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**Torgie Madison:**   Welcome to the November Community Technology Advisory Board meeting. This is the last official business-related meeting we will be having this year. The December meeting is going to be our board elections, which I will talk about once we have gotten through the bulk of the agenda. And speaking of the agenda, let's go ahead and proceed with our motion and second to approve the November agenda. Can I have a motion for that?

**Ty Grandison:**  I move to approve the November agenda.

**Torgie Madison:**   Ty has made the motion. Do I have a second?

**John Krull:**  I'll second it.

**Torgie Madison:**    Get ready to unmute. All those in favor of approving the November agenda, say 'aye.'  Anyone who has a 'nay' or abstention, please say so now. All right. With that, the agenda is approved. I want to make a quick motion to add an item to the agenda. I guess I could have added it before we voted, but I wanted to keep it separate. Just after the break, we have an addition from the Technology Matching Fund group. This is a pool of money that's collected by the City that is dedicated to community projects, grassroots projects. The money is allocated every year, just in case everybody doesn't know what the TMF acronym stands for. So, I would like to move to add a presentation from Vicky Yuki and the Technology Matching Fund at about 7:00 p.m. Do I have a second?

**John Krull:**  Second.

**Torgie Madison:**    John seconds. All those in favor of adding the agenda item, please say 'aye.' Are there any 'nays' or abstentions? Motion passes. We will add that agenda item at around 7:00. Our last item of business is to approve the October meeting minutes. I hope you've had a chance to review those. You can always find those at <https://ctab.seattle.gov/> .Do I have a motion to approve the October minutes?

**Rene Peters:**  I'll move to approve the October minutes.

**Torgie Madison:**    All right. Rene has the motion. Do I have a second?

**Ty Grandison:**   I'll second.

**Torgie Madison:**   Once again, all those in favor of approving the October minutes, please say 'aye.' Are there any 'nays' or abstentions? All right, and with that, the motion passes. So, we can move right along through introductions. I have one person I'd like to pick on a little bit, and call out ahead of everyone else. We have David Kirichenko, who is our newest Get Engaged member. So, maybe David, you could take the floor and say a little bit about yourself?

**David Kirichenko:**   Thank you for the introduction. Good evening, everyone. My name is David Kirichenko, and I am a Get Engaged Fellow. I'm really happy to be serving on this board, alongside of you, and I am looking forward to contributing. I currently work for Amazon out of Seattle. I am also a Seattle Global Shaper; and I also serve as an adjunct instructor at Green River College, where I teach programming and data analytics courses.

**Torgie Madison:**    Awesome. Thank you for that and welcome to the board. I believe this is your first time attending, so you've gotten a little taste of what our procedure is like. You are also, as a full-fledged member, able to vote on issues, so you can join in with the 'ayes' and the 'nays.' Usually we would do something social, and greet you and make you feel at home. But we can't do that right now. I think your insights and contributions will be valuable. For anyone who isn't aware, the Get Engaged program is a membership through the YMCA to get engaged younger members of the public on the board contributing and participating in civic engagement. So, we can move along. Let's go ahead and start at the top of the participants list. For all of you who are on the app, you can open the participants list by clicking at the bottom right, if you are on a PC at least. I'll try to move it along. Hopefully, when you see your name on that list, you will know where you are. The introductions are pretty brief. We just mention our names, say a little about ourselves.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

**Torgie Madison:**   All right. Let's proceed. Sorry about the introductions. They always take a bit longer than they used to when we met in person. But, let's move right along to our first presentation. This is from the Chief Privacy Officer of Seattle, Ginger Armbruster.

**CHIEF PRIVACY OFFICER PRESENTATION**

**Ginger Armbruster:**   Hello, everybody. I was asked to come and give an update on the Surveillance Working Group, and I have slides. But I want to take just a minute to maybe give more of an introduction on what I do and what my team does. It has grown since I last talked to CTAB, and I haven't spoken to many of you in quite a while, or some of you at all. I want to introduce myself, my team, and then go into what the Surveillance Working Group is and what we do around surveillance.

When I last spoke to CTAB, really all I did was privacy and compliance to the Surveillance Ordinance. I'm not going to do a show of hands because we're all not together, but I'm wondering how many of you know about the Surveillance Ordinance. I going to take a minute and tell you about that. But first, I'm going to tell you what I am and who I am. I came to the City to be the Chief Privacy Officer in 2017. I had a team of three people that we built to run a privacy review process, determine what a privacy program ought to be for the City, and work on the newly enacted Surveillance Ordinance. Since that time, over the last three years, and very recently, I've added some additional function. So, my team now is comprised of the open data team, so we're responsible for open data; data governance, which is how we use data internally as a critical City asset for performance management and a few other items, by making sure we use data appropriately against all of our laws and compliance issues. I am now taking on the public records program, so when a public record is requested of the City, there is a program to help manage that across all departments. We've got 34 public disclosure officers on the dotted line now, too. But, I'll be taking on that program, which has compliance implications as well as State-wide reporting requirements. And finally, I'll be also taking on e-discovery, so Electronic Discovery responsibilities for my team. So, lots more than when I first started out with just privacy. I wanted to make you all aware of that. If any of those are of interest to you, and you want to hear more, I'll be happy to come back to this group and tell you more about it.

So, now I'll get to the topic at hand. What is the Surveillance Working group? And what is the Surveillance Ordinance. If this is information that is old to many of you, my apologies. For those for whom it is new, I'll try to be brief but complete. In 2017, we enacted a redo of the Surveillance. This was added new when I realized how many new people were on this group. The Surveillance Ordinance speaks to the City trying to get their arms around how we use a specialized type of technology that surveils people Surveillance was defined as technology that analyzes, tracks, and monitors identifiable individuals in a way that may impact on civil liberties and other civil rights. A reasonable gauge of that. So, it does not include data, necessarily, but it includes the acquisition of technologies. And we spent a six-week period of time to do an audit internally, to figure what technologies those were. And we came up with a master list. What is in use now that we would we do a retroactive review for an approval process through the City Council. And any new technology would have to go through this review before we purchased and put it in place. So, hopefully, that gives you a background on this law. There's lots more. There's reporting, there's lots of exemptions, so certain technologies are exempted, body worn camera video, for example; red light cameras, security cameras. Cameras that are used on critical infrastructure for security purposes, so consider dams or the undersides of bridges, and anything that has a consent option or notice. So, if you're in a place that says 'Cameras are in use,' that wouldn't be surveillance. You know that's already in use.

The idea around the review and approval process is to do basically very in-depth privacy review, talk about how data is used, and shared and collected, and protected. I do a fiscal analysis. Through public engagement, we had one of those at the end of October for the three technologies that are under review now. I'll talk about that in a minute. And then we present all of this information to Council. Cara Vallier would be the recipient to take a look at does this technology do what it is supposed to. Do we have policy in place protecting individuals from civil liberties concerns, any advice, any changes? Part of that review process is comment and review by an external advisory group. That's a surveillance advisory working group. Their job, as an external body, four are appointed by the Mayor and three are appointed by City Council, so seven in all take a look at these technologies and come up with a list of any concerns around the technologies, the policies in place, are they adequate, are there other concerns from a civil liberties community perspective. Five of those positions are from community groups, the idea there being we want to hear from community groups that may feel disparately impacted by surveillance; and two are at-large members. Those are folks who have interest in this area, like CTAB members, but do not necessarily represent a community engaged in this issue. So, that's the surveillance advisory working group. They've been meeting now for probably a year. It was added as an amendment to the ordinance that was in place. What we do is give them six to eight weeks to review any of the surveillance impact assessments, and allow them to give us feedback that we can respond to. The CTO has a written response they can make for any concerns. All of that is presented to Council to help them in making their decisions for something we need to pursue. So, that's the background. I hope that gives you a setting of who I am, what my group does, and what this conversation is about.

Now, I want to give you an update on what this working group has been up to, and an update on surveillance, generally.

I'm going to talk about the surveillance impact reviews. We call them SIRs, the submission status for where we're at. The CTO equity report, that's an annual report that is due to talk about are we meeting our goals with the policy that's been in put in place and approved by Council, and finally, more about the working group and interests you might have in knowing more about them.

We have divided 26 technologies into four groups. We try to do that, at request from Council, early on, as we cannot look at each of these technologies individually and have an in-depth conversation--could you please put these into groupings so that we can look at these together. Hopefully, they have something to do with one another and we can look at them as a group. So that's what we've done. Group One was kind of a trial run. We had two technologies approved last December, and they were SDOT technologies, so not having to do with police surveillance, but having to do with other technologies. We ended up with four departments which submitted technologies that we determined could meet the definition of surveillance. Most, as you would imagine, were with police, but we had technologies with City Light, with the Fire Department, and with transportation. So, Group Two: What are we doing? Right now, we are ready to submit for review and hopefully approval, with Council, the following technologies. And we are planning to submit those on Monday. If everything goes well, and we're still in communication with Council to make sure we're doing all of the things they're expecting in getting this the way they want. And while we may be submitting them here in November, considering their schedule and what they will be taking on, they probably won't be looking at these until January or February of next year. They're kind of Seattle City Light technologies that are used for current diversion investigation. Acyclica, which may be familiar to some of you from watching the privacy landscape, this is a technology that looks at how to do traffic pattern and evaluation of how long it takes to get to the downtown core using a mobile device technology sensor. Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) -- and you'll see this both for fire and for police, that's what CAD is. 911 Logging Recorder, which logs all of the 911 calls for later use for analysis, for a variety of reasons. ALPR stands for Automated License Plate Reader. We use that for patrol reasons. You'll see it here twice. One is for patrol and one is parking enforcement use for SPD. And then there's SPD.CAD, computer aided dispatch; and this technology is used at the time of a 911 call to dispatch the appropriate resources, depending on who is calling and for what reason. And finally, CopLogic, which is a portal for input on events, where you might have a cop come out and take your report or you can give it this way. I personally used it when my car was broken into. It was easier than having to wait for someone to come out and take my report. I was able to do this, get a police ID, and be able to use that for insurance. So, it's got a variety of uses, including a retail core use, which allows store owners to use this as a way to communicate with police about suspicious activity or other illegal activity. So, all of those have been reviewed. I'm going to give you the link right here. <https://www.seattle.gov/tech/initiatives/privacy/surveillance-technologies> . You're going to get these slides. If you want to go and read those SIRs, read about the technology and what it's used for, and also make public comment, you are able to do that. For Group Two, those are going in now. Public comment will close, I think, Friday, but we'll make sure you have access if you have a few minutes here before the end of the week. Or, if you want to make comment afterwards, you can do that here. And then, just to let you know, we just did public engagement soliciting public comment for the following technologies that are in Group Three. King County Forward Looking Infra-red sensor (FLIR) is a mutual aid call that the Seattle Police Department may make to King County if they are flying their helicopter, Guardian One, this sensor can help find targets that are picked up on infra-red. That information is then requested if they are flying for SPD for use in investigations. Situation awareness cameras, without recording, but still are used by folks in SWAT team investigations if they need to know what's around the corner, over a fence, behind a barrier. So, this gives them situation awareness video. This is not recorded. And finally, video recording systems that are used in police stations are used to record events that are happening in interview rooms, blood alcohol situations where people are brought in for that reason, anywhere inside the police department, while they are inside, are being used to log the information and record it. We are looking to submit Group Three, these three, in January, and this is active now. So, the SIRs are available, public comment is available for these, but that same link for the SIRs will take you to any of the historical SIRs. If you're interested in seeing what are those last technologies that are being submitted, complete SIRs will be posted there.

When they're done -- and I have to say we're still finalizing the CTO responses and putting those together, but they will be available on the same web site. I would ask for questions, but why don't I do that at the very end. I'm sure there will be some.

I do want to tell you that we had hoped to be done, and by law were supposed to be done with all of these by September of 2020. Because of Covid, we had to put everything on hold, as you may be aware. The Governor put all non-Covid-related government activity on hold. And by the time we got back to business in late June, there was no way to make a September deadline for all of the submissions that needed to happen, so we requested and received a six-month extension, which means all of the retroactive SIRs, all 26 of those technologies, will be due to Council by March 1. I have a very busy team, so I better hope we get that done by then.

Our Group Three public engagement happened on the 28th of October. We had a one-hour event. We got to check out Webex and see how that works. I think we had somewhere over 40 attendees. People came and went, depending on their interest levels. But information about these technologies and the recording of the meeting, if you want to review that, is posted on our public web site. So, you can see that there. I think it went okay. We got feedback about ways to make it better. I think for Group Four, which will be coming up, it seems to be a little bit more of the surveillance undercover technologies, people indicated they probably want some more time. Not just one noon hour, but some additional time. So, we'll probably be expanding this public engagement.

I wanted to let you know that another thing the working group does, while they're writing their reviews, if they're supposed to be advising us on public engagement, give us some ideas about how to improve our outreach to community members, they also review an equity report we do. It's submitted in September. What it's supposed to do is look at how have we done against policies that were approved by Council. Since we haven't had any new technologies really approved since our last submission, and all of this has been so delayed because of amendments and changes to the law that happened over three years, we really don't have a lot of meat to that equity report. It is also on our web site. If you want to take a look at what that looks like, I think we will have more content coming out next year. And we may be reaching out to CTAB to see if you want to participate in any part of the equity report as we help to gather SIRs, community member concerns, and any other issues that might help us improve how we're running our surveillance monitoring; even policy.

Finally, what is a working group? I've mentioned it; I've told you a little bit about it. Their primary role is to review SIRs. They have a six-week review period, with a two-week extension, if needed. And usually, they need it. It's important for them to elect co-chairs.

We have two people who are supposed to be running this organization, very much like CTAB. They have to at least hold meetings quarterly by law, but they can be more frequent, depending on workload. And then they comment on the CTO equity report. They provide input on public engagement and how we improve that, as I mentioned before. And creation of any bylaws, just like you have established. They're still developing theirs. And finally, membership, as I mentioned, is Mayoral and Council appointments, four from the Mayor, three from Council. And as I mentioned, community members represent five of those positions. At-large members represent two.

And that is it. These are public meetings, so we do place them on our calendar, which is also on our web site. Those links will take you there. And if you look at our calendar, you are more than welcome to attend any of these meetings. We don't have public comment, but it's an opportunity to see how we're doing and leave personal questions on site. Or you may want to get involved with providing your own comments about the technologies we're reviewing. I hope I didn't take too much of your time, but I'm happy to answer any questions if you have some.

**Torgie Madison:**   Thank you so much for your presentation. That was pretty much perfect. Exactly 15 minutes. Well done! so, we can open this up to the board, and the public. If you have any questions, you can post them to chat, and Ginger should be able to take a few.

**Ty Grandison:**   This is Ty Grandison. The presentation was really eye-opening. So this group is about review and commentary on technologies that are approved. Is there another group that is dealing with the apps that are dealing with enforcement? The reason I am asking this is because of the report that came out about SPD using Clearview AI....

**Ginger Armbruster:** You are so on it, because that's exactly what I've dealt with most of today. I'm glad you asked the question. I'm happy to answer it. This group is not talking about proof technologies. We are talking about technologies right now that are in use already that need to be reviewed to make sure our policy is up to date and they're using them as they should. Clearview is the article you're speaking to. That was brought to our attention that a public request had revealed that it looked as though there was some activity around Clearview. Clearview, if you're not familiar, is facial recognition technology and artificial intelligence facial recognition technology. SPD does not use facial recognition technology. The only one they used at one time was a booking comparison software. They decided it was not effective, and not really important to the work they do. We are investigating this because there are a few aspects of this type that are not clear to us. It looks as though there were just some aspects of this. So, it's under investigation right now.

The Office of Inspector General is investigating and so is the Office of Police Accountability. So, I can't speak to exactly what is, but I can say that it's under review. It's a little more complicated than one would hope. I think we'll have a full report on this, Ty. In terms of enforcement, that was exactly my question. I can be really involved in review and approval and policy. Enforcement is a different argument. Enforcement is who is going to investigate this. Although I have ten people on my team now, we do all different things. I don't have anybody to take those on. but that's why the Office of Inspector General is going to be taking this on for police questions. Anything that comes up about police technologies that should or should not be in use, to make sure that they are following policies that are established. And the City Auditor will take on anything that's not SPD. So, as I mentioned, we had Seattle City Light, Department of Transportation, Seattle Fire Department would take on anything that is not SPD. SPD has at its disposal the Office of Police Accountability, so they have a deep process for review, and that's what we're undergoing now. They're going to be expediting this particular one, because they're hopeful that this is an interview process and they can get through it relatively quickly, but that's all I can tell you. Usually, these investigations can take several months. So, wait here at this station to hear more. What we did establish is we will not be doing enforcement but investigation. And once a finding is made, we will go back to the departments to make sure they're using technologies appropriately. So, hopefully, that answers some of your question.

**Ty Grandison:**   Fantastic. Because I thought it was on your approved list.

**Ginger Armbruster:**  Yes, it wasn't even on the review. We heard over and over from SPD that they were not using facial recognition.

**Ty Grandison:**   Perfect. Second question:  You mentioned that there are many exceptions. Are the exceptions per device category, or are they per device use?

**Ginger Armbruster:**  By device category. I think what happened was there was a discussion about some technologies, like body-worn cameras, have really met policy expectations and were put in by executive order in the first place. So, they kind of are outside of our normal process. As an example, cameras that are used for red light type enforcement and other legal requirements are kind of outside of this, because they've got laws that are attached to them. Security cameras, especially the ones that are noticed--security camera in use in this building, for example--thee are devices that have been identified that are outside of the scope of our look at this. I think the real intention of this ordinance was to look at technologies' use, so you have a point. Is there any technology you can use here, but you can't use it there? That really depends on things like notice. So, cameras are fine, as long as you know they're all on, right? That would be an example. If it's a camera that's being used that you don't know is being used, now we're talking surveillance. That might be an example of that. For the most part, if you look at the list of exemptions, if you go to our web site, you'll be able to see. For the most part, these exemptions were put in as technologies. So, hopefully that answers that. If you go here, that link will take you -- and I'll make sure this is available to everybody. That link will take you to our site. You'll be able to see information about privacy, information about surveillance technologies, but also the law, and all of the other things that would help you understand a bit better how this is used.

<https://www.seattle.gov/tech/initiatives/privacy/surveillance-technologies>  Thanks for the good questions. Anyone else?

**Torgie Madison:**   Yes, we had a question in chat from Nicole Espy. Do you want to ask that? And we'll get to Nicole's introduction after this. She joined a little bit late.

**Nicole Espy:**  Yes, my question was about you mentioning the need to improve public engagement in your review of the technologies. So, I just wondered what sort of steps are being taken to help with this review, and what can CTAB do to get involved?

**Ginger Armbruster:**  I could ask you guys to come. That would be good. Usually, when we hold a public engagement, when we were doing them in person, we planned for a cast of thousands, because we thought there would be a lot of interest in showing up for these events. But we would get eight to fifteen people, and it's hard to know why. I think a lot of people are interested, but when it comes to maybe schlepping across town when we were doing these in person at 6:00 at night, maybe the interest wanes. We've got family responsibility, and are tired at the end of the day. Who knows? We did them online, and we expected more attendees, and we did get more attendees. I don't know. We are open to suggestions. We've opened that up to the working group. I open it up to you. If you want to help advertise these events as they come up. It's really hard. Public engagement seems like it would be a no-brainer. You all are engaged. You showed up tonight. You show up on a regular basis. But it is hard to get the public interested, especially when you ask a narrow question. Part of my philosophy on this is we're asking narrow questions. We're saying, 'we have three technologies for you to look at: FLIR, and situational awareness cameras.' People maybe don't gravitate to that as much as they might for general surveillance discussion. Let's just talk about surveillance generally. Now I can engage with that. So, it's hard. On our site we translate this into seven different languages; we explain the technology. So, were trying to help people to get close to it. In this time when we can't have meetings -- the Library is where we used to do it in communities -- we are limited in how we can get people interested in attending. We're open to any suggestions. Really, how can we do this better? Ask the questions during the meetings, after the meetings, to anyone who wants to hear? If you have opinions, come to us, please. ginger.armbruster@seattle.gov. I'm happy to hear anything you might have to help us make sure we're reaching community.

You asked about Group Three. We had not intended to, Camille, mostly because we were on such a tight schedule to get this done, but we did extend our public comment period, so that folks can have an opinion about this. But we did not consider doing another event, because I think we kind of felt that we don't usually get good attendance. So doing more of the same may get the same people showing up again, but not really get any community.

**Camille Malonzo:**  So, when is the closing of the comment period?

**Ginger Armbruster:**  I think it's Friday. However, we have a place for you to comment at any time. We are happy to take comments at any time. The reason we have an open and closed period is not to make it difficult for people. The reason we do that is that we need to grab those comments, do some analysis on them, and bundle them into the SIRs, the Surveillance Impact Reviews that we have to submit to Council. So, we've got to put little parentheses around this when we have a limited period time.

**Camille Malonzo:**    I think the extension, which is great, given all of the adjustments that have to be made. Could you walk us through a general timeline for -- I think your final deadline is March 1. Is that for all of the technologies?

**Ginger Armbruster:**  Group Two is going in on Monday. Group Three is going in the first week of January. And Group Four is going in right at the deadline, if we can get them all done. And so they are in various stages of completion. Each of these SIRs take somewhere between seven and nine months to complete, because of the public engagement, because of the eight weeks they've set for the working group, because of the drafting time and the back and forth. Our job -- we don't write these as much as we work with departments to help us write them.

We have the questions. We've come up with the template. We're here to help make this happen. But think of us as project managers. I don't know if these technologies are operational in nature and not necessarily as central as IT service. So, I go to SPD and we get with the investigative officers who use something. And we say we have 51 questions we need you to answer. Can you? And they're not yes and no. They're essay questions. Could you help us fill this in. What are the policies? How do you use these? What is the purpose? What are the security measures?  All of these things. So, we work to make sure those answers are complete and legible and make sense and answer the questions. And then we do this project management piece around public engagements. It takes close to nine months for each of these, even though we're getting better every day. It just takes time.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Right. On the point of public engagement with the community members on the working group, has there ever been conversation -- I know, the narrow question, but also reaching out to particular groups and communities and organizations. Or I guess, sorry -- to utilize the organizations of which the surveillance working group members are from in order to elicit more conversation there? I know you have the open house, but that's a pretty broad call. Are the other communities that are being asked to participate?

**Ginger Armbruster:**   Well, the main thing where we have people representing communities on the advisory group is to provide that. And it's really up to them to see if they can help us represent. And really, they're like CTAB. You are entirely to decide how you want to do that work. We have one and a half people, if you count me, and I actually have other things that I do, too. So, we are very limited in our resources. You probably hear that from City people a lot. It's not a cop-out. It's for real. We just don't have the kind of outreach. And that what the advisory group is designed to do. It's designed to help Cara and company make informed decisions with community input. And that's really what they're designed to help with. So, I can have a bunch of great ideas, but I just don't have staffing and resources to do that outreach and do my day job. So, we are really relying on that advisory group to help us with that. So, we're hoping to engage people who are interested, engaged, actually helping to spread that information with their community group.

**Camille Malonzo:**   I posted this in the chat, but it is different than the public engagement question. Have you spoken about how the Surveillance Ordinance is mostly a retrospective on currently used technologies, and a review on those technologies? Is there a process for new technologies? Let's say a department wants to utilize or adopt a new technology that may or may not be a surveillance technology? Is there a process thro0ugh which they can appropriately engage with your office, as well as public engagement, to, in the spirit of the Surveillance Ordinance do good?

**Ginger Armbruster:**   You will recognize the 26 technologies is a very small proportion of how many technologies the City actually manages. We have a privacy program that reviews all new technology acquisitions. They go through IT. We have done 3,000 reviews since we stood this process up, and part of that is to identify if something is a surveillance technology or not. But the privacy review is not as in-depth as the surveillance questions, but they are in the same spirit. How are you collecting data? Who are you sharing it with? How are you securing it? Are there regulatory oversight issues which we need to be concerned about? Are you collecting HIPPA data? Are you collecting seamless data? All of these. And we are involved in project review also. So, we have a process by which we review projects as they move along to completion. And we are reviewing for privacy concerns along the way. Surveillance bubbles up, because we ask surveillance questions. Are you analyzing, monitoring, tracking people in a way they could have civil liberties concerns? This is one of our questions. But that process is available to identify a high privacy risk technology. We do go through a privacy impact assessment, which should be familiar to some of you in the privacy world. It goes into that depth of question. Those are the same questions in the surveillance impact reviews, the first part of it, the first 51 questions or so are represented in that privacy impact assessment. We do have those posted on our web site, as well for any technology that has gone through that kind of rigor. And that's most of what privacy is, and surveillance is 'oh by the way.' Now, for new technologies that we identify, they have to go through a review and approval before they're acquired. So, we're still working through the retroactive stuff. But anything that's new has to go through this review process. So, we have had these on hold for about three years, because any new technology that we've been waiting to get through this retroactive list. And there are reasons why that was delayed, but we are moving along now, and we are hopeful to see anything new and be able to take this into account. You might imagine where those are. They are in police, but they're also in transportation. A lot of the Smart Cities type technologies lend themselves to a little bit of surveillance. What we do is advise departments when they do come to us with something, and we go, well, that's surveillance, but here's how it won't be. Let's put a sign up. Let's make notice. Let's de-identify. We help them mitigate those issues so that we can hopefully make them not surveillance, and make them still do what they're designed to do, but not in a way that collects data and civil liberties.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Thank you, Ginger.

**Torgie Madison:**  All right. Thank you so much. Unfortunately, we do not have time for anymore questions. Thank you so much. We usually applaud speakers, but we will have to put that in chat this time.

**Ginger Armbruster:**  If you have any more questions, you know where to reach me. You can reach me through any of the people here, and I am happy to answer any additional questions. Take good care, everybody.

**Torgie Madison:** Thank you for your time. I will take the time to circle back to introductions. We have Nicole. Would you like to introduce yourself?

**Nicole Espy:**  Hi. I'm Nicole. I work with Camille on the Privacy and Cyber-security Committee. Thank you.

**Torgie Madison:**  And it looks like Dorene has picked up an audio device, so maybe Dorene, you can introduce yourself?

**Dorene Cornwell:**   Hi. I'm Dorene Cornwell. I live in Judkins Park. I do lots of advocacy around digital inclusion and transportation.

**Torgie Madison:**   Great. Thank you. And I have a call-in user who might be Steven Maheshwary. Is Steven on the line? (No answer.) Okay. No Steven. But that should cover it. So, let's move right along. Sorry about the late start, but we have a collaboration that was just started off by Rene Peters. Thank you, Rene, for doing the bulk of the work to put this together. the San Francisco Tech Council is here to tell us what is going on in their City.

**SAN FRANCISCO TECH COUNCIL PRESENTATION**

**Karla Suomala:**  All right. My name is Karla Suomala, as I mentioned at the beginning, and my colleague, Andrew Broderick is with you this evening. We serve as project co-directors of the SF Tech Council. And we will try to zip through some of this information, just to give you a sense of who we are and what we're about. And one of the reasons that we entered into this collaboration is that Rene Peters reached out, and we discovered that we have a lot in common. In San Francisco, our organization has a very particular focus, but I think that you'll see that there are a lot of things that CTAB and SF Tech Council are doing that are quite similar.

Just to get started, the San Francisco Tech Council is a mission-driven, multi-sector initiative that brings together government, business, non-profits and consumers to advance digital inclusion for older adults and people with disabilities.

We were officially launched in April 2016, and our focus is unique in terms of its focus on older adults and people with disabilities. There are other organizations in the City that look at other groups and digital inclusion, generally. but, the City of San Francisco and a number of organizations that serve older adults and people with disabilities realize that nobody was thinking specifically about them, and that they represent a really significant portion of the population in San Francisco. My colleague will tell you a little about what we are working on and what we have been working on.

We do a couple of things in collaboration. As I mentioned, we area convening table. We bring together across boundaries and barriers; we try to break down silos. Because the issues of digital inclusion are just too big for each organization or business or segment to really solve on their own. So, we are a table. We try to get people to collaborate and bring together a whole range of resources. We work to identify policy, to advance policy, to advocate for policy that advances digital inclusion in San Francisco. And we work on a number of projects, from pilots to planning, all kinds of different things. That's what I'll be talking a little about in the next few minutes. So, those are three areas that we really focus on.

The San Francisco Tech Council, and this is a little bit different than CTAB--we are made up of 25 member organizations. We are a nonprofit organization under the auspices of a community-based organization called the Communities Living Campaign. And they really had the idea to launch us in 2015, as sort of a sub-organization. Communities Living Campaign is our fiscal sponsor. But the Tech Council, a 25-member organization, four different groupings. Community based nonprofits, private sector, City and County departments, and academia and funders. These are all equally represented in terms of our members. For example, we would love more funders, and we are working to build up our private sector. But, in general, we do have a pretty robust range of organizations. So, in our private sector we have organizations like Kaiser and Microsoft, as well as smaller businesses, as well. Community based organizations include the San Francisco Public Library, and Self Help for the Elderly, which is a very large organization here in the Bay Area. for academia, we have U.C. Berkeley, to give you a sense. All of the members are listed on our web site. In terms of our day to day activities, we meet once a month, and it is always on the third Wednesday of the month, so our next meeting is November 18, if you're interested in joining us. And our topic is Advancing Health Equity Through Digital Inclusion. And we're having people, professionals from neighborhood that serve underserved populations in San Francisco. You can check it out on our web site and join us at our meeting. We also targeted work groups that meet on a regular basis. For example, the Access and Learning group really focuses on issues of digital literacy, and basic access to broadband. We also have an employment work group, which I'll talk more about in just a few minutes. In terms of our funding, it comes primarily from the City of San Francisco through the Department of Disability and Aging Services. They are a primary source of support. Our second source of support is the Metta Fund, a san Francisco foundation that focuses on the needs of older adults. They have a particular interest in social isolation and loneliness. So, if you are interested in either, you can check out Metta Fund. They are easy to find.

So, what are some projects that we've engaged in? Over the past couple of years, Comcast is one of our member organizations, and we've promoted support of the Comcast Internet Essentials program, which has helped a lot of low-income seniors enroll in low cost broadband access (unintelligible) to the pandemic. And we're working to extend that program further and help enroll more older adults in it, so that they're able to having broadband. We have supported the deployment of refurbished computers to San Francisco nonprofits, and this is an ongoing kind of project that we're involved in. We, ourselves, don't do direct service, but we are a help in the planning and coordination of these projects. We've worked with the Mayor's Office and many other partners to advance accessible technologies for people with disabilities and older adults to make them more widely available, and to vet those kinds of things. I should stop here for a moment just to think about the question of why our focus is on older adults and adults with disabilities. One of the reasons is that these two populations often coincide and have often very, very similar needs, and they aren't populations that other organizations were really thinking about in terms of the digital divide.

I've got a few more projects that I want to tell you about. This is a year ago now, when we organized a job fair for older adults and adults with disabilities. It was sponsored by the Mayor's Office. This is a really exciting event. We really had hoped to do it again this past summer, but because of the pandemic, it didn't happen. But this is definitely something we plan to do again. There was a huge turnout. Up to 500 people showed up. We had not anticipated the level of interest in that event. We had employers from all over the City there, and there were actual on-site interviews. Another event that we've been involved with over the past couple of years is the San Francisco Public Library's Connect with Tech Week. In the past they had a tech expo that we participated in. This is something, again, we had planned to do again. It's always in May. We'd hoped to do it this year, and we plan to do it when the libraries are again open to the public. In San Francisco, they are slowly opening right now, just with curbside services. They are a huge resource for the community in terms of tech access. I'm assuming it's the same in Seattle. So, we are very hopeful for a speedy and safe reopening.

This past year we've had a couple of interesting projects. Over the past year, the Tech Council membership decided to really focus on an employment initiative. How can we really focus on older adults and adults with disabilities to help prepare them for the workforce and give them the digital skills that they would need, and to make sure that they're job-ready. We had just launched a pilot in this direction in February of last year.  As you can imagine, we didn't get far. We were just getting into the process of focus groups when we had to shut all of that down. We have since, due to the pandemic, really focused on this issue of the digital divide again based much more on basic kinds of things: WiFi access, devices, digital literacy and support. We do hope to return to this employment focus when it's safe to do so. I should note that this is a huge issue in San Francisco. Rents are insanely high, and it's pricey to live here. By 2030, fully one third of San Francisco's population will be over 60. And that number is climbing by the day as we move towards 2030. So, we have a very large population of older adults and people with disabilities who want to, and many have to remain employed for longer than they intended. So, this is something that we want to continue to think about. This past summer, we did sort of an ad hoc. It was serendipitous to work with a San Francisco start-up called Lessons Up that has been focusing on providing virtual tech lessons for older adult. And we were interested in working with them to see what they learned from working with older adults in some of our member organizations. And they provided 63 lessons across a number of organizations to older adults on anything, from getting onto Zoom, to opening an email, to connecting with their doctors. And it was a really great learning experience for us, as well as for Lessons Up and for member organizations. We sometimes collaborate with academic programs. The University of California at Berkeley has something called a fellowship program. They have programs for graduates and undergraduates. But, we worked with two teams of undergrads last spring in this program that really looks at a couple of different things: health and wellness, use, and the elderly. Our two teams that we worked with were focused on developing digital literacy tools that were designed specifically for older adults. That just isn't out there right now, and it was really promising. And we plan to work with them again this coming spring with some new teams. Over the last couple of months, during this Covid era, we have been working on a campaign called Keep Us Connected, to obtain additional funding from the City of San Francisco, to provide further devices, more money for WiFi access, more money for training.  Across the many agencies and organizations who this this kind of thing in the City, and we were able to secure about $300,000, which we just are now in the process of figuring out how to divvy it up among the organizations that do this. And there may be additional funding, as well. So, that's been taking up a significant chunk of time.

A couple of quick things. I know we're running behind, but I just want to share a few things. What does the digital divide actually look like in San Francisco. You may find this interesting. Let's take a look at a couple of basic things.

San Francisco, and maybe you would like to disagree, being in Seattle, but we're consider ourselves the tech hub of the world. But given that, over 100,000 San Franciscans lack meaningful WiFi access. And our population is between 800,000 and 900,000 people. It's a big chunk of people, who in this tech mecca, don't have tech access. This lack of internet access and basic digital skills disproportionately impacts people of color, those who are low-income, seniors, limited English proficiency, and people who have a disability. And as you well know with our access especially now during the pandemic, people can't get information. They have routine medical visits. They can't pay bill or taxes. And they can't reach out to family or friends, especially when they have no other way to do this. Things that are only made available on the internet.

I'm going to skip past this, and I can share this PowerPoint with you, but the bottom line is that this shows you the number of people aged 65 and up who don't have access, which is about 40 percent of people have no internet use. Non-English speakers and Latinx, people of color, as well fall into this category, the very bottom bar is people who make less than $25,000 a year. About half don't have internet access.

What we're experiencing, and this might be interesting for you to look up, an organization called the Green Lining Institute, they're based in Oakland, has put together an amazing study. If you take a look at their web site, you can find digital resources. But they have put together research on how digital red lining follows the very same line as real estate red lining. That was very prominent in the 40s and 50s. So, if you take a look at the map on the left with the areas that are in red and those in the yellow, those are the lower income red lined areas of San Francisco, where people with lower incomes, people of color, immigrants, were not allowed to move out of those areas. Take a look at the map on your right. These areas where you see heavily in purple, San Francisco in particular, and then moving upwards follow the very same patterns today of areas that don't have adequate digital or WiFi access. This is consistent across the country, in fact. If you look at old red lining maps, compare digital lines today, you'll find a lot of similarities.

You will see the data on the right, but social isolation and loneliness and access to health care are significant problems that the Tech Council has really been looking into and focusing a lot of our time on, bringing in experts from the University of California San Francisco, as well as other hospitals and research entities that are doing work on this. We have in San Francisco the highest proportion of seniors and adults with disabilities in California. We also have the highest proportion of those 75 and older who are living alone. Thirty-six percent are living alone and are facing health and other mobility problems. Covid-19, particular, has left many of these people literally stranded. Of these people, especially those 75 and older, more than 50 percent lack home internet. So, these are the issues we're tackling. One of the things that we will spend just the last couple of minutes on is the pilot we're developing and hoping to get funded to really tackle some of these issues. I'll turn it over to you, Andrew.

**Torgie Madison:**  I just want to make a quick comment here. You don't need to feel that rushed. We have flexibility in what we do with our committee update section. So, you can take your time.

**Andrew Broderick:**   Thank you, Torgie. I just want to talk a little about the pilot that we are currently in the process of planning, for early 2021. The goal of this pilot is really to support aging in place by connecting older adults to essential care resources using accessible technology. And I think it's probably clear to everybody, with Covid-19, it really has amplified the digital divide and exposed how vulnerable older adults are today, given the reliance on technology for engagement and access. What we've found with the pandemic is Tele-health is the prime means for timely access to medical care and treatment and management of health conditions. And just to give you a data point, prior to the pandemic, one percent of Medicare beneficiaries have used Tele-Health services prior to Covid-19. There are a lot of restrictions around use, based on the originating site as well as geography, as well as health professional shortages. So that was a major reason that led to a lot of restrictions on use. But the data point that we put up against that one percent of Medicare beneficiaries, is between March and June 2020, nine million people have used Tele-health. So, there was a sudden explosion in the use of Tele-health providing access. We have learned a lot from our member organizations, as they've tried to pivot their services from traditional in-person brick and mortar to a virtual program is that a lot of their clients, these clients being older adults, did not have connectivity at home, they did not have a device, and they certainly were needing support with digital literacy. And so, what our pilot is really trying to do is ensure that we can connect these vulnerable seniors with their medical providers and their extended care networks in way that they are using technology that is both affordable and accessible.

One of our major academic centers here in San Francisco is UCSF, and they have a lot of resources, both in terms of research, but also in terms of service delivery, so they are one of the major providers working in delivering medical care. They have centered on vulnerable populations where they are looking at the role of digital health in particular, and how vulnerable populations are using digital technology, but also what are some of the barriers and facilitators that might promote greater use in the future. So, there is a kind of high interest in digital health care services for all patients, but there are lot of barriers, especially for more marginalized populations, and those are usually communities of color, people with literacy issues or low income populations, or English is not their primary language. A lot of these people are very hard to reach for service providers in San Francisco. And there is not a lot of high demand coming from these communities and their ability to use technology for access to medical care.

Restating what I said earlier, there is a need for greater device ownership, access to high speed internet, digital literacy. What we've been learning also, there is great need to consider some issues around health care when it's delivered digitally around privacy security of medical information as well as sharing that information with their extended care networks, and also the need to develop personal connections with their health care team, when using technology can be quite difficult. There are positives and negatives.

Our primary goal with this pilot is really connecting 200 individuals with both connection, advice, training and support and ensure that they can use those devices primarily for Tele-health encounters but also connecting with extended care networks as well as for other issues around social engagement and connection.

We are considering working with two types of technology providers. One is a start-up called Acquinity. Acquinity is kind of built on the notion that they can deliver trusted technologies that are accessible and usable by seniors, so they are using refurbished I-Pods. They will come fully managed. They will also be cellular rather than reliant on home WiFi connections, and fully supported. The goal being that building accessibility on the I-Pad or the Apple operating system, with devices that can be managed remoted, as well as fully supported with 1-800 numbers for individuals who are having challenges. This is the goal of working with this particular provider to demonstrate the effectiveness of this business model. What we're seeing today in San Francisco is a lot of service providers are working with the Android operating systems; they rely on home WiFi connectivity, and then they are expecting to send people to the home of the happy individual participating in remote digital learning or training. And that just comes with a lot of challenges from our experience. Oftentimes the Android operating system being accessible and usable by older adults, both in terms of their ability to have a reliable connection to WiFi in the home, and the ability to support them remotely with digital training.

A second platform that we're considering is GrandPad. I'm sure some of your may have heard of this. They are now the preferred device for case programs, which work with some of the most chronically ill and costly seniors. But the national case organization has endorsed this particular organization for its device and it's recommending that other organizations use it. Again, it's relying on cellular service. It comes fully supported and managed. It is an Android operating system but looks and seems, from a user experience perspective to be just like an I-Pad. So, we will also be trailing this type of device in our pilot.

Some of the eligibility that we will be looking to cure, at least 50 years and older, are coming from underserved communities and also through a racial equity lens over the participants in terms of coming from LatinX or African American communities. We would support both English and Spanish speaking individuals. And we will expect a certain amount of physical dexterity in terms of being able to interact with the device, as well as some kind of cognitive ability to understand, communicate, and provide informed consent.

That's it. That's our goal for 2021, to start to put this pilot in place. And really the goal is to generate data to show the effectiveness of this approach and be able to engage more health care providers, especially large health systems Like Dignity Health and Kaiser Permanente and putting more resources into closing the digital divide for a large segment of the San Francisco population. I'll stop there.

**Rene Peters:**  Thank you, Karla and Andrew for really a great presentation in just setting the groundwork for our board and our membership to understand what's going on in, as he said, one of the great tech meccas. Unfortunately, we don't have time for question and answer, but I think that will be fine, because hopefully, we'll have you guys back on some period basis. You know, when I reached out to the Tech Council, the idea is that as San Francisco and Seattle are two Cities that really have the ability to really push the agenda in unique ways. And I think that, hopefully, some of the subcommittees on our side can interact on a running basis with some of the work streams that you guys have going on, and vice versa, to sort of swap and share best practices. And then, as I said, hopefully we can have you guys back on some periodic basis to provide updates. Just for the folks on the CTAB side a couple of weeks ago, I logged onto the San Francisco Tech Council's call and just gave them an update on some of the things that we've been up to in 2020. So, with these two presentations, I think that both of our memberships have a good understanding of some of the key works that are going on. So, hopefully, this can be a good long-term exchange. Again, Karla and Andrew, thank you so much for spending some time with us. I will hand it back to Torgie.

**Torgie Madison:**  Thank you so much. Let's get some applause into chat. And thank you, Rene for all of your work building the conversation that led to this sharing and collaboration. We are going to move right along. We are a bit behind schedule. We are going to ask that when we get to committee updates, that they are very quick, or if you don't really have an update, just say that's fine, there's nothing new that needs to be reported for this time around. As per our slight change to the agenda, I'd like to move right along to Vicky Yuki on one of our favorite activities of the board, the TMF.

**TECHNOLOGY MATCHING FUND UPDATE**

**Vicky Yuki:**   Hi, all. How are you doing? My name is Vicky Yuki, and I'm with the Community Technology Program within Seattle IT. I'm the Technology Matching Fund manager. The Technology Matching Fund has been launched. So, it went live yesterday, and we don't have any applications in yet, which is great because the application deadline is January12, which is a Tuesday, at 5:00 p.m. I'm going to put the web address ( <http://www.seattle.gov/tech/initiatives/digital-equity/technology-matching-fund> ) into chat. I'm just wanting to share with everybody that this is a great opportunity for organizations that you know of who might be interested in applying for grants around digital equity to pay for things like devices, connectivity and digital skills training. My number one thing for today was to request that people volunteer to be on the review panel again. Many of you have in the past volunteered to review Technology Matching Fund applications. Because the due date is January 12, we anticipate finalizing the awards on February 16. So, it will be about three weeks for review. We are on this quick schedule because there is just so much need out there. Organizations have been wondering when we're going to be launching. Last year, we launched it in October and we had a January due date. So, we are trying to stick to our schedule so that maybe we can get the funds out as quickly as possible. Does anyone have any questions about the Technology Matching Fund?

**Torgie Madison:** I was curious if you knew what the budget for the 2021 cycle is this year?

**Vicky Yuki:**   It's $325,000. I believe that's right, but I will double-check that. It could be a little higher, but I'm just not certain. I'm sorry. I don't think I have anyone on here like David Keyes or Delia Burke. I think it's just me. You're stuck with me.

**Torgie Madison:** I was curious. That's $325,000.

**Harte Daniels:**  That's what you announced to the Digital Inclusion group on the 27th, as well.

**Vicky Yuki:**   Thank you so much, Dan. That's very helpful.

**Harte Daniels:**  I have a question. Have you considered this year trying to be in alignment with (unintelligible)...look more favorably on groups led by people of color that actually their presence in the neighborhood, itself? Align it more with the social justice angle or something of that nature?

**Vicky Yuki:**   We are trying very hard to align the Tech Matching Fund grants with the Internet for All Resolution, as well as all of our digital equity strategies and actions. We have a very diverse group of folks who are reviewers. We have a very diverse panel made up of about 15 individuals. We have made a lot of effort to reach out to certain communities. If we think there are organizations that have not applied in the past, they are encouraged to do so. We do provide support in terms of application outlines with groups ahead of time. So, if you're interested....  Did I answer your question?

**Harte Daniels:** No. the question wasn't about the reviewers. It's about trying to look more at organizations where the leadership of the nonprofit is BIPOC people, as opposed to some chapter of a national organization or a large organization coming for these neighborhood grants. To encourage nonprofits where the leadership is actually BIPOC. Thank you.

**Vicky Yuki:**   That's a really good question. If you were to look at our TMF recipients for our 2019/2020, there is a huge amount of diversity in the leadership of the organizations. That was not necessarily intentional. I think that many of the organizations that we have provided grants to have representation in their communities across the City. And so, it's extremely diverse. I would love you to take a look at the 2019/2020 grants. It's all located on our same page. But again, that's not necessarily a criterium we look at when we do fund. But that's something to keep in mind.

**Harte Daniels:**   Thanks.

**Vicky Yuki:**   So, if you're interested in signing up to be a reviewer, you can contact me, vicky.yuki@seattle.gov , and I will put that into the chat. I know we're getting short on time. We're trying to turn this around very quickly. Please encourage and pass on the word. We have a press release coming out probably on Thursday, so hopefully, that will be an opportunity for everybody to pass the word along, and we can get a great number of applicants. One last thing: We've been working very hard with the Internet for All to try to increase the amount of funding for the Technology Matching Fund. As we are working through this funding cycle, we are working to get more support to continue providing these great programs. We would like to see the Tech Matching Fund grow. One of the goals of the Tech Matching Fund is to increase the Tech Matching Fund by $250,000 over the next year. So, we are looking for both private sector as well as foundations for their support to add to the pot. For instance, this year, the Verizon Fund will provide a grant for $45,000 for an organization, which then allowed us to fund one extra organization in 2020. So, we're looking for more opportunities like that. They would go through our same process, but they would be funded by external dollars.

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

**Vicky Yuki:**   Thanks for letting me jump in here.

**Torgie Madison:**   We can all make time for the TMF.

**Vicky Yuki:**   Thank you. And please, please volunteer. And if you did volunteer in the past, we will send an invite to you.

**Torgie Madison:**   I think I managed to get first on the list. You don't need to be a board member to volunteer. And for board members who are new, like Lassana and Brandon, or committee leadership like Tyler and Nicole, I highly recommend going through the Tech Matching Fund review process. Like Rene said, it's very rewarding. It's a way to directly engage with communities that can be helped directly. So, I highly recommend it.

**Vicky Yuki:**   Thank you, Torgie. I see Rene there, who says this is a really great opportunity.

**Torgie Madison:**   Thank you so much. So, let us move right along. The public comment section, let's go ahead and do that now. It's next on the agenda. I would appreciate it if we could keep the public comment portion to something like announcements, a quick sentence or two so we can leave on time. I can open up the floor to public comment.

**Harte Daniels:**   So, it doesn't cost you anything to put the cellphone , your tablet, and your PC down or off for 60 seconds at the 11th hour tomorrow, to remember all of those people who sacrificed something so you could vote last November 3. People keep forgetting what November 11 is about. It really doesn't take much. Thank you.

**Torgie Madison:**   Thank you. Are there anymore comments or announcements? All right, then I can make an announcement. This is directed towards board members, but I encourage anyone to observe this process that's happening next month. Our elections are coming up. So, the meeting in December is not going to have presentations or representatives from Seattle IT, or organizations from the City. It's still a regular meeting. We will have approval of the minutes and agenda. But it's not going to have the same kind of presentation content that we're used to. So, there are a couple of things that I would like to go over regarding the election process. And I will send this out in an email to all of the board members so that we can have a copy to refer to. But, I'll just go over it really quick now.

Coming up for CTAB elections, we are going to be electing one chair and one vice chair for 2021. They will start their duties at the January meeting, which is the 12th of January. So, if you would like to nominate yourself for a leadership position, self-nomination is perfectly fine, or if you would like to nominate someone else for a leadership position, please let me know before December 1, which is one week from our next CTAB meeting. If you would like to nominate someone else, I recommend not surprising them with a nomination at that meeting. Please coordinate with them. Make sure you have their consent to nominate them because they might not be seeking a leadership position themselves. That could be pretty awkward. If you are nominated or want to self-nominate, we have a brief section for you to give a speech, just to quickly go over your interest in the position, what sort of qualifications you bring, and most importantly, a vision for the board, what you'd like to see happen for the year 2021. Those short speeches will be capped at three minutes. And, yes, we are going to hold the vote over Webex. Historically, the Seattle IT liaison, which is Jonathan Porat -- it was David Keyes in the past -- he is the one who collects and counts the votes to avoid conflict of interest or anything like that, for chair and vice chair. So, just a heads up. What you'll have to do to vote anonymously in Webex, is send a private message to Jonathan with your vote.  So, if everyone opens up their chat and you see this little 'TO' section, it just a way to vote over your chat message. You will change that to Jonathan in order to submit your vote. And I believe that is it for the election update. There are two people who are at the end of their two-term limit, and will no longer be eligible to serve as board members. Those people are Steven Maheshwary and me. So, sadly, I'll be terming off. I'll still be a TMF reviewer, but I won't be there. And, technically, Mark DeLoura. Although Mark has been sort of in limbo for the past year. He is still here because the Mayoral position wasn't filled and we needed him as a voting member until that position is filled. So, that's a list of the people who will be leaving and unable to return.

**John Krull:**  I am also terming out.

**Torgie Madison:**   The way Jonathan filled me out on this, I believe you served your first term as the education liaison, and when you were moved over as an at-large member, it actually reset your terms.

**John Krull:**  Oh, interesting. Okay.

**Jonathan Porat:**  That's correct, John.

**Torgie Madison:**   So, if your would like, John, you are eligible to be reappointed for one more term.

**John Krull:**  Kind of like Mark?

**Torgie Madison:**   Three people are going to need reappointment, should they seek it. And that is Rene, Lassana, and Brandon Lindsey. I don't believe Brandon is on the call, but Lassana is. Jonathan will handle all of that coordination. And the last thing I wanted to mention is that this was something that had confused me until I got clarification just recently. The term limits are defined by the position that you hold on the board, not by when you were confirmed or appointed by City Council or the Mayor. For example, when I joined, I was confirmed in, I believe March, for a position that lasted from January through December. So, the position term was over and went unfilled up until that point. the seat still existed, the clock was still ticking on that seat, but it was just unfilled for the first few months. So, that's why some people are coming up rather quickly who just joined the board.  Camille, John, David, and Ty, you're good. That is the update. Again, I highly urge considering going for a leadership role. The committee leadership -- we used to do voting for the committees along with the other leadership positions before, but since things are virtual, I think it would be cleaner if the committees just handled their own leadership change or continue the same leadership on their own. So, maybe that would be something that you approach in your January committee meetings. That's what I would recommend. So, it will be up to the committees to self-elect and handle the leadership however they would wish. Is there anything else, Rene, that you would like to add?

**Rene Peters:**   No. I hope that everybody commits to clean and peaceful transitions of power.

**Torgie Madison:**   OMG, that hit a little too close to home. Yes, I am happy to not try to keep my illegal position as a voting member past December 31. Just remember if you desire to self-nominate or nominate someone else, just let me know by December 1. And this will all be coming to you in an email, as well. So, can we get to our committee updates, very briefly? We have about ten minutes left. We can start with Camille and the Privacy and Cyber-Security subcommittee. Or Nicole?

**COMMITTEE UPDATES**

**PRIVACY AND CYBER-SECURITY**

**Nicole Espy:**   I'll chime in. We were very happy that Ginger Armbruster was able to present today. That was of interest to us, and we will continue to discuss this in our subcommittee meetings, and find other ways to participate in the technology reviews.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Yes, we had a meeting on the 27th, and our next meeting will be on November 24, when all of the other committees will also be hosting their meetings at 6:00 p.m. If you're not on the Privacy list, just drop your email into the chat and we will make sure that you get those meeting invites.

**Torgie Madison:**   Thank you. And it sounds like if anyone has an interest in the Surveillance Ordinance or the committee as a whole, now is the time. It looks like Ginger is getting back into gear. There will be quite a bit of activity in that committee going forward. Thank you. Can we get an update from Tyler and the Smart Cities committee?

**SMART CITIES**

**Ty Woebkenberg:**  Yes, good evening all. I can be really quick. We did meet in the past month or so. It was a later meeting, but we got introduced to the revised pledges. We discussed some of that, overall. And then, for the coming months, this month in particular, we're going to shift the Smart Cities committee meetings up by a week. So it's actually going to be next week, I believe the 17th, due to the Thanksgiving holiday which occurs in two weeks. And I think during that period, Parker has offered to come and give a quick overview of the Smart Cities Initiative that he is pursuing through Google, and what he is hearing from City officials everywhere. The invite has been updated, for folks who are on the mailing list. I'm putting the email that you can email me at to contribute to the group and get added to the group. If for some reason this doesn't work o0ut, we may shift it to the week after. That's all we have for now.

**Torgie Madison:**   Thank you. The Privacy committee also has a list email, and that's CTABprivacy@gmail.com. All right, last but not least, John Krull and Harte Daniels on Digital Inclusion.

**DIGITAL INCLUSION COMMITTEE**

**John Krull:**   We met a couple of weeks ago. We had a great presentation from Vicky Yuki. Our committee is reviewing the Internet for All proposal. If you haven't seen that, it looks great. So, we're reviewing that and are going to be giving that committee some feedback. We are working on the Tech Matching Fund to find willing nonprofits that want to pursue the Tele-health initiatives that we are pursuing, so we're trying to find a sponsor and encourage them to apply for TMF. That's our update. I just put our meeting in the chat. In two weeks  on Tuesday at 6:00 p.m. I put that Zoom link in there. We meet virtually.

**Harte Daniels:**  Vicky also gave us an update on the Digital Equity Learning Network and how they want to be more collaborative and expand around the region. She's telling me that she doesn't have the date for the meeting, but I did put a link in the chat for the Digital Equity Learning Network deln blog for your perusal. Thank you, and I also appreciate both San Francisco for what they're doing with older individuals and highly overlooked persons, as well as it was very interesting to find that we've been working 'copacetically' on Covid-19 Tele-health. We'll connect later.

**Torgie Madison:**   All right, so with that, we have four minutes left. I will try to use them all. For wrap up, we heard an update from Ginger Armbruster, chief privacy officer, on the Surveillance Ordinance. We heard from the San Francisco Tech Council on their work with older and disabled digital equity efforts, which again, I'm loving the overlap that we have with our health initiatives and the Digital Equity Committee. We heard from Vicky Yuki on the Technology Matching Fund, and her call for reviewers and call for applications and also their plan to increase the budget, which is fantastic. I did not know that. And yes, I believe that this concludes the meeting. Everyone have a great rest of the day. And like Harte said, do take a moment to reflect tomorrow, instead of just ignoring the holiday like a lot of people do. Have a good evening. The meeting is adjourned.

**ADJOURNMENT**