that the Beacon helped me as well as other people, having not just communication to tell you that the Beacon is available, but also going to stores that you wouldn't normally go into. Going into places where you wouldn't be able to buy clothing. Even in second hand stores. They have better clothes and variety than, I'm sorry to say, big business. But it's just that flexibility and that ability, that you have the Beacon and it has funds on it. I went to a major meeting I was invited to, and just to be able to relay enough information and my experiences at the time, somebody graciously put $500, so when  I was able to get a place, that deposit was available. It's remained on my Beacon and not been touched because it's for that specific purpose, through a person who was kind enough to give it. I try to inspire people to get on the Beacon, even if somebody only gives you a dollar. They stopped what they were doing in their life. At first I was pity party. Oh my god, only a dollar? This is a natural instinct. But I realized, on my own, that wow, they stopped what they were doing and put that dollar on. They stopped in that moment their own life, and put that dollar on there. Or put that five dollars on there. Through my consistent faithfulness in making effort to connect with people that could possibly connect with the Beacon, I must say here and now, though, that I think that we need to have meetings on some of the difficulties that people are having to maintain those Beacons. I almost think we need more people working to keep up with it all. This is a major issue. I see the vast importance of having it to help peoples' emotional states, as well as connecting with business purposes. And also, we become advocates for businesses because if we see something haywire, something not quite right, or somebody's playing their music way too loud, we can actually write in and say it's much more palatable to turned down the music a little bit. This increases that business purpose, that business place, for that owner, or management or whatever. This is pretty much a healthy partnership we're talking about, as a Beacon owner graciously having one.

**Comment:** Jonathan, could you speak to some of the biggest problems that you face as far as your group is concerned?

**Jonathan:**   Yes. Obviously, it has been two-plus years of piloting, deploying new technology. It's such a complex and trauma-filled space. it's a challenge. Situations of homelessness are so tragic, and people are on different levels of spectrum in terms of mental illness, disability, addiction. And so, there are a lot of lessons to be learned, obviously, there. And also working to see adoption by nonprofit agencies that have done things a certain way for a long time. Actually, recently in the last six months, we have seen an uptick in terms of nonprofits looking to use the technology to enhance their own outcomes. We're not building houses. We don't own any buildings. We're not doing case management. We're not doing outreach. All of the outcomes that you can actually find on our pilot tab on our site here, are to be credited to the nonprofits that are working with the individual. Just getting everything put together between the Beacon holders and the nonprofits who are having these life care visits with them on a monthly basis, and involving now over 9,000 Samaritans on the app is quite a challenge.

**Comment**:  How big is your team?

**Jonathan:**   Eight and a half, the half being part-time.

**Harte Daniels:**   Have you mentioned Healthfair, etc.? Do you want to make connections to innovators on multi-chapter behavioral health, presentations on innovation in your area and connections on those that are dealing with health, and the new federal guidelines on behavioral health? This might assist [unintelligible]. Are you interested in ....

**Jonathan:**   Oh, of course! Yes. I think that's sort of our back up plan.

**Harte Daniels:**   Do you want to talk to me offline?

**Jonathan:**   Yes. I'll get your card. That would be great. Thank you.

**Charlotte Lunday:**  So, people who want to find out more can look at the web site and app. And then, if your are interested in attending the hearing, it's April 2, 9:30 a.m., Council Chambers at Seattle City Hall. It's on the second floor, right upstairs. Endless stairs. The information is on the board.

**Torgie Madison:**  Great! Thank you so much for that presentation. For those of us keeping an eye on time, I'm happy to high abridge my section, because I think you've heard me talk a lot, but you hadn't heard those stories before. So, I'll cut down my section quite a bit to make up the time. We can have a quick five minute break, and come back at 7:30.

**BREAK**

**Torgie Madison:**  All right, if we can take our seats, we can get started on the second, air quotes, half. This will be a little bit like a lightening round. First up, we have some committee updates. We will start with the Smart Cities Committee.

**COMMITTEE UPDATES**

**SMART CITIES**

**Maitreyee Joshi:**  Hi, guys. In our last meeting, we decided the two topics that we are going to be focusing on. The first one is AR/IOT, how we can study infrastructure, how we can study [unintelligible]. And the second topic is facial recognition and policing. What kind of laws and such should we suggest to make sure that it's used in a way that's [unintelligible].... And so if you guys are interested at all, in any of these topics, please come out to our next meeting. It's going to happen next Wednesday at 6:00 p.m.at the Starbucks. And if you guys can't make it, just let me know. You can always contribute to what we are doing. Even if you can't make it out, you can always contribute your thoughts.

**Harte Daniels:**   Your email is still smartctab@gmail.com?

**Maitreyee Joshi:**  Yes.

**Harte Daniels:**   Perfect. Thank you.

**Torgie Madison:**  All right. And we can move on to the Digital Equity Committee.

**DIGITAL EQUITY**

**John Krull:**  Hi, I'm John Krull of the Digital Equity Committee. Karia is also co-chair with me. I'll start, then let her update if she has anything else. We had a great meeting last time. We meet the fourth Tuesday of every month. Our next meeting is 6:00 p.m., on Tuesday, March 26, at the Chinese Information Service Center, which is in the International District. At our last meeting, we decided our next initiatives, and today's, maybe, was a good kick off for that. We are hoping to do a deep dive into the Technology Access and Adoption Study. We want to be able to come up with maybe some recommendations of next steps and/or maybe things that they missed, and make a recommendation back here to all of CTAB, and then try to get input back to Seattle IT, and ultimately, to whoever the decision makers are. We want to basically, as the CTAB board provides input to the survey, it would be an idea of what to do next. We are hoping at the next meeting to come with having people had at least an initial reading, and maybe some of their initial findings. We are going to invite Chance Hunt, either for this committee meeting or the next one to do kind of a deep dive with us. We understand that it's big. We're not going to have our full insights. We were hoping for the next meeting, but we could probably use Chance's help in doing a deep dive into the dashboard.

The other main area that we want to focus on, perhaps, and we're still looking into it, is how can we help support the census, particularly the digital aspect of it and digital equity. If people want to be part of the census, how could they perhaps do it digitally. We want to see how we could maybe be involved with that, or again, make recommendations. If you saw the news recently, the Mayor has put out a task force. I didn't see anything in there that's really focused on digital, so maybe we could somehow help with that. So, that's the two areas.

**Seferiana Day:**  I can also connect you in with that. There's a new person in Department of Neighborhoods (DON) that's kind of leading the City's efforts. I mentioned CTAB to her and said we should be involved. So, she knows about you now. We can definitely work together on that.

**John Krull:**  Okay, great. And we have food and drink there. We try to make it kind of fun, and we try to be about only 90 minutes, and get done by 7:30, hit the International District afterwards. Sometimes we go karaoke-ing. Karia, do you have anything to add?

**Karia Wong:** No. You did that really well.

**VOTE: GROUP 2 SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGIES PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Torgie Madison:**  All right. And we can move on to my much shorter version. the Privacy and Security Committee, which is co-chaired by myself and Smriti Chandrashekar, has put together a public comment on the Group 2 Surveillance Technologies, as part of the Surveillance Ordinance passed by City Council. It's also available in paper form. There might be a few grammatical changes. This is it. It's addressed to City Council, because ultimately, this document will be entered into public record. It's the impact report for SIR. You've probably heard me say that a lot. Hopefully, the SIR is going to be presented to the Community Surveillance Working Group, which is a nine-body board that will take a more civil liberties approach to these technologies. Then it will go on to City Council.

This is the paragraph that talks about a few issues that we saw were common among all technologies that we wanted to get repeated, copied and pasted to everyone. We talk about inter-departmental sharing of best practices. Seattle Fire Department and Seattle Police Department have created some other policies. SCL and SDOT don't. Information collected in one department shouldn't be any less secure than that same information collected in another department. That is one thing we emphasize in general having external security audits of systems so it's not just an internal review process. Because once you see something for the twelfth time, you start to overlook those things.

Another thing that showed up in this Group 2, is that there are eight technologies in this group. There were two that were subject to some parent company being merged into a larger parent company independent of each other. Both happened in September of 2018. So if that changes any underlying contracts or obligations or privacy policies, those should be reviewed. So, we encourage these departments to keep up on the mergers and acquisitions and make sure that those are still delivering satisfactory privacy policies if there are third party services.

And, last, [unintelligible], in a nutshell.

This is put together by a a group of seven very talented and gracious volunteers and the Privacy Committee mailing list, as well as input from board members here. So, I really appreciate all of your help. I see a couple back there. So, I'll go through this very quickly.

Seattle Fire Department, their automated dispatch--oh, and there's a public meeting hosted by Seattle IT at a technology fair. Every department in the group had a person asking expert questions, and I did that on the 7th. This one, the main points are that there was a merger and acquisition that might be looked at. [Unintelligible] got absorbed into Central Square, and that's one of the largest mergers and acquisitions in government services to date. And I guess that's all I'll say about that.

Acyclica was actually a good one. Acyclica is a little monitoring device that sits at intersections, mostly downtown, and they capture your MAC address from any WiFi enabled device, encrypt it, rotate the encryption every 24 hours, and never leaves the device in an unencrypted state. And it's used to track commute times. This one just seemed like it had a very mature approach to a very narrow scope, keeping in mind security best practices while they're going through it. This one was also subject to a merger and acquisition. the other parent company, FLIR, has their predominant business in infra-red. FLIR is pushing for any kind of infra-red sensing.

Seattle has had three technologies. I thought it was going to be a lot of work, but they're all supporting one team inside Seattle City Light. This is the current diversion team, not current as in right now, but as in power. Basically, the current diversion team is deployed to a site where there is always a suspicion of current diversion. It means hardware that's been installed on lines to mask usage, to share usage, or to bypass a meter entirely. So why not just disconnect the wire at one end of the meter, reconnect it at the other end of the meter, and then you don't pay for electricity. These are usually neighbors or suspicious meter readings that are causing them to go out to the site. So, it's not public surveillance, but it's surveillance of specific incidences. And their top technology is a pair of binoculars. It's not powered. It's doesn't record video. They're good. They're checked out. They're in locked vehicles. Mostly, this is fine because there is such a narrow scope. Mostly, my issue with this was that there was no tracking. The current diversion team was happy in performing these investigations. This one was more of a racial equity concern. The racial equity toolkit is included in every SIR and has a specific section dedicated to explaining how disproportionately [unintelligible]...franchise. Since there is no tracking of where the current diversion team is going, it's possible, while it's equally illegal and equally prevalent in all of Seattle, they're only actually investigating neighborhoods of poverty or neighborhoods that are otherwise disproportionately burdening surveillance. So, there's not tracking on this right now. Their inclination is to start doing that.

The 911 call logging: This one is one of those things. It's got so much oversight on it. People have a reasonable expectation that if they call 911, that call is recorded. But at issue here is that the technology, even though it's an on-premises solution, is NICE. They've been in business since 1986. They suffer a couple of pretty severe vulnerabilities. They left an entire Amazon S3 storage bucket public, which resulted in four million [unintelligible]. So, that seems pretty important. So, we are recommending external audit. Not just Seattle IT, but hiring someone to come in and check all the permissions, all the dials. And this one is interesting because they, as far as we can tell, don't have an explicit lock down [unintelligible].... They do use them for quality assurance and criminal prosecutions in some cases, but they don't say they won't use their 220,000 audio recordings for police work, voice recognition. We just wanted to make sure that they had a policy that not only defines what it will be used for, but excludes everything else.

SPD dispatch: SFD and SPD both have the same issue where they dispatch with technologies that are 15 or 16 years old. That's problematic because the information security world has changed a whole lot in 15 years. I'm sure they're receiving updates but legacy code tends to stick around. Also, interestingly, SPD was involved in a lawsuit with a vendor for their CAD system because there is some discrepancy in data that was published. It got tweaked three times in a row really rapidly, so the public got concerned. Seattle tried to do their public information requests to furnish some of the training manuals and documentation from the vendor to show why it was difficult to generate those reports and why they kept changing. Then they got sued and the technology vendor won. So there could be some bad blood there.

The last one is probably the one that got the most attention. This is Cop Logic. Good name. there are two parts. Number one, if a crime has been committed where there is no evidence and you have no suspect; i.e., you woke up one day and your car window is busted out. You don't know who did it. You can use Cop Logic to enter that record. The police don't need to come to you because thee isn't anything for them to do. And you get a general offense number, a GO number, that you can then give to your insurance. So, it's mostly a fast track to your insurance plan. Track Two is a retail loss prevention track, where retailers actually get a login and password to Cop Logic. And if they suspect a shoplifter, theoretically, they could detail and demand identification from the shoplifter, which is scanned into Cop Logic. Cop Logic is a third party hosted system. It's not on premises. We've had a lot of problems with this and mostly recommend discontinuing it entirely, because you don't have to provide identification unless you're getting arrested.

So, that was supposed to be about twice as long, but are there any questions?

**Question:**  For some of these technologies, can you also look at some of the other cities are doing, or are there other best practices that we can apply?

**Torgie Madison:**  Yes. In this case, we put more of a focus on data retention, privacy policies, and there are three main areas that we're focusing on--and access control. Who can access what technologies and are there third party hosts, that sort of thing. We probably could look at precedent and other implementations of similar things, other cities, for Group 3. I think that would be a good thing to hit. I do know that the SPD dispatch lawsuit involved more than just Seattle. I think Chicago was also involved, also trying to do public records.

**Harte Daniels:**  So, is this finalized?

**Torgie Madison:**  Yes. This is released to everyone you see here on Saturday with the intent to review over the weekend, and put to a vote today. I received lots of feedback over the weekend.

**Harte Daniels:**  Because I was just going to say that your mergers and acquisitions can be modeled after the Healthcare Industry's business agreements. That is a legal thing. The second is you could send out a note this afternoon about the review of anybody that did not attend. There was an offer from a person who would be able to assist. I highlighted that section as of interest to privacy, and highlighted a section of interest to Smart Cities. There is quite a bit. It is a lengthy note. You received it in your email. So, I didn't know whether talking to you about this would make sense if you have already signed off.

**Torgie Madison:**  One of the nice things about the surveillance review is that this is only Group 2, and we have many chances to improve it to include research to provide comparisons to help us in Group 3.

**Harte Daniels:**  So, I can talk to you offline about the business associates agreements and how it doesn't matter who you hire or where you put it, your organization or vendors are still legally culpable. And then, you might also look at Office of Civil Rights (OCR) on the federal level. I don't know if this administration pulled it down, but anybody with more than 500 patients [unintelligible]...put it up there; what happened, where it happened, and how. A public wall. I can talk to you offline.

**Torgie Madison:**  Great. Any other questions?

**Question:**  Will this be published on the CTAB web site?

**Torgie Madison:**  Yes. This will all be publicly available. Okay. I'm going to head back over to this seat.

**Charlotte Lunday:** We need to approve this to submit it, yes?

**Torgie Madison:**  Yes. So, I move to approve the Privacy and Cybersecurity Committee Surveillance Impact public comment.

**Charlotte Lunday:** I will second that for you.

**Torgie Madison:**  Charlotte seconds. All those in favor say, "Aye."  Steven Maheshwary has proxy voted an aye.  Any nays? Any abstentions? Motion passes. Sorry I had to talk a mile a minute there. We have one final item.

**FCC 5G RULING APPEAL**

**Charlotte Lunday:** This just came onto my radar. Basically, I just wanted to present something that we could perhaps follow and do some ad hoc work on. The FCC is making some moves again, or at least they did. They actually went into a [unintelligible] on January  14 of this year. this order surrounds the deployment of 5G technology, which is the next generation of wireless internet. It's at least five times faster than 4G. I believe it can deliver up to gigabit wireless internet speeds. But early estimates suggested that to deploy this you would need a small cell wireless facility -- I believe that's what they're calling it -- basically on every block. I think there's later research that suggests that it can go a longer range, but essentially, this is going to be a really heavy lift for deployment purposes. So, to speed this up, the FCC recently made some rules regarding deployment, and they took away a lot of local control over right of way, and utility poles to allow for this deployment. Their rule also affects 4G deployment. so it's a little broader than 5G.  Basically, the US is trying to stay competitive, so we're trying to figure out what is the best way to do this.  Now, Seattle and a bunch of other cities have sued, and that appeal is currently ongoing, and it's a little procedurally complicated. It's something that I will try to follow and track. Right now, it's a little stalled, but basically, there are principles in the Constitution that say to the federal government that there are limits to how much you can tell state and local governments what to do. Cities are arguing that the federal government has done an over-reach, particularly with access to utilities and poles.

I have not dug into the research enough to be able to say either way. I'm assuming that CTAB's perspective is that we want people to have as much access to high speed internet as we can get. We see this as a net public good. With respect to which position could deliver that best, whether it's the City of Seattle's putting this more into hands of local control, or what ramifications of the FCC's rules are for other types of technology deployment versus whether the federal government is right that the local governments create too much of a burden for companies to deploy it quickly, I can't say for sure around either of these things. And it seems that both of the political parties are also kind of split on the issues, we see this as not really a partisan issue.

Currently, I know of two bills that are being proposed: One that has a Democratic and Republican co-sponsors. It's Senate Bill S.3157. It's sponsored by John Thune of South Dakota and Brian Schatz of Hawaii that's aligned and favors the FCC's approach. And then House Resolution H.R. 930, proposed by Anna Eshoo of California, would nullify the FCC's order.  My proposal would be to --and if anyone wants to help look into these things at little more and track the progress of the litigation as it goes on. Potentially, we might want to get involved in some of the legislation on the federal level. To that, I think I have a connection to a tech policy adviser for Brian Schatz. That might be something that we can pursue. So, I wanted to put that on everybody's radar and get a feel for how everybody feels about pursuing that going forward.

**Harte Daniels:**  So this is -- the way that you stated that all legal matters are confined to the domain there are specific resources. Eminent domain. We have something here from Seattle City Light, but Security and Privacy might be interested in who owns this technology and how has it been possibly used as a back door for foreign nationals, mostly your Chinese Huawei, which has been in the news. And they have stolen intellectual property from T-Mobile and there is a great deal of concern. We do have security people here, but there is another aspect on the 4G technology, foreign and domestic, primarily to do with back doors.

**Charlotte Lunday:** I think this is beyond the scope. And we are kind of out of time.

**Mark DeLoura:**   I would love to keep the conversation going with you, and get immersed in the technology and what it can and can't do. That might help inform the conversation. We'll chat again.

**Torgie Madison:**  We'll also have a lot of free time after this. I know we're all ready to get out of here, so I don't think we have time for public comment, as we're already ten minutes over.

**Charlotte Lunday:** That might be something that's required.

**Torgie Madison:**  Is there any public comment?

**Harte Daniels:**   One thing that wasn't mentioned is that Microsoft's ability seminar is going to be in May, and it would be grand if epople from CTAB, board members, went on that second day. I also included in my notes and research a lot of resources that the board could use.

**Torgie Madison:**  Yes. I did appreciate that email. I saw it.

**Harte Daniels:**   There's more information. Thank you.

**Torgie Madison:**  Are there any more comments? Great. Thank you, everyone. Meeting is adjourned.

**ADJOURNMENT**