**January 22, 2020 Meeting - Seattle Community Technology Advisory Board**

Topics covered included: Goals and Expectations for 2020; Technology Matching Fund Grants committee updates.

**This meeting was held:** January 22, 2020; 6:00-7:30 p.m., Seattle Municipal Tower, 700 Fifth Avenue, Room 2750

**Attending:**

**Board Members:** Torgie Madison, Rene Peters, Katie Cummins, Steven Maheshwary via phone, Mark DeLoura via phone, John Krull

**Public:** Adam Owen (Century Link), Camille Malonzo, Sean McClellan (CDW), Tyron Grandison, Tyler Woebkenberg, Harte Daniels

**Staff:** David Keyes, Tracy Brown, Cass Magnuski

**15 In Attendance**

**Torgie Madison:**  I think we're ready to start. Thank you, everyone, for making it out on kind of a crazy day, to a special meeting, and taking the time to come down here and have this quick meeting. Mostly, I just wanted to get everyone onto the same page, and not cancel the January meeting, but going on to February. I think we can start with minutes first or motion to approve the agenda.

**Cass Magnuski:**  Introductions are always first, then minutes an agenda.

**Torgie Madison:**So, let's go around the room. Say your name and where you're from in the Seattle area, and what you're up to with hobbies, life, jobs, etc. We can start on this side of the table.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

**Torgie Madison:**I believe that's it for everyone who has dialed in. I know Sean and Tyler from the Privacy Committee. Sean McClelland and Tyler Grandison.  So, it's great to see them on the line. The next order of business is to approve the December minutes. Can I get a motion to approve the December meeting minutes?

**Rene Peters:**   I will move to approve the December meeting minutes.

**Torgie Madison:**   All right, that's one motion. Do I have a second?

**Katie Crimmins:**   I'll second.

**Torgie Madison:**   All right, we have a second. The motion passes. How official. Similarly, can I get a motion and a second to approve the agenda for the January special meeting agenda? This is the one that replaces the regular January meeting that was supposed to be held on the 14th.

**Rene Peters:**   I move to approve the January special meeting agenda.

**Torgie Madison:**   All right, is there a second?

**Steven Maheshwary:**   I second.

**Torgie Madison:**   All right. I think we can get started. The comment that Mark DeLoura made about on appointment until being replaced by the Mayor leas me to what I wanted to talk about first. I went back through the legislation that created CTAB, the ordinance and the rules of procedure that govern the board. And I wanted to make sure that we were doing things right, and that we weren't cutting corners too much. I just wanted to get everyone on the same page and realign a bit with what that language is, and what maybe we can do to better align with the board charter and with the rules of procedure.

I have a couple of notes here, that I want to go down. Again, Mark is on appointment on an interim basis until replaced by the Mayor. So, that's not a great position to be in. One of the things that we're doing is we have, I believe, four recommendations that have been made to the Mayor's Office. I wanted to  make sure with not only those recommendations being fro the Mayor, but with John Krull no longer being employed by the Seattle Public Schools system, that we might need to go back through those applications and make sure that we have on mayoral appointment that is dedicated to public access to information and communications technology, and one education member. Of course, we have one Get Engaged member who is here with us. So, one thing we might need to do is go back through those applications. I don't know if David Keyes still has access to the applications or the recommendations that are on the Mayor's desk right now, but it might be worth going back through those at some point. Maybe we can work together and make sure we're filling those positions with the changes that have been made to the board.

**Mark DeLoura:**   Is there a plan to send the Mayor and City Council a letter accepting our priorities for this year?

**Torgie Madison:**   Yes, perfect. I did want to get consensus from the board to make sure we are aligned on that kind of communication, because I've been waiting a little bit to send out spoken introduction to Saad Bashir, and to Alex Pedersen, who is the City Councilmember who chairs the committee that CTAB is now under. I was going to get to that a little bit later, but yes, that's definitely a priority. Not only to get the outstanding board position filled as soon as possible, but also to petition to expand the board to 15 members. We do have the interest. It wouldn't be hard to fill them. We just have to get the actual machinery moving inside Seattle IT and City Council, and the Mayor's Office.  I think we actually have, David, a bit of an update on the appointments.

**David Keyes:**   Yes, two things. I did talk with the Mayor's Office, and our Chief Technology Officer and Trayce Cantrell, our executive adviser and director. They're going to call all of the people who have been pending to check in on their interest. Hopefully, that will happen in the next week. Then we will know if we can move forward on completing those appointments, and how many positions still need to be filled. We know that there's at least one Council position through Alex Pedersen.

**Torgie Madison:**   I want to mention two people who have just shown up. Do you want to do some quick introductions?

**MORE INTRODUCTIONS**

**Torgie Madison:**   We have just had introductions, approved the minutes and the agenda, and started talking about the board structure when the appointments finally get approved by the Mayor and City Council.

So, to get back to the conversation, do we have a plan for the City Council positions open? Have we interviewed for that?

**David Keyes:**   No, we have not.  Tracy Brown or I could shepherd it. Just had a meeting with Alex Pedersen's staff this last week. We now know that he is chair of the committee, which is called Utilities and Transportation (and Technology). It's parenthetical.

**Harte Daniels:**    There were several who were supposed to be retiring on December 30, so you have two remaining from last year.

**Torgie Madison:**   We actually have every active board member present for this meeting right now, which is pretty great. Who we have right now is myself, Rene Peters, Katie Cummins, John Krull, Steven Maheshwary, and on an interim basis, Mark DeLoura. He was supposed to cycle off, because he's been here for two terms. But until he is replaced by the Mayor, he is continuing on. So that make six members total. Up to five are remaining to be filled. Four of them are mayoral appointments, and one of them is a City Council appointment.

**Camille Malonzo:**   I have a question. Remember last year in the 2019 letter that there was an ask for 12. There was an ask for the Mayor and Council to increase the number of positions that are open. Were all of those given the pending five?  Were all of those filled? Will there be a back fill for any remaining spots?

**Torgie Madison:**   There are two separate tracks that are going on right now. The first track is just filling the positions that we've already interviewed for and made recommendations for. That will take us up to nine members. And then we need one more effort to fill the City Council seat. And that will bring us up to the board capacity of ten members. The second track is starting a conversation with City Council to expand the board to 15 members, which the board was before I came long. It was 15 members prior to being reduced to ten. Fifteen members puts us on parity with the other boards and commissions. So, there are two tracks. My hunch is that we will fill the positions that are vacant first. And then, at some point in the future, if we get a board expansion approved and can put that in the ordinance, we will have another round of interviewing and making recommendations.

**Harte Daniels:**   There are people that have applied who have no idea what's going on because nobody has ever contacted them again. We should at least update them.

**Torgie Madison:**   Yes, that's actually what David Keyes was just talking about. You were mentioning reaching out, David, to the people who had applied, were approved and recommended, but haven't heard anything from us, just to make sure that they're still interested.

**David Keyes:**   Yes. We're going to make personal contact.  Camille, does that answer your question?

**Camille Malonzo:**   It does, yes. Thank you. And one more follow-up to that:  The ask for the extension still exists, right? Is our renewal ask just a continuation of the ask, and we are waiting for the approval? Is that correct?

**David Keyes:**   The board passed a policy recommendation last year that the board be reexpanded to 15 members, and sent that to City Council and to the Mayor. It still needs a yes from City Council or the Mayor that they are going to move forward with that. I don't know if CTAB got a specific response. There is no actual legislation introduced, so I would say, basically, you're kind of starting fresh. You've got the construct, and I think we even have a draft of what the legislation might look like.

**Torgie Madison:**   Yes, that was something I wanted to bring to the board. I don't know if it needs a vote, *per se*, but I did want to get a consensus from the board. I was starting these conversations with Sad Bashir and Alex Pedersen, and I just wanted to make sure that we were on the same page with pushing to get the appointments approved, and pushing to reexpand the board to 15 members was something that we all wanted to do collectively. And, if I got the board's general consensus and blessing on that, I was ready to move forward with conversations, hopefully setting up an in-person meeting with Rene Peters and myself with Alex Pedersen, start building that relationship, start those lines of communication. Because we have a new CTO and a new chair of the committee that oversees the board. So, with everyone's approval, I was about to start those conversations and try to build those relationships with the stakeholders who would be making the decision.  If anyone has any objections to me and Rene Peters starting those conversations and building those relationships, I would like to hear that. Okay, great.

**Katie Crimmins:**   I don't have an objection, but I do have a question. I raised this at the last meeting, but the problem that we're facing sounds like it's not just our board but a lot of other boards and commissions. At least, at the Get Engaged meetings, we do our own monthly check-ins, and it's something that's come up. I guess I'd be curious to hear feedback on if we all wrote letters, gathering them, and then delivering all of the letters, in addition to the letters themselves, that might help if we all would attend a meeting *en masse*. I don't know if that would help or hurt.

**Torgie Madison:**   Storm the capitol.  I'm not sure.

**David Keyes:**   It wouldn't hurt.

**Harte Daniels:**   It would make us visible, as opposed to suffering alone, they could actually see that there is a problem.

**Torgie Madison:**   I think the only difficulty there is that the boards live under different commissions in City Council. So, you might convince Alex Pedersen to support the Boards and Commissions  under his committees, but you might not get the other City Councilmembers interested. But, it's not a bad idea.

**Steven Maheshwary:**   (Unintelligible)...the technology subcommittees or just general City Council meetings. In my experience, the most traction we got was with Bruce Harrell.

**Torgie Madison:**   I actually did plan on attending a Transportation and Utilities Committee public meeting.

**David Keyes:**   But, if you have folks from various committees together that could go speak at a public comment time during a City Council meeting,....

**Torgie Madison:**   There's a person who is the Boards and Commission director?

**David Keyes:**   Yes, it's somebody from the Clerk's Office, Thao Madsen, who maintains the directory of all of them. Do you work with a City staff person on Get Engaged?

**Katie Crimmins:**   We don't on an individual level. We have a meeting on the 28th, so I can raise it then, and then follow-up with our board.

**Torgie Madison:**   That makes sense to me.

**David Keyes:**   You might consider a sign on letter from all of them.

**Katie Crimmins:**   Yes.

**Torgie Madison:**   That's why I was wondering if there was a single point of contact who could distribute a call to action. If we had to hunt down the names and email addresses of every chair and vice chair of every board, and see if it's the same, that they have the same difficulties, and push back like we are.

**Katie Crimmins:**   Yes. We at least have the Get Engaged members connected. That's not all of the Boards and Commissions, but I'll see what I can find out and I will share it.

**Steven Maheshwary:**   The Mayor's Office also has a person on Boards and Commissions. I don't know who that is, but that may be the person we can sit down with and hammer out the issue.

**David Keyes**:   I think that's Sabrina Bolieu. I think they had separated out which boards and commissions, which mayoral staff works with. We can always ask who the contact people are.

**Torgie Madison:**   One of the struggles that I've always had, being a board member and being a chair, is knowing who the right person is to contact. Knowing that point of contact in the first place, who you even talk to with these conversations. Hopefully, we can work with Get Engaged people. You mentioned Ari might be a person who has a broader picture on where all the boards are at. And, hopefully, with David's help....

**David Keyes:**   Yes, we can help.

**Torgie Madison:**   ...we can find these people.

On other thing I wanted to mention. I don't know if this is something as high a priority, but I wanted to touch base on it. The original charter #3.23.060B1 says that the primary duty of the board is to study and make recommendations on issues referred to CTAB by the Mayor and City Council. So, along with talking about board expansion, I don't remember a time when CTAB has actually been the recipient of a request from City Council or the Mayor's Office, where they actually made  a request for us.

**Steven Maheshwary:**   Technically, last year, Bruce Harrell asked us to review the Samaritan app, but that's the only one.

**Torgie Madison:**    For context, that ask was sort of a side conversation that happened during the reappointment for Rene Peters and I. We were in front of Bruce Harrell and we were chatting about some of the work we had done for the board. And we talked about Samaritan talking in front of the board and how that was a very interesting project and that we really enjoyed the presentation. We got talking about Samaritan and kind of off-hand, Bruce Harrell said, "Oh yes.  We were looking at that at City Council and we had some struggle getting neutral third-party opinions on the technology and its efficacy and all of that. That could be something that CTAB could do."  And we put our arms in the air, and said, "Yes! We got a request from City Council. Kind of."  But that was the last we ever heard about that. We tried following up multiple times, sent letters to Ben in Bruce Harrell's office. And we never got a response. So, that was the first and last we heard of that.

So, circling back to what the charter says, we should be getting more requests from the Mayor's Office and City Council.

**David Keyes:**   I would say, just for reference and context, that when Seattle IT asks for something, we are servants of the Mayor. We are the Mayor's agents. So, when we're asking you to do something, you can think about that as an extension of the executive asking you to do something, as well.

**Torgie Madison:**   That's good context. Hopefully, in these conversations with Alex Pedersen, we can also build more *rapport* with that committee, with that Councilmember and maybe get back to that kind of relationship with City Council.  Alex Pedersen on the City Council page, from his committee assignment statement, he says, "We have an incredible opportunity to leverage our City's world class technology, improve data collection, and to get positive results from City government. And I look forward to the customer service experience to our City's residents. I look forward to consulting with local technology companies to determine where we can leverage their expertise to help us solve some of the City's most challenging issues." So, it sounds like he's in the right mind-set, at least. It sounds like he's kind of on the same page, at least in his statement on his web site. So, hopefully, that will be a productive conversation. That is about it for board expansion and filling the outstanding seats. Is there any more comment from anyone on those topics? Great.

Other things I wanted to bring up:  In the Rules and Procedures, there were several things that stood out to me. I'd like to get a sign-up sheet for public comment. That's part of our rules of procedure. I think that might help get a little more structure to the public comment section. And maybe people who --what I want to do is enable people to feel comfortable talking in front of the board. So, if someone had an idea that they wanted to bring in front of us, and due to discussion changing, maybe they felt like, well, it's not on topic anymore. Then they just keep that topic to themselves. They don't speak up. If someone had signed up on the sign-up sheet at the very beginning, we would be able to circle back and give them that space to say what they wanted to say. I just think it's a good idea. I'll design a little sign-up sheet. It will be separate from the sign-in sheet. If anyone has any comments about that, having a sign-up sheet to help foster communication during the public comment period and keep it a little more structured.

**Harte Daniels:**   Available in advance.

**Torgie Madison:**   Sure. I think it might be able to go out with the agenda announcement.

**Harte Daniels:**   Either that or on your web site, as well. People could know that they can do that.

**Torgie Madison:**   Great comment. We're going to do a web site review, hopefully very quickly.  And that would be a good addition. You go to the web site, you have a public comment; you register there.

**Harte Daniels:**   Yes. It just tells people to come and focus their minds in advance of the meeting.

**Torgie Madison:**   We have a rule that I actually want to remove from the Rules and Procedures.

**Tracy Brown:**   I have a point of clarification. On the people coming in, and having them sign one sheet so they can speak, and not necessarily sign in to the official attendance of the meeting....

**Torgie Madison:**   Oh. Maybe we could put a check box on it.

**Tracy Brown:**   ...or something. Because I think it is used to show that they attended the meeting, unless you want to staple the two, that they were officially in attendance at the meeting. I just want to make sure that that wasn't lost.

**Torgie Madison:**   That's a good point, that people might confuse the two sheets. Or don't want to write down duplicate information. That's a lot of writing when you come into the room. So, I think maybe just changing the design of the sign-up sheet, to have, "Do you have a public comment?" Yes/no. And you could put a check that says, yes, I do have  a public comment.

**Steven Maheshwary:**   I have a quick question about the public comment discussion.  Is there any time or (unintelligible)....

**Torgie Madison:**   Yes. There's a document that Rene Peters and I had shared already, that's an agenda planning document. I was planning on opening that up and sharing it with the rest of the board members, so that people can an idea that they'd like to see on the agenda, and roughly what month they think it's most appropriate. I know there is a similar document from last year. I actually took a look through that and carried some of the things over from that document as well. So, I was definitely planning to open up brainstorming the agenda items to the larger board.

**Steven Maheshwary:**   Okay, thanks.

**Torgie Madison:**   Yes. The rule that I would like to discuss is 3.3C4. Speakers should preface their remarks--this is during the public comment--by stating their first and last names, where they live and where they work. I think we should just remove that. There are some people, especially when DACA was more forefront in our minds, that might not necessarily want to identify themselves in that way. It also implies that everyone has work, which not everyone does. We haven't been adhering to that anyway, David is bringing it up on the screen. I'm just hoping that maybe we could just strike that language. We aren't really following it anyway. And I think that if we did start following it, that might intimidate people from being more comfortable speaking.

**John Krull:** Do you want to discuss it?

**Torgie Madison:**   Yes, I guess I'm opening it to discussion, so maybe I should make a motion for it. I move to strike 3.3C4, "Speakers should preface their remarks by stating their first and last names, where they live and where they work," from the rules of procedure. Is there are second for that motion? I don't know....

**Steven Maheshwary:**   I second the motion.

**Katie Crimmins:**   Could we change it to 'may?' Because I think it's nice for people who want to share, but I agree with you that we shouldn't force anyone, especially, like you said, do people work? Maybe they don't have stable homes. I think leaving it as optional let's people do it but we don't have to enforce it.

**Rene Peters:**   I agree. I read it as optional. Like speakers should maybe add verbiage. To say, 'as desired,' just to add that extra.  I think that it has probably a little bit of organizations value to this. If that information is available, it helps sort of focus. Here's this person's expertise, if they want to volunteer that information.

**Torgie Madison:**   I'm thinking, too, of RFC, the Request for Comment documents in the tech world, where there is 'must, should,' that sort of thing to direct how important it is.

**Mark DeLoura:**   Torgie, is there anything in there -- we usually do introductions at the beginning of the meeting. Is there anything in the bylaws about that, or is that something we just informally do?

**Torgie Madison:**   That is something totally informal that we do.

**David Keyes:**   The sign-in sheet helps in terms of if people want to be identified, acknowledging that they were participants.

**Torgie Madison:**   Is there a way for someone to attend this meeting anonymously, like they leave a dash in the name column?

**Cass Magnuski:**   There have been people who have come in here and as the minutes taker, I actually kind of followed the person around the room asking what is your name. The person said, "I'm not telling you my name." I got it somehow and put it in the minutes. The person complained and I got spanked. And a person could write Mickey Mouse on that sheet. Who is going to check? So, it has happened, and nobody cares what your name is really, unless you're on the board.

**Torgie Madison:**   The general mindset that I had for this entire conversation that we're having is how to protect people and make them feel comfortable speaking and attending meetings. Just from a data collection standpoint, I was thinking that that was a little much to have first/last name, where they live and where they work. I guess it's not a requirement because the word, 'should,' is in there.

**David Keyes:**   The only think I'll add is that -- and I think it could be reworded to say, welcome, everybody, and if you want to identify them and acknowledge their participation -- I think, the reason originally that the question the board was hoping to get where they live and where they work was a broader question, to know if you're representing an organization or a company and speaking on their behalf, and if you're somebody who is a resident of Seattle or working in Seattle, to signify that we have (unintelligible)....

**Torgie Madison:**   Okay. Then maybe we can table this for now. And I can think of some language to put in there where something like, 'if a speaker is representing a business or organization, they should state what organization they're representing.' And also some language that people may withhold their name if they want to. I can take another look at that and maybe we can all get together and write some better language for that one.

**Steven Maheshwary:**   But you have to be wary (unintelligible)....

**Torgie Madison:**   Oh, yes. Because we were streaming our meetings to Facebook occasionally.

**Harte Daniels:**   I can see that there are other issues. There are people who have restraining orders, safety issues, and have privacy problems with the company, itself.

**Rene Peters:**  There is usually blanket language. I don't know how recent it has been since we streamed live, but there is usually blanket language, like at the intro of the meeting, like just a sentence. Just to say that this meeting is being streamed, if you have any qualms with that. Or we might post something when people are coming in so that there are options there.

**Torgie Madison:**   Personally, I would rather refrain from streaming, especially on a social media platform. It is a public meeting, so anyone could join the meeting and see the attendance through Skype. But to broadcast it  on social media, I'm a little worried about that.

**Rene Peters:**  I didn't know that was actually a thing.

**Torgie Madison:**   Off and on.

**David Keyes:**   I think it would be a great thing to ask Get Engaged to see what the other boards are doing. They may have language, too.

**Katie Crimmins:**   Yes. I'll ask.

**Tracy Brown:**   Are our rules governed by Robert's Rules of Order?

**Torgie Madison:**   Yes. Actually, down at the very bottom of this document, it says something along the lines of 'everything else is Robert's Rules of Order. If it's not addressed here, then default to Robert's Rules.

**Tracy Brown:**   I think when we look at this more closely, there are Robert's Rules of Order, especially when it comes to public meetings and legal requirements. When people come and make comments, they may be challenged. If it ever has to go to a hearing or a court or something, the question is who was in the meeting. I think that needs to be looked into a little bit more closely, especially if we're governing by Robert's Rules. I think there are some exceptions. If people are on the register for domestic violence, then they'll have some protections around those kinds of things, or some other types of protections. There may be some exemptions, but I think before you strike the language, you need to have a legal review, because it is a public hearing and you are governed by those rules.

**Torgie Madison:**   Yes. I think it's a good idea to investigate this more fully before making any changes. I retract my motion to strike that language. We should definitely take a look at it, though.

**David Keyes:**   You could go through the rules, though, with just an overall review of those.

**Tracy Brown:**   You could just table it.

**Torgie Madison:**   In the State of Washington, the rules you are suggesting are not required.

**David Keyes:**   These bylaws are up to the board in the legal constraints. But these are board-written.

**Torgie Madison:**   I think we can move on from the rules of procedure. The last thing that I wanted to talk about is, since the board is so short of members right now, it's going to be more important than ever that we try to attend every meeting, to get quorum, first of all, but also to show that we are active with five and a half active members, especially February's meeting. I really hope that everyone can make it. I hope to do a group photo, first of all, to put on the web site, which I will get to later. And I am very happy to announce that Saad Bashir will be here to give an update on Seattle IT. So, it would be great to show how active we are, even with just six members. Hopefully, we can have a quarterly update. That's only four visits a year from the CTO. I think that's pretty reasonable. I'm really looking forward to having him here next month. So, if everybody could be here in person for the February 11 meeting, that would be a one to get a group photo done. And have a conversation with our CTO.

**David Keyes:**   You can have Saad in the picture, if you want to.

**Torgie Madison:**   Have Saad in the picture? Sure!

**David Keyes:**   We also have the two folks who were supposed to present in January, from Performance Seattle, and from Seattle IT, who are working on performance numbers. They also can come to the February meeting.

**Torgie Madison:**   All right. I think that is it for my big spiel that went way over 15 minutes. But there were some good conversations in there. If there are no further comments about general rules, the charter, and all of that, we can move on to the brief TMF update from David Keyes.

**TECHNOLOGY MATCHING FUND GRANTS**

**David Keyes:**   The Technology Matching Fund deadline was this past week, and we have 41 applications, which is great, particularly because we did a different cycle and came in earlier than usual. We're about to start the review process. The goal, then, would be to present the slate of recommendations to the board for March. February is the review month. I think it's an important opportunity for the board to participate. It gives you a fair amount of reading, but reading that gives you a great idea about needs, and projects, and things in the community.

**Torgie Madison:**   Is there time for board members here to volunteer?

**David Keyes:**   Yes. You could tell me now, and Delia Burke will be sending something out. I would hope that as many board members as possible would actually do this. It's important to us in terms of having enough reviewers to read proposals. And also, the review committee is usually composed of board members as well as volunteers. You don't have to be one of the appointed members to be able to do that. If you want to do that this year, this is your chance.

**Torgie Madison:**   Camille Malonzo, for example, if you are interested?  Thao, I know you're on the line.

**Katie Crimmins:**  How do people volunteer?

**David Keyes:**   Tell me.

**Katie Crimmins:**  I mean for people not in the room. Is it that the general public can volunteer?

**Torgie Madison:**   Ping david.keyes@seattle.gov.

**David Keyes:**   You can tell me now, but it's Delia Burke who manages the review process for the grants. I'll ask her if she wants to send out something for the broader thing, but you can let Tracy Brown or me know and we'll pass that on to her, and sh will send something out.

**Rene Peters:**  Delia just sent something an hour ago to people on the board just asking that same question. Let her know by the 24th, this Friday, if you want to be on the review panel.

**Torgie Madison:**   We're having a little bit of noise on one of the lines.

**Tracy Brown:**  Delia may not send it out to the general public, but just to the board members. People have applied from the public, and there are matters of confidentiality, conflict of interest statements. So, you just may want to limit it to the board.

**Torgie Madison:**   There are definitely conflict of interest checks.  And I think I did have to report one last cycle. It's a pretty involved process. I believe each reviewer gets about eight applications each to review, so that we have redundancy and there are three or four multiple reviews for the same application. There's a web site portal that you go to that contains all of your scores, brief comments on each section. And it's all aggregated into one statistical model that gets the best ones on top. Then, there's a discussion. We all go into a room together and go through the top ten, one by one. It's a pretty involved process, but I've always found it very rewarding, personally.

**David Keyes:**   Different reviewers pick up on different things. Some of that conversation after people have done a draft scoring, it gives you a chance. Like, somebody will pick up on this curriculum is really great. Or, they noticed these things in the budget, or the equipment, or what have you.

**Torgie Madison:**   I remember one project that Mark DeLoura and I. I gave top marks, and he gave bottom marks. We said, wait!  Let's have a conversation. How did we get so far apart on this one? That was a good conversation to have.

**Mark DeLoura:**   Because you were wrong.

**Torgie Madison:**   Strike that from the conversation. Because I was wrong. That's why we were so far off. I think that last year the total amount awarded was $320,000?

**David Keyes:**   Yes.

**Torgie Madison:**   And the project budgets are going down from $50,000 potentially for projects to $25,000.

**David Keyes:**   Yes.

**Torgie Madison:**   Theoretically, to get a lower amount, but to more projects.

**David Keyes:**   So, do folks want to tell me now?

**Torgie Madison:**   I volunteer.

**Rene Peters:**   I already responded to the email.

**Camille Malonzo:**   I volunteer.

**David Keyes:**   Is that Camille?

**Camille Malonzo:**   Yes.

**Torgie Madison:**   It is a lot of work. It's understandable if--no pressure.

**David Keyes:**   Just one more thing on the time frame:  I don't know if it's in Delia's email, but basically, she will do a orientation for folks at a time that works for folks. That will probably be the first week in February, roughly. And then you will have about three weeks or so. And depending upon the numbers of reviewers, it's 15 to 20 or so applications. You usually have about three weeks to do it. Scores, then. CTAB is the second week in March. Then we'll have the review meeting probably that first week in March, or maybe the very end of February, depending upon peoples' schedules.

**Tyler Woebkenberg:**  How long does each application take to read?

**Torgie Madison:**   That's very up to the reader. I tend to go really in the weeds. I'll bring up tabs on the organization. I'll bring up meta information, get a bigger picture of what the project is. You don't have to do that. They can be like half an hour each, something like that.

**David Keyes:**   I was going to say 15 minutes to 45 minutes. That also depends in part upon how many comments you make. Those comments provide information for us to give feedback to the organizations, also. So, if they do make it or they don't make it, it's a way for us to help them with their capacity and their projects, as we+

ll. Your comments are valuable.

**Torgie Madison:**   The applications are very structured, so as you get to the halfway point, you'll find yourself getting faster because you will know what to scroll past, the boilerplate text.

**Tracy Brown:**   I have to go. My husband is here.

**David Keyes:**   I don't know if there is anyone else who has joined us. We've got Mark DeLoura, Steven Maheshwary. There may be one other person on the phone I can't identify.

**Torgie Madison:**   I see Sean McClelland and Tyron Grandison.  If anyone has joined, but didn't make an introduction, if you're on the phone please say hi.

**Ashley:**   Hi. Good evening. My name is Ashley…. [on skype- not certain of name]

**David Keyes:**   Great! Excellent. Can you drop me an email just so we make sure you're on the list and get your contact info, too? If you have questions, you can ask me and I'll refer them to the board. This is David, so it's david.keyes@seattle.gov.

**Ashley:**   Absolutely. Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

**David Keyes:**   Anybody else in terms of signing up that we missed.

**John Krull:**   I'll volunteer to recruit Seattle Pacific University students. They helped last year.

**Torgie Madison:**   If you want to think about it, then get in touch with David within the next few days. Or Delia Burke delia.burke@seattle.gov , if you got that email from her, feel free to reach out.  Moving right along. I think we're pretty close to the end. We can move the web site review to net month's meeting, if we start going over. I didn't want to keep anyone past one hour.

**David Keyes:**   I do want to do a brief note on digital equity legislation. Just a quick note. I will have more tomorrow, but there is a State digital equity act being proposed by Rep. Mia Gregerson and a number of other sponsors. There was a first hearing on that last Friday.  The bill is being revised and rewritten in this short session. We're working on integrating the current framework in the State broadband work. So, that is expected to be voted on in the committee on Friday. So, it's moving pretty fast. Then it will go to appropriations eventually. There will be a Senate bill in the next couple of weeks, I'd expect. Anything the board can to do support that--I'll have the revised bill in the next day and can send that out to everyone.

**Torgie Madison:**   I read that legislation and it sort of looks like the Technology Matching Fund, but bigger.  It supports Technology Matching Funds in local jurisdictions.

**David Keyes:**   Yes. Basically, it would do two or three things. It would support local communities doing digital inclusion plans, and starting to implement projects. It would have a competitive grant that organizations, be it local government, or schools, or community organizations, or companies could apply for to do digital equity projects. And then, it would also have an element that would encourage the sharing of best practices and capacity building, and network evaluation. It is modeled after the federal legislation, and it will also tithe back to the State's goals on broadband deployment to bring in the adoption side of it, previously work on community technology.

**Steven Maheshwary:**   Maybe we should do something officially as a board, if we could.

**Torgie Madison:**   Yes. We have to do that basically now, because the vote is on Friday.

**David Keyes:**   Yes. It's a short session legislature. Sixty days.

**Torgie Madison:**   I don't want to ask the board to vote on something we haven't seen. It' kind of tough to get a vote out in time. We haven't even had a chance to see it and review it. I've looked at it. I like it, but I haven't seen the revisions. So, I could endorse it personally.

**John Krull:**  We could tell the board that we are in favor of it, and then relay that to the representatives from our area.

**Torgie Madison:**   Yes.  Do we want to read 73 pages of State legislation?

**David Keyes:**   Yes. There is a summary out.

**Torgie Madison:**   I wish there was a way to vote on things asequentially, so we would put up a poll or something, and say at this meeting we agree to vote on something within a week. Something like that. But that's not really how it works.

**David Keyes:**   I'm just thinking out loud here, but one possibility would be to endorse the concept of a State bill that would support these things, with a condition or proviso that we support with comment.

**Torgie Madison:**   I think time is a little short to get a vote on it right now. But, I have been following it, and it looks like a really good bill.

**David Keyes:**   And I'll send out the information. It's HB 2413.  I'm just searching to see if I can pull it up.

**Torgie Madison:**   I'd like to move along to ....

**David Keyes:**   Just on other thing. I'll just mention, too, there's going to be a first hearing federally for the Digital Equity Act, in the House Energy and Commerce Committee on the 29th of January. That announcement just came out today. We're hoping that Saad Bashir will be able to speak at that Congressional hearing. We don't know that for sure yet. I'll send info about that with a link.

**Steven Maheshwary:**   Did you say Saad will be speaking to the Congressional committee?

**David Keyes:**   We don't know. We're in touch with the House commerce staff. There is interest in having some local representatives, and we are potentially being put forward for consideration to testify, and so, we're talking to them, but it ultimately has to, even though it's a week late, go to the chairs of the House committee and be vetted for approval for testifying. We don't know for sure that that is going to happen yet.

**Torgie Madison:**   Is there budget to get us all roundtrip tickets to DC?

**David Keyes:**   Dream on. I'm sorry this is happening in January, but we might as well put that on the agenda for the February meeting when Saad is here, to get it in place for the future. One thing to think about, too, is the National Digital Inclusion Alliance conference in in Portland in April. There might be some great opportunity for us to attend that.

**Torgie Madison:**   All right. Thank you for that info. I know that the committees have just gotten started for the 2020 year, so there isn't a lot to say about what you've accomplished yet, but maybe we cn just get the new leadership or continuing leadership to speak?

**COMMITTEE UPDATES**

**Smart Cities**

**Rene Peters:**   Yes, absolutely. I definitely wanted to give Tyler Woebkenberg a chance to introduce himself as the incoming new chair of the Smart Cities and Community Innovation subcommittee. So take it away.

**Tyler Woebkenberg:**   Sure. I'll be quick, as well, given timing. I guess I'll give a little more comprehensive introduction to myself.

I'm Tyler Woebkenberg. I'm currently at Salesforce.org here in Seattle, working with nonprofits and customers in the social sector. What drew me most to Smart Cities was recently in the past couple of years, I've finished up a master's degree at NYU on urban informatics and data science. We worked around Smart Cities concepts, so I'm very excited about the content. Like Rene said, I've just joined, so we haven't done anything yet. I'm looking forward to great meetings.

**Rene Peters:**   Yes, and I'll just add something that Tyler is playing down. He was really instrumental to the work that Maitreyee Joshi and I were trying to spearhead last year. So he really had a lot of good perspective to add. I'm excited about the vision that he will bring to the subcommittee this year. I'm looking forward to seeing it all come together.

**Torgie Madison:**   Thanks for stepping up to the leadership position. John, you are continuing on as chair of the Digital Equity subcommittee?

**Digital Equity Committee**

**John Krull:**   We had a short meeting. Basically, the committee wants to do less on recommendations and more on service and promote digital equity beyond what we're already doing with the matching fund. So that came up. There was one idea for having a group to focus on City housing for seniors. First off, just looking at the issue, but then combining digital equity with health access, having access beyond one generalized access, but to be focused on health. That's one idea.

**Torgie Madison:**   Cool. Thanks for continuing to lead on that committee. I believe we have Camille Malonzo online. She was very, very helpful during my chairing of the Privacy and Cyber Security Committee. So, I'm very happy to have her volunteering and stepping up to chair the Privacy Committee. Do you want to say hi, Camille?

**Privacy and Cyber Security Committee**

**Camille Malonzo:**   Yes. Thanks so much. My name is Camille. I will be chairing the Privacy and Cyber Security Committee this year.  We will have our first meeting of the year next Tuesday, which I think is the 27th, 6:00 at the Capitol Hill Library meeting room. I'm really excited about it. I think a lot of it will be reconnecting with the advisory committee working on the Surveillance Ordinance. (unintelligible)  And we will also go over other privacy and security interests. Also, I think we have a list. On that list, we would like to connect with the rest of you. My email is camillemalonzoATgmailDOTcom. I'll be sending out an email next week.

**Torgie Madison:**   Thank you!

**John Krull:**   I usually like to pitch my meeting too. And I was reminded to do so. Our next meeting is next week. It's also Tuesday at 6:00 p.m. We used to meet at the CISC building, which is in the International District. We've moved to the Bush Garden restaurant, which is kind of kitty corner from there. So, like always, we have good food and drink at our meetings.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Yes. I'm sorry about that. I didn't realize. I think for next week, we'll fix that so that the other subcommittees don't overlap.

**John Krull:**    I don't know if you need to.  I know it works for some of the other people to have the meetings on the same night as the CTAB meeting, two weeks before.

**Torgie Madison:**   The Privacy Committee used to hold their meetings on the 4th Tuesday of the month, knowing that CTAB is the second Tuesday.

**John Krull:**   Yes. That's what I'm doing. I think people are only attending one committee meeting, so if they have to pick, I don't think it's that bad.

**Torgie Madison:**   Yes, that's really not a bad idea. Maybe the three of you could coordinate and agree to hold the meetings on the same day. That way, we're not writing a bunch of different random dates on the board, which I remember everyone scrambling to write it down. If there is a expected day that they were being held....

**John Krull:**   It helps me because I know that on Tuesdays--I keep it in the back of my head that Tuesday at 6:00, I might have a meeting.

**Harte Daniels:**  I put in my comments for the minutes on the inequity of urban education on diversity, and some comments on privacy that Camille may want to look at, considering that there was a new law passed in California. I didn't have her email address, so I sent it to you, the minute taker, and David Keyes.

**David Keyes:**   Camille, I can jump on and forward it to you.

**Torgie Madison:**   Some general expectations for the committees:  I'll be very brief. The committees should hold monthly meetings, as reasonable. The committees usually self-direct. The CTAB leadership is here to support the committees, but they are generally self-guided. All of the projects will come from the community. I already introduced you, Tyler Woebkenberg, to someone that I met when Rene Peters and I spoke at UW yesterday. We spoke in front of the Change group at UW and did an introduction. There were about 30 people there, I'd say. We had some good conversations. I quickly wanted to make that contact happen. Last year, the subcommittees were loosely asked to host a panel discussion or some sort of public event. It doesn't have to be a panel discussion, *per se*.  It could be a presentation of some of the work you're doing, but some sort of event is nice to see from the committees to get some public engagement. Just pointing that out. You have a whole year to figure that out.

Once again, thank you to the people who have stepped up to the positions or continued on. It can be a big responsibility. So, we are very happy to have you. If we can agree really quickly, I move to do the web site review portion of this meeting in February's meeting, or possibly take it offline, and maybe I can start a document and share that with people. I have a whole bunch of notes that I can share with everyone, and maybe get comment offline. Maybe we can bring it back on the agenda in February's meeting to actually request changes to the web site. Is that from you that we make those requests?

**David Keyes:**   Yes. I think there will be two phases of it in a sense, because one is simpler content changes, and the next is structural changes that could potentially require work with our public engagement web team. But it still would be good to get on the map where we're going with that. As you're reviewing, just think about that and how to simplify it. And I think starting a list would be great. People could add to the list and consolidate or organize it a bit, and say here's what we're finding; here is the feedback and bring that into the whole meeting.

**Torgie Madison:**     Like a change request?  I've received a lot of change requests. I could probably write one. I think we have to make a motion to get it off the agenda, right? I move to, instead of reviewing the CTAB web site at this meeting right now, to take that discussion offline and come back in February with recommendations to Seattle IT.

**Rene Peters:**   I second that motion.

**Torgie Madison:**   Rene seconds. Oh, we didn't actually do the aye or nay on voting for the minutes and agenda.

**Cass Magnuski:**  I knew that.

**Torgie Madison:**   All those in favor of taking the discussion offline and voting on the recommendations at the next meeting, say 'aye.' Motion passes.  With that, we just have wrap up and next steps. This would be a good time for brief public comment.

**Harte Daniels:**  Mine were written.

**Torgie Madison:**   I notice that your last point in your email was about Facebook. I have some opinions on whether or not we should be maintaining social media accounts. I'm pretty much against it personally, because I don't think we're getting much exposure. I don't know that it's a major driver of people attending.

**Harte Daniels:**  My point was about informing the public of what happens. It runs into that ball of wax with California.

**David Keyes:**   Mark and I worked on this at one point with folks looking at what it is the communication strategy is. The web site is one element of it. It may also be a piece to bring in our department communications staff. Maybe thinking about that, conceptualizing the web site in terms of a broader what is the board's communications strategy your expertise.

**Torgie Madison:**   I know we have a Facebook profile. We have a few Twitter accounts.

**David Keyes:**   There are things about the board as an extension of a City agency. We've got some limits on social media because we have an obligation to store back-ups in order to comply with public disclosure requests.

**Torgie Madison:**   I just wanted to put that idea into the back of peoples' minds to think about. Is our marketing strategy effective? Is it appropriate? How could it change? If it exists, but we don't ever post to it, is worth having?  And of course the social privacy ramifications of using social media. We will probably talk about this at some point this year. With that, if there is no other public comment, I believe this meeting is adjourned.

**ADJOURNMENT**