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**Steven Maheshwary:**  We always start the meeting with introductions. Let's go around the room, say your name, your neighborhood, and a little something about yourself, or a fun fact.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

**Steven Maheshwary:**Before we move on to the next item, I just want to ask how many people are on the phone? How many members?

**Seferiana Day:**   There are probably four people. Enought to make a quorum. Torgie, Mark, Alice Lawson, Smriti.  There are some people trying to get on.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  While you work through technical difficulties, I want to introduce Kate Garman, presenting an update on the Mayor's Innovation Advisory Council update.

**Kate Garman:**  Good evening, everyone. Thank you, Steven, for inviting me, and everyone, for having me.  I'm totally up for making this a conversation, so if you have a question at any time, please feel free to ask.

We gave this presentation in December of last year to the advisory council. It is made of 16 members for Wave One with Seattle companies, and in Seattle companies we include Microsoft, Amazon, Tableau, Expedia, WTIA, University of Washington, Facebook, Twitter, and a few individuals. And then we have a Wave Two, which is other companies that are interested is also fulfilling the mission, which is to find a way to partner with private sector and solve problems that the City faces, using, possibly, technology ways. The IAC has three focus areas: Homelessness, Mobility, and Delivery of Basic Services.

This is how we got started. The Mayor really wanted to find a way to have deliverables with the projects, so we went to several departments, and we  said, 'If you can have some opportunity for collaboration in these three focus areas, what would you do? And we had a pitch day at Tableau with nine projects, six City departments, several department directors, and at the time, 17 IAC members. Now it's 16. But it was a really fun day for a reverse pitch of projects and the opportunity for collaboration. We now have seven projects, which I'll explain to you in a second. As we enter different processes which are not normal for the City, we wanted to make sure that we had an internal review board to look at all of these really important areas, so that we make sure that all of these projects serve everyone in Seattle, that privacy is being considered, that ethics, procurement, race and social justice, any budget needs, and then if we can be transparent at all times, we absolutely should be.

The projects that we're working on, the first one is our Nav App 2.0 Team. This is currently an app that our navigation team, who interact with those suffering from homelessness directly uses in real time on an iPad or cellphone, and this is to elevate that to the next 2.1. The members here are Microsoft, who are helping us build this out, and we're also engaged with a smaller company called RevTech, and there are several City staff, as you can see, in many department groups that are working on this project. You don't have to understand, but this is just to illustrate that it's a complex process with complex data. So, we're trying to make more data available to the people that are working immediately. And this will include real-time shelter data for how many beds are available so that we can send people to somewhere where there is a space. This is just more information. It will include Seattle GIS mapping. A lot of people just use their phones to communicate to one another in the field. We want to isolate that so we can document appropriately and get that all on the app. We have already reached a lot of Phase One with site totals in real time, including some of the tracking that's going in and these other phases will continue to build as we work with RevTech and Microsoft. I do want to mention that we are working towards having a demo day in October, which will be a public event. And we would like to tell the story of all seven projects and how we progressed.

These are Grouping Two. These are two earthquake projects with the Office of Emergency Management. the first one is Earthquake Early Warning. This is similar to what the City of Los Angeles is doing. We now have a formal application for a pilot with the U.S. Geological Services or Survey. We can find out if an earthquake is coming, or a seismic event tow to ten minutes in advance.  This is a beta project, and our members here. Zillow is no longer on it, but we're working primarily with Amazon and Twitter. It's two pilots of infrastructure providers. If we can make aware the Light Rail elevators and shut those down before an earthquake comes, or the second is for those who do not have English as their primary language, what will we send out to those groups who need other languages for warning. And then we have several OENs. We're working with Los Angeles to learn what they've learned. We're working with the University of Washington and some regional partners on this, and should make progress, I think, as in June they're meeting every other week.

Our other is  with earthquake damage assessment, with again, Amazon and Twitter as partners, is to, once it has occurred, how do we in an equitable way, have an assessment of damage around it? If a neighborhood can't communicate, for whatever purpose, they can't or they don't know how, we want to make sure that we're addressing neighborhoods and their needs base. The ultimate get from this project will be a recommendation on how to approach this. Twitter has been a really great partner. They are thinking about social media differently, should an event occur. And how we can use all resources, how we can use Find, Fix It. I want to assure everyone in this room that we are fully up to speed with the Surveillance Ordinance, so we are not turning anything on if an event occurs.

This project is one of my favorites. I love them all, but the Affordability Portal has three partners. Expedia is leading it, and Tableau and Spy were also partners. And we had a huge amount of City partners working on this. This impacts 11 departments with programs that they've provided to the City. This is how to better connect low income households and residents to programs that will lower their cost of living. We estimate that some will be able to save over $1,000 per month on costs if they were to engage with all of these programs. They're simply not in one place. Some of them are available to apply to online, and we're trying to assess and put them  together.  The outcomes of internet access to information, ultimately, we're trying to increase enrollment into these programs and retention. We are also on track for that. New York City has an Affordability Portal, and we look at that, but we will come up with a calculator. We can say, "I have a family with two kids; I have a car' I own a home with a mortgage or I don't. What programs am I eligible for?" And it will calculate that for you. We will put that on open source and share that for other cities to have.

The Youth Opportunity Portal is a similar concept, but to offer the programs for ages--I think it's 12 to 24--Technology Access Foundation, Facebook and Microsoft, and LinkedIn is partnering directly with us. Two-thirds of the economy is on LinkedIn and they are a huge data resource, and they are showing us what sort of talent is happening, what talent we're losing in Seattle, what talent we're gaining. And it's a close to real-time information in that regard. Several internal departments are working on it. So this is addressing where young people can go for youth training programs. A lot of programs are run through Parks, HSD. So, we are creating one portal, and we're also trying to track better, so is someone is applying for a program and doesn't get it, how do we recommend a different program to them? How do we know what works for specific individuals going to a program. So Phase One is identifying four programs on this site. Phase Two is to launch, and Phase Three is to look for additional programs and private sector connections and tasked with providing us user experience. We're actually giving a stipend to students to help us test out this site.

Any questions? I don't want to take up too much of your time. Yes?

**Rabecca Rocha:**  Are you guys [unintelligible]...?

**Kate Garman:**  It's not an infrastructure project. The first one is to warn over a communication device. And the second is to assess better the damages that have occurred.

**Rabecca Rocha:**  My second question is about data collection. Is there going to be something standing between the City and ICE, or whatever? Because right now, the Latino community is really concerned about data being gathered.

**Kate Garman:**  Are you talking about the earthquake?

**Rabecca Rocha:**  My concern is about the second item, data collection.

**Kate Garman:**  Again, this is to create a pilot. So, we're just figuring out the mechanics of how it works. The only thing we would do is push out data. We would never collect. Of course, we would go through the policy and make sure that our legal counsel is assuring that the data can't be handed over. That's a great question.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  I have a couple of questions. From the user testing perspective, there is a diverse set of people with different abilities, different perspectives. Is there a plan to go and actually test out these within the communities, or even leverage community resources to help with these projects?

**Kate Garman:**  That is a great question. Many of them have undergone journey mapping experiences as well as testing on the user side in partnership with a corporation. And I think the earthquake ones are formal and need to be done internally. They are both getting tested with user experience. Definitely with a diverse group. I think Zillow as well. I'll talk about that in a moment. I think all of them are doing that.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  There was a benefits calculator that was user-tested here.

**Kate Garman:**  Yes. And we would like to hear about that definitely.

This may be the last one. This is a housing Search Tool. Zillow is the main partner with this. We also are working with a start up company that uses short-term rentals in a really interesting way to provide housing for the low income folks. And so, we are building here a centralized way to locate affordable housing. There's really no central spot right now. Of course, Zillow is an excellent partner. They're going to build this on their platform. They're going to maintain it in perpetuity. They're also working with the Chamber of Commerce for programs specific to where landlords opt in for a level of housing. So, it would make sure that people suffering with homelessness currently would have access to that, rather than compete with the open market. This one is probably taking the longest. There's a lot of research into this, and in partnership with the Chamber,  we will likely do a demo in September. If it works, they will release it to other cities, so they can have a one-stop shop for affordable housing.

We do have one more. Homeless Data modeling is in combination with Tableau, Amazon web services, and UW. This is to focus on automating and helping to better visualize our contracts related to homelessness and performance. It is now manually entered by some staff that work at HSB and it doesn't really tee it up for better visualization. So when we report out to Council on how we're performing on our contracts, it is more challenging than it should be. So, we are looking to automate it. And the campus, of course, is building it, with Amazon and Tableau, and this will be done by the end of May. So, it will be a 30 percent reduction in analyst staff time for manual  data management and makes it more available for regional deployment. This one is running on time.

**Dorene Cornwell:**   For this last one, is there any way for agencies to have a contact to be able to view their data or view their data compared to other people? I would think that IT issues are not usually the strong suit of the agencies providing direct services, but that some kind of report where everybody agreed could be incredibly valuable.

**Kate Garman:**  That's a good question. I'm not terribly informed on that. They are are allocated to give us certain data. I'm not sure if we require a format. So, to make sure that it is in our format.  Question?

**Chance Hunt:**   These projects are all developed to solve very specific problems. Their task is to adopt and do whatever. What is the extent is the City also committing to applying those same solutions to other similar kinds of problems. Is there a team beyond the external providers, of City people, who can go, "Hey! That worked for this project. We can identify this one and this one." How much of that future thinking is a part of this project?

**Kate Garman:**  That's a great question. We're working on that right now. How can we think about this from a larger innovation standpoint, since it's highlighting a lot of work that can be done in other departments? To be continued, but I think you're exactly highlighting that if this can work for one department, how do we learn specific things.

**Harte Daniels:**   Sorry, I missed the first part of your presentation, but on your last point regarding service providers about their performance methods is attached to the availability of housing. I wonder whether you built that into what Dorene suggested, maybe a portal for those people, but also there is a conflict between those two products. The one people say they can't meet their goals because the other is not available. Also, on your affordable housing, besides just looking at affordable units you wish to look at, past work by the King County Senior Services regarding home sharing, I wish you would confront renters, etc., knowing a person's background, whether they have been released from prison, or coming off eviction, etc., you would want to see some cross pollination with people that have shown an ability to stay with their case workers, and additionally, the case workers [unintelligible]...making referrals across and working together to [unintelligible]....

**Kate Garman:**  Right. I super appreciate the suggestion. We actually mapped out where all of the data sources and where it comes from. We mapped it on a wall, and HMIS, the Police Department, the County, and all of these things. It's a huge body of work that some folks, especially within the County, are starting to work on. It was a huge scope. And so, we wanted for these projects to have something that was the right size. Definitely, I think, other people outside of the IAC are working on your suggestion. And your first question was about connecting the homelessness information with the availability of the housing. We're just automating our data collection, but that already exists.

**Harte Daniels:**   And on the last part, about references, etc., we could design the form specifically on that, evolving all the way up to State.

**Kate Garman:**  Thank you. Any other questions? I think I'm done here.

**Andy Katz:**   Just to be clear,  is that HMIS or a provider like contracting agencies?

**Kate Garman:**  It is not HMIS data. There is actually no personally identifiable information in that data set.

**Steven Maheshwary:**   I know you mentioned a demo day in October. Is there a mechanism whereby we can get involved or continue to contribute perspectives or have visibility to the progress of the apps?

**Kate Garman:**  Yes. We have a web site. It's http://seattle.gov/innovation-advisory-council . There's a page for each project with a blog at the bottom. And we are very dedicated to making sure those projects are alive and fresh, and we're updating the progress of all of that. We are also taking a look at working with IT with what we want to do for 2019, and we had an ideation workshop just a few weeks ago, where 25 departments came and identified areas of innovation, opportunity, collaboration. And there were some very interesting themes, like how do we know our customers better? There were themes of how do we tell our story better as a City. And there were multiple themes of how do we better what we do and make ourselves more efficient. We are looking to  take what we learned from the cabinet and to co-create solutions with IAC members, rather than have an already determined bundle of work, like here's our problem and we give them the answer. So, we are going to get the IAC members, but I think we will also have that conversation where members of CTAB could be invited. We certainly want to be as transparent and open as possible. I'll keep you posted.

**Steven Maheshwary:**   Cool. Well, thank you so much for presenting. And is Joe Wooley online?

**Joe Wooley:**  Yes, I'm here.

**Steven Maheshwary:**   Joe, are you ready to present or at least provide an update from the Surveillance Advisory Working Group?

**SURVEILLANCE ADVISORY WORKING GROUP**

**Joe Wooley:**  Yes. I can go ahead and do that.

Thanks to all for having me. I apologize for the fact that I wasn't able to get down there on time. Just wanted to make sure that I was able to be there, albeit virtually. Quick intro, my name is Joe Wooley. I'm a member of the Community Surveillance Working Group. I'm one of the City Council appointees, and I'm honored to give a quick update on where things stand,. I'll give a quick three-part update that's pretty brief, and then you can all ask questions at the end, should you have any.

The latest working group meeting was on April 23, after which we formally transmitted our first round of privacy and civil liberties assessments. There were six technologies in that transmission. And they were emergency themed cameras, HAZMAT cameras, closed circuit TVs, automated license plate recognition for patrol, parking enforcement systems, and then another round of license plate readers, as well. These were some of the more--I don't want to say 'benign,' but more straight forward low hanging fruit, if you will, technologies for us to tackle. The main comments and recommendations from the working group, all of these technologies really fall back into two main themes. One was data collection and retention. The advice was that those two things occur as minimally as possible in accordance with the utility, so obviously the technology may have a certain degree of collection and retention for optionality purposes, but that it not be beyond that optionality. And the second being that there are state and federal rules, regulation, restriction that may also be at play, so understanding and giving the City the benefit of the doubt. They have to balance collection and retention with those two factors, but that it not extend beyond that in any and all matters. And then the second being that the comments really pertain to the third parties that are involved, either through hardware, software, or service providers that they are held to the same standards that the departments would be, as well. Torgie's comments certainly highlighted this and we agreed that that was something worth noting and worth the Council's review.  That was the first round.

The next thing is that the Governance, Equity, and Technology committee is meeting on May 21. The first group of Surveillance Impact Reports (SIR), the impact reports, were determined right for Council. I think they were submitted today, correct, if I read the email correctly?

**Seferiana Day:**  Yes, they were submitted today.

**Joe Wooley:**  The committee had May 21 on their agenda to address those submissions. I look forward to sharing their thoughts on what we put together, among everyone else's. The working group's next meeting is on May 28, at which time we will review our next round of technologies. We have six more slated and those are some more first round low-hanging fruit, but we have a few more of the meaty ones. The low-hanging fruit are binoculars, up-spotting scopes, amps for the check reading device, and then some of the more substantive ones that we expect more of the discussion about surround Acyclica, and then computer age dispatch for both the First Department and the Police Department. That's the update, I think, as probably as detailed as is useful to get into with this audience. I'd be happy to address any questions anyone might have.

**Steven Maheshwary:** Joe, is it possible to provide a full text of your recommendations on the six technologies so we can socialize over that.

**Joe Wooley:**  Just to make sure, I coughed and there was another voice. Could we share the documents that we transmitted? Is that what you were asking?

**Steven Maheshwary:** Yes.

**Joe Wooley:**  No objections from me. I don't want to speak for either of our co-chairs or the City, if there are any protocol violations. But not that I'm aware of.

**Steven Maheshwary:** If you submitted for public comment, it should be public domain for us to see anyway, I think.

**Seferiana Day:**  Yes, that would make sense.

**Steven Maheshwary:** Seferiana makes that an official yes.

**Seferiana Day:**  It's public record.

**Joe Wooley:**  [unintelligible]

**Torgie Madison:**   This is Torgie. I am also dialed in. I believe the community surveillance working group's comments will eventually be compiled into the SIR  itself, and then submitted to City Council. So, that's one way to look at them. But if we could get access to the pre-formatted comments when they get to the City, that would be great, too. And I just have one question. I got wind that the Acyclica technology in particular had misleading or inaccurate information in its SIR about what they were using to protect data. I don't want to get too much into the details about it. But what is the process for reviewing a technology when the information available in the SIR is incorrect? Were you aware of that? I think it came up in your April 23 meeting.

**Joe Wooley:**  The short answer is I don't know. I don't recall that coming up in the meeting. I'd have to go back to my notes, but it's not coming top of mind for me. We have not discussed Acyclica in depth yet. That's on deck for this next round. I haven't reviewed it yet. I will review it in advance of the meeting on the 28th. So, I can't speak to that at this time. I don't know if there's anybody else in the room who can speak to that basically erroneous data.

**Torgie Madison:**   Interesting. I was just curious about that. Because from my understanding--and maybe I can reach out to Ginger or somebody else to help compile the SIRs. From my understanding, the Acyclica SIR mentions that MAC addresses were hashed on the box, then sent out encrypted, but then it turns out that the MAC were actually leading to the third party service and then hashed in the cloud, and then sent back to the City, which is a pretty big difference. I would be curious if you had heard about that or if there's some sort of policy for retroactively going back and updating SIRs once that information was provided by the City from that department. Maybe that would be something that I can hopefully get to the May 28 meeting and see if that comes up in discussion.

**Joe Wooley:**  Yes. I am not aware. Feel free to shoot me an email and I can make sure the working group is aware of it. Or, if you're attending the working group meeting in person, all the better. I'm happy to look at it.

**Torgie Madison:**   Thank you very much.

**Harte Daniels:**   I have a question for Torgie.  During one of your earlier reports to CTAB, you addressed the second point which Mr. Wooley brought up, which is third party standards, and you positioned an issue or risk on third party standards. I did write you and to the board an explanation of the business associates' agreement. I'm wondering if you received that email? I received no acknowledgement.

**Torgie Madison:**   Yes. I actually still have it in my inbox here. It was sent Tuesday, March 19, and I do see it here, yes.

**Harte Daniels:**   Thank you.

**Joe Wooley:**  Steven, circling back to your question, yes, the working group's comments are part of the SIR, once it is all buttoned up. it would be public record. I think it's a matter that if CTAB wants to see what we as a working group have put together in the interim before we put a bow on it, until it gets published. I have no problem with that, as long as that's okay with Seferiana, Ginger, Jim, and everyone else. We cold certainly look at providing that to you guys, assuming the parties that are mentioned are also okay with it.

**Steven Maheshwary:** That would be great, just in the spirit of working closely together. And especially coming up in the next round with Acyclica, which has a lot of general interest in that technology specifically, because I think it tracks movement patterns around the City, so there's a lot of debate about the use of that technology, and then, of course, all of the other ones that you guys are noodling on for this round and the next round.

**Joe Wooley:**  I'll take that as an action item to bring up with the group at our meeting on the 28th.

**Steven Maheshwary:** Okay. Well, thanks so much for the update, Joe.

**Joe Wooley:**  No problem. Thanks for having me in. Again, apologies for not being there in person.

**Steven Maheshwary:** We do have a quorum on the phone, so we're excited to actually move forward and have a discussion and presentation by Delia Burke about the Technology Matching Fund recommendations.

**TECHNOLOGY MATCHING FUND RECOMMENDATIONS AND VOTE**

**Delia Burke:**   Thank you! I really have the pleasure of being here tonight to share with you all of the hard work done by the TMF review committee this year.

The Tech Matching Fund is the City's annual grant program that provides funding to the community for digital literacy programs, digital equity programs. and it's really been a cornerstone of the City's digital inclusion efforts over the years. We've given away $5 million since the program began. And that's to programs that help people give access to technology, the devices they need, being connected to the internet, and to gain the skills to be able to use that technology. This year, we have $320,000 to distribute through the Tech Matching Fund. And, I just want to point out that it's not just about the money that we distribute. It's really an investment we have in our community based organizations, and that it's a partnership where for every dollar that the City distributes, our community partners also provide a match in terms of volunteer time, donated labor, or other resources to the projects. It's been a great to leverage City money and to work with the community. We do considerable outreach for the matching fund. We reached out via email, various social media channels. This year, our  communications team threw in their lot with other City departments to really get the word out about the opportunity for this grant. We did three workshops. One was in the north end, High Point, and also south Seattle.  We also went one on one with organizations that are interested in applying for grants. We had a really nice response from the community. We received 47 applications, requesting $1.8 million in funding. So, we really see a tremendous need for the program to support for digital inclusion work throughout the community.

How do we decide who gets these grants? We work with our volunteer panel each year. This year, we had 14 reviewers. And I just want to say thank you so much for your time and your efforts. The reviewers did a really great job of reviewing each proposal, scoring them based on criteria, and ultimately [unintelligible]. So, many thanks to you. We had three folks from CTAB, Steven Maheshwary, Torgie Madison, and Charlotte Lunday. And we also had three students from Seattle Pacific University, Abbe Blank, Mary Christensen, Richie Gamiño, join our panel this year. We are excited about working with the students who are in information studies, and are contributing to service learning by participating in the committee.  It's great to have your voices this year. Staff who participated were David Keyes, Seferiana Day , Vicky Yuki. We also have several very engaged community volunteers who participated, Kenny Shelton, John Lefevre, Kellie Kinzel, and Brian Hsi, a former CTAB member.

Again, the panel is a really important part of that process when we can get really diverse perspectives to help us make these choices.

From the 47 applications, the review panel, through a long process, recommended funding for 11 projects this year. It was a tough decision, and these 11 projects really stood out in terms of strength of the projects themselves, likelihood of success, also meeting a really important need within the community. I hope everyone got a hand-out which gives more specifics about these programs and what we're recommending. But, I'll just give a little bit of an overview. You can see here on this map where the organizations are geographically located, and the panel worked pretty hard to allocate the funds not only to the best projects, but also considering what makes sense and what would be a fair allocation throughout the City on our small budget. You can see the projects. We had several in the north end, central and southeast. Of the programs that are here, five organizations we've actually funded within the last three years, groups like Multimedia Resource Training Institute, Full Life Care, and South Park Information Resource Center. These are programs that executed well in their past projects, and our continued support will help to further leverage the City's investment, and also help to build that longer term sustainable network of community technology providers that the City is looking for. Also, within this cohort, there are brand new groups that we have never worked with in the past. It is always exciting to be open and bring in funding to new organizations. A few of those groups are Dress For Success Seattle, which is a program that is going to be working with women who will be learning coding and other tech skills for workplace development. We have Indigenouz PlaceMakerz, which is working with Native American artists. Another new one is Computing For All, which is working with low-income students, again on coding, web development, and in gaining STEM skills. We're pretty excited about the cohort. The majority of these programs are providing digital literacy training in some kind of traditional computer lab setting. One of the projects is looking at pilots to look at how the Internet of Thing (IOT), hearing devices, things like Alexa might be of benefit to people with disabilities. So we look forward to seeing how that project plays out. We like to always be open to these new, emerging technologies that people are using and how they're using them, and how that benefits people on a daily basis.

Like I said, all of these projects really target historically under-represented and under-served communities. There are certain populations that some of these groups are focused on. Kin On is an older person senior project  working with Asian seniors in southeast Seattle. Full Life Care and Jack Straw both are helping to support people with disabilities. Jack Straw is working with blind youth. Indigenouz PlaceMakerz is working with Native American artists, which is a community  that we haven't worked with in the past. I think there is really a broad section that these programs will be touching. Overall, these programs will reach more than 3,000 residents. We hope they will make a really deep impact on their communities.

Kudos to the committee and thank you for helping us through this, and for all the amazing programs that the community brought to us. We had a tall order. we were only able to fund 11 out of 47. Had we been able to go a little bit farther down the list, I think there were some very smart programs.

Does anybody have anything to add? Steven, you were on the committee.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  I just wanted to extend my appreciation to you and the rest of the team for coordinating and organizing the TMF process, and the reviewing process especially. Seeing year on the year the fund go down begs the question, if we're basing it upon subscription dollars, is there a plan from the City to think about how they're allocating to the fund. Because we would like to continue finding more organizations, new organizations on a variety of digital literacy initiatives. That's something that I would love to get more information on, or find out if that's an area where we can assist in terms of supplementing the program.

**Chance Hunt:**   Just for the sake of accuracy, the $320,000 that is allocated to this project is the budget that City Council has allocated. The specific allocation has not changed. What we have been able to do over the past three or four years is to augment that either with public dollars, or in some cases, private dollars. We agree with you. You can see the demand far exceeds what the current allocation has been. And I think that becomes the question about the overall opportunity as well as this is one piece of how we fund digital equity programming in the City. But, because of the way people apply and the innovation that comes through this, how do we begin, perhaps, to think about a different kind of allocation, perhaps a higher allocation in the future.

**Harte Daniels:**  Chance, what percentage were private people, private sector have chipped into the fund? Can you tell me the percentage of that? Is there room for the board to try to represent to private sector people? What percentage of private sector?

**Chance Hunt:**   Well, I think over the past two years we have had $325,000 specifically through a donation from Facebook. So it was $25,000 added to that $300,00. So, it's not a huge percentage. But the opportunity to fund raise for it--I don't know whether CTAB is the board or body if they want to take on fundraising as an activity, or not, if they can. But I think there's always opportunity to consider alternative funding streams, not just for this program, but for the overall activities that we provide. Our primary source of revenue for this and our work is the cable franchise fees revenue. That is also what City Council identified a million years ago towards the equity efforts. The actual budget of the Technology Matching Fund has really fluctuated over the years. It was much, much smaller a million years ago. So it has grown over time. I think there are definitely opportunities, but I think the larger question really is about the City's commitment to this work and what are the alternatives, or what are the mix or blended funds that we can start to look at as a City. CTAB can certainly advise and have an opinion on that. Whether they're the right body to fund raise, I don't know.

**Harte Daniels:**  I bring this up because two years ago, I was told that that was one of the qualifiers for becoming a board member. Delia, great work, as usual. Have you contacted the ones that did make it, or the other ones that didn't, about what it would have taken to increase their ability? There are many more who attended your workshop that I didn't see on this list, that didn't make it. So, if we continue to reach out to those about how to make the process easier and lastly, as I mentioned before, there are trade organizations, private sector, that partner with you or any of these people that are trying to apply to be able to do the due diligence and also tell their story better?

**Delia Burke:**   I think that's a good point. First of all, you're the first to hear it. This is hot off the presses. The public has not been made aware of the committee's recommendations yet. Typically, we wait until after CTAB has an opportunity to look at the recommendations and endorse what the committee does. We're optimistic that this will happen shortly. But then after that, when we notify folks of the recommendations, we do offer to meet one on one with any project that did not get funded and go through their applications and give them constructive feedback about how they can strengthen it, what are pieces they need to work on in order to come back for funding. And I would say that that has been a very rich opportunity to help folks who are still doing this work. And often we can find other resources for them during this period, since we only offer this once a year. We do that. And I would say, given the limited resources, most projects do not get funded, but then very often people will come back and get funded. For example, Indigenouz PlaceMakerz was a very small nonprofit. They applied last year and did not get funded. And I did give them feedback last year, and they got funded this year. Kin On was another example. Initially, they didn't get funded. Computing for All is another example. Some of you might recognize some of these names, who continued to do the work and then improved their proposals. That is definitely something we like to do.

The other point about working with other organizations on providing support and assistance, I think that would be great to work more with those on that on how to improve grant writing skills.

**Harte Daniels:**  [unintelligible]

**Delia Burke:**   That's terrific. I'd love to follow up on that. And again, maybe start with that person kind of early on our outreach cycle so that we can engage them as people are preparing.

**Harte Daniels:**  [unintelligible]

**Dorene Cornwell:**  This is Dorene. When we think about City funds, and we think about all of the applicants, has the City ever considered some kind of coordinated application process where people could do one application for TMF and access something also through Social Venture Fund or Seattle Foundation at the same time so that people could do the same grant writing, be judged by the same criteria and then apply to other funds? Because  that seems like it would be worth investigating, although I'd love to hear of all of the people that you say find other funding. Some of them are private sources.

**Delia Burke:**   I do know that there are common grant applications. I think one of the directions that we're looking at as a City is -- the City is a major funder. Many departments provide community grants. And so one thing we're looking to do is to coordinate better just as a City in general. Ultimately, it could be one grant management platform where organizations could put in their profiles, use one portal, and hopefully share information among other grant programs. I think our direction starts within the City as a large funder that funds multiple programs. I know many of these groups also get funding from the Department of Neighborhoods, Arts and Parks. So, I think that's something that we're looking to do to make it easier to access our funding.

**Adam Owen:**  I just want to point out that you said some of these have been funded years ago. Is there a limit to what they can ask for? I have asked these organizations how Century Link can contribute to this from our side. I think one thing that stands out is whether or not they would have decision making or putting money into a program that [unintelligible].  This is a technology fund. This is digital literacy. They may not see that. But then [unintelligible]....  We go to specific events [unintelligible]....

**Delia Burke:**   Maybe we can talk more specifically about what is your criteria for the kinds of projects you would like to fund. These are just the names of the organizations. Through our grant process, one of the  key criteria is meeting our program goals for increasing access to technology. So there's always a technology component. Helping people get connected, and digital literacy skills. So, these top 11 projects met those requirements fully. People might not think that the Native American community is one of the most disconnected groups, lacking access, lacking skills, and we're seeing more of this where certain jobs that in the past had not required technology access to basic computer literacy skills now are doing that. Native artists now are finding that they really have very limited skills, but it's required as an artist to be able to manage a portfolio, communicate with various things

**Adam Owen:**  [unintelligible]....

**Delia Burke:**   Yes, and I think we're just sort of sifting through this. We just got the results. We will be describing these programs in more detail, and specifically what we're funding. What is the technology piece? What is the training piece? What is the connectivity piece? But, all of these programs are really working on digital literacy and helping to give people access.

**Harte Daniels:**  I also think that there is a difficulty for indigenous people in explaining the connection to technology because of the cultural difference. And i applaud you for helping that, and being able to get that across, because, you know, this is about digital literacy, but there is a cultural component, and I have found with all of the multiple various minorities that I've worked with First Nations have this difficulty in being pre-judged just by a title like that, not knowing that this is integrated into the culture this type of literacy, digital literacy, etc. So I really applaud you for the work that you did last year and helping them to express to a different culture their indigenous science and technology which is very old and very strong, but just communicating with them.

**Delia Burke:**   Well,  thanks. And like I said, that's really one of the strengths of having this open, competitive cycle every year. We are able to work with community groups who are designing their own solutions, that are meeting the needs of their own communities. We, as a City, are not saying this is what a digital literacy program needs to look like. Each of these community groups works closely with their own clients. Multimedia Resources and Training Institute works with East African youth, and they have a lot of expertise in delivering media programs to the East African community, but we really are helping to enable and support these really local solutions where people can meet their own needs.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  Thanks. In the interest of time, and in the interest of being able to fund these, or recommend these for funding, would anybody on the phone like to make a motion to recommend the 14 Technology Matching Fund organizations for funding?

**Torgie Madison:**  This is Torgie, and I move to approve the TMF recommendations.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  Do we have a second?

**Mark DeLoura:** This is Mark. I'll second.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  All right. All in favor, please say, 'Aye.' Any abstentions, or any not in favor? I think we had Torgie, myself, Mark, and I think Smriti are in favor of passing, so the motion then passes for CTAB to approve the Technology Matching Fund recommendations.

**Delia Burke:**   Yay! Now the fun begins. Now we get to work with all of these groups! So, thank you, everyone, and thabnks again to all of the committee members. We appreciate it.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  Thank you so much, Delia. Just a quick rearranging of the schedule. We only have the committee updates next, so I'm curious to see whether you guys would be okay to power through and move the break to afterwards. Unless people have a strong objection. We can quickly do the committee updates. Or actually, just quickly voting on the agenda and minutes from April, and then do the updates. Does anyone want to make a motion to approve the May agenda?

**APPROVAL OF APRIL MINUTES AND MAY AGENDA**

**Smriti Chandrashekar:**   This is Smriti. I move to approve the agenda.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  Do we have a second?

**Cass Magnuski:** Someone did, but I don't know who that was.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  I'll second. All in favor? We have four proxy votes, so it's Smriti, Torgie, Mark, and me. And do we have a motion to approve the April minutes?

**Torgie Madison:**  This is Torgie, and I move to approve the April minutes.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  I'll second. All in favor? So, the motion to approve the April minutes passes.  Great! Just to speed things along, we'll move into committee updates. Maitreyee, since we have you in the room, would you like to do an update for Smart Cities?

**SMART CITIES COMMITTEE UPDATE**

**Maitreyee Joshi:**Yes, so as you probably know,  the Smart Cities Committee is working on two projects. One of them is related to prredictive policing and visual recognition, developing recommendations to Council, based on what kind of legislation that they should implement, regulation around this topic. And the second one is what are some of the key transformations that might come  to Seattle in the next ten to twenty years, and how can Seattle leverage those appropriately. So, we've been working on these two topics. So far, all of the committee members have been doing a lot of research, looking into issues, and researching transformations that will affect Seattle. We have compiled a lot of research so far. Our next steps are going to be to go through that and actually come up with solid recommendations. So, if you guys are interested in joining,m we are always interested in getting more members. Our next meeting is tomorrow at 6:00 p.m. It's no longer going to be on the fourth floor at Starbucks. Feel free to come join. You can reach out to me at smartctab@gmail.com. I can send you the details about our community meetings. Even if you can't join in person, you can still offer your recommendations for what should be done.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  Awesome. Thank you. Do we have someone from the Digital Equity Committee on the phone? I don't think John Krull or Karia Wong are online.

**DIGITAL EQUITY COMMITTEE UPDATE**

**Dorene Cornwell:**  The Digital Equity Committee met, and I'm happy to say a little bit. We talked about the survey, and I haven't printed out my notes to send to the committee, so I'm a little bit putting my own spin on it. Because we met at Chinese Information Service Center, and we decided that we were interested in responses from households that didn't speak English. And we were a little surprised because about five percent of responses were from households that didn't speak English, and we think the percentage of households that don't speak English in Seattle as a little bit higher than that. I think 20 percent sounds like a more reasonable number. Interestingly, the language that had the most responses was Chinese, which might just be because CISC is doing a great job of getting people signed up for services. Income-wise, we looked at income and zip code, and income-wise, there was a very small number whose income was over $100,000.And then there was a big number of people who were low income. Like I say, we were a little surprised that Chinese was more frequent than Spanish. And we were a little bit not sure whether the information reflected households and who in the household has a connection and uses the internet. I think that was our first task, to dive into the data. We sort of sat around and the two women from Seattle Pacific University, and John Krull and Karia Wong and I--we kind of just sat around and asked what would we like to see about the data. We made some other comments, but I didn't look at my notes before I came. So, that is my little thumbnail sketch. There is probably more to say, but that was what we did at our last Digital Equity meeting. We're going to do it again. The other thing we're going to do, we're working on letters thanking Patty Murray for introducing the Digital Equity Act, and asking the Mayor and elected officials to reach out to their peers and get their peers to sponsor it and talk it up, because it's important. It contains language that defines what they mean by digital equity and digital inclusion, and has important provisions about encouraging states to do broadband development plans either through governmental channels, or there's a channel intended for non-governmental organizations. It sets a limit of five percent for administrative costs of these projects, but it also specifically allocates five percent of whatever they come up with for budget for tribal communities. So, it's a pretty important piece of legislation.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  There are a lot of board members who are also interested in providing support, so that's some the Digital Equity Committee is drafting where we could lend our support, that would be great.

**Dorene Cornwell:**  I think our goal was to get it to the committee, to the board, by the next monthly meeting.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  Okay, perfect. Awesome. Do we have an update from the Privacy subcommittee?

**PRIVACY COMMITTEE UPDATE**

**Torgie Madison:**   This is Torgie, and I can give a quick update on that. On Tuesday, April 30, we had our Privacy and Cyber Security Committee meeting, and we had a guest speaker from the Seattle Public Library. He was talking about the Emerging Technologies 101 presentation that the library is putting on. And we were discussing whether we maybe could cooperate or help them in some way with that, and use that to facilitate our panel discussion that we're gong to be hosting. The conversation is ongoing. Beyond that, we talked a little bit more in depth about the recommendations for the Surveillance Ordinance, and we had one of the attendees. That is where we heard about the Acyclica SIR, which is also ongoing. And the last bit of news is that I will be out of the country from the 17th to the 27th. That means that the next possible committee meeting, which is usually held on the last Tuesday of the month, would be the 28th, the day after  I get back. So, it's likely that there won't be a meeting for May, just because of my travel schedule.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  Got it. And if you are able to finalize dates on an event that is partnered with the Seattle Public Library, see if you can give us some lead time so that we can make sure we're creating awareness for that event to increase traffic, that would be awesome.

**Torgie Madison:**   Yeah. I heard from Craig that the latest Emerging Technologies presentation that they held on digital privacy was a very high level, like don't recycle your passwords. Have you used public WiFi? What you should and shouldn't do on public WiFi. Very high level stuff like that. That was attended by about 30 people, which seems like a pretty good turnout. Hopefully, leveraging that existing channel that is already in place with SPL will also help drive attendance to our panel discussion. As far as returns, right now the committee is hoping to brainstorm potential speakers and topics, and when we get something more tangible, I will let the board know.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  Awesome. That is it for committee updates. Before we conclude, are there any public comments?

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Harte Daniels:**   June 18. It's not local, but it's probably in D.C. for the Worldwide Human Geography Data Group. April 23 webinar was concluding the instructions on modeling had the U.S. Census Bureau, the City of Montreal on immigration, and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation on the positioning and supply chain for human beings that are in need of services. It's very relevant. You can still access them. It is a free worldwide group that was started by the U.S. State Department. I made these announcements before, but an example of relevance would be one of the earlier works on trafficking. Since the City of Seattle is number one in the country for the most disappeared or trafficked American women and children, I participated in one of the solutions that people are modeling in making a policy cross-jurisdictional work that is now being highlighted at Tulalip, but since this is a technology group, the concept of looking at geography data and how it serves for human security and services to under-served populations is relevant. But it is cutting edge and breaking, so if it could be socialized to NGOs and academic sectors, that would be appreciated. It is still open and free for people to use, so it's a resource there if they do wish to focus their research on that area.

**Steven Maheshwary:**  Thank you. Any other public comments? Looks like the rainbow is back. Hopefully, you guys can get outside and enjoy it. If there are no other public comments, we will adjourn the meeting. Thanks, everyone.

**ADJOURNMENT**