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**Camille Malonzo:**   Good evening, everyone. Welcome to the June Community Technology Advisory Board meeting. My name is Camille Malonzo. I'm CTAB's chair this year, and we're really excited to have a great agenda with interesting presentations tonight. So, first off, we're going to take off with some introductions. I think we're going to go around the participant list online, and then we'll head over to folks in the room.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

**Camille Malonzo:**   Before we go into our first presentation, I'm going to hand it over to Vinh Tang to talk through our new hybrid meeting style. And we will go to some motions for our meeting.

**Vinh Tang:**   Thanks, Camille. Starting on June 1, the Governor's Proclamation Order which required online meetings ended. So, now as of June 1, we have to provide a physical location for a meeting for all boards and commissions. This is the first one for June 14. Moving forward, we will provide both the online option vis CISCO Webex, and a physical room location like what we have here today. If there are any questions, I can answer them right now. Thanks, Camille. (From chat: <https://www.seattle.gov/cityclerk/city-clerk-services/city-hall-visitor-information/city-hall-public-meeting-locations>)

**Camille Malonzo:**   Thank you, Vinh. I can see for folks who are on the call if they want to engage, how are we going to do the folks in person? Hand raises?

**Vinh Tang:**   I will bring the mic over to that individual.

**Camille Malonzo:**   I also want to say thank you to Vinh, David Keyes, and the folks at Seattle IT for as always organizing and helping us out with these logistics as they change. Before we start our presentations, I'm going to quickly run through some motions. The minutes from the May meeting were linked in our agenda, and so I am asking for a motion from the board to approve the May 10 meeting minutes.

**Rene Peters:**  This is Rene Peters. I move to approve the minutes.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Thanks, Rene. Can I get a second for Rene?

**Lassana Magassa:** I second.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Thank you, Lassana. All those in favor? All those who abstain? Nays? I think I heard all yeas, so this motion passes. And then, may I please have a motion from the board to approve the agenda for tonight's meeting?

**Femi Adebayo:**  I move to approve.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Thanks, Femi. Can I get a second for Femi?

**Nicole Espy:**  Second.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Thanks, Nicole. All in favor? I heard all in favor, so this motion passes. Thank you all so much. Now business is done. And I'd love to introduce our first agenda item tonight, which is a presentation from the Seattle IT Privacy Office with an update on data ethics, the Surveillance Ordinance, and facial recognition. Introducing Sarah Carrier and Omari Stringer.

**SEATTLE IT PRIVACY OFFICE UPDATE**

**Sarah Carrier:**  Hi, everyone. I will be sharing my screen. Just give me a moment, please.

**Omari Stringer:**  We have a short little presentation for you all. Sarah will be sharing the slides, since I am not at a computer right now. I'm hoping that this goes well. I did want to also just point out something that we left off the agenda and the slides, because it's a recent development. And I forgot the name of it, but there has been a new bi-partisan data privacy bill introduced at the federal level that we are very excited about. I think it's the American Data Protection and Privacy Act. It's got a terrible acronym, as per most bills, but that won't apply to the City of Seattle or most government entities. however, it will extend some data rights to consumers and all Americans, so it's something that we're pretty excited about and we'll be tracking. I think data privacy is kind of big right now and entering the public consciousness. Let's go to the next slide and jump into our specific presentation. I'll also ask that Sarah or someone just call out the slides, as I can't see them. If anyone has any questions, feel free to stop me at any time.

The first topic on our list is just to give you an update on our Surveillance Ordinance process. As some of you may know, the City's Surveillance Ordinance, Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 1418, has required the City to do some extensive reviews and public engagement on certain technologies that may meet the definition of surveillance. Right now, we are working through the end of our retroactive reviews that we started a couple of years ago. The last group, Group 4B, has been delivered to the Community Surveillance Working Group, whose external board was created by the ordinance to help review these technologies. The public comment period has closed for these technologies. It closed about a week ago. We received approximately 45 comments from a wide variety of people and organizations. We are happy to see some higher engagement in this group as they are more privacy invasive and have the potential of civil liberties concerns. The working group has eight weeks to do a privacy and civil liberties impact assessment and response to these surveillance impact reports, and they will get those back to us by July 22. Following up with that, we will have a review of those documents, finalize the impact reports, and then prepare those for submission to Council, where Council will then be deliberating on those through committee hearings and full Council action to approve or require more information on these technologies. So, we're scheduled to submit that by September 1, which is our deadline provided by Council. I'll pause here because that's a big one. I know that CTAB has traditionally commented on these technologies and has been a good partner for this, so if you have any questions?

**Nicole Espy:**   I do have a question. You mentioned that these were the last of the retroactive technologies for review. Do you know what the process will be for evaluating prospective, or are there any prospective technologies to review?

**Omari Stringer:**  There are no prospective technologies at this moment. The process will be very similar, although there will be slight differences as most of the SIRs and discussion are on existing policy. So, I think we will have a unique chance with proposed or new technologies prior to acquisition to kind of set policy in conjunction with the working group, or help put the guard rails on instead of doing it *post hoc,* or after the fact. I'm looking forward to that process. I think there will be a good test to see if the ordinance needs any adjustments, or things that were missing, but also really get to what I think the ordinance was meant to do, which is to give the community some input on how potentially concerning technologies are used. So, I imagine the process will be similar or slightly different. But, of course, we will let you all know if there are any changes or new technologies coming across, and let you know how that process works out.

**Nicole Espy:**   Thanks! And then my second question was will there be a review of how the Surveillance Ordinance has gone thus far. Will there be a 'lessons learned,' or metrics that will be in place?

**Omari Stringer:**  Yes. The ordinance provides for the CTO to create a policy guidance and equity impact assessment. We just call it the equity report. I believe that's in September every year. That is also a chance for departments and other folks to comment on if Council should consider any policy adjustments to the ordinance. I don't think we have anything major planned at this junction, as far as recommendations. I will say that there is also a mid-course evaluation done on the ordinance, and the working group, as far as effectiveness. I can say that the working group has, despite limited membership, been able to complete all of their impact assessments on time. So, I want to applaud them for their work and partnership there. We are open at any time to receive comments about how people -- we've gotten comments from the public before about changes to public engagement, or other things to consider on the strategies, so we are definitely open to feedback. But, given that this is codified in the Seattle Municipal Code, there are limited amounts of changes that are needed to make, either through executive policy by the CTO, or considering potential amendments from the City Council. So, at this time, no lessons learned explicitly, but we do have a section in our equity report that may address potential areas for improvement.

**Nicole Espy:**   Yes. And this is my last question, then we can move on. I think from this board that some of the contents of the memos that have been added to some of the SIRs include just a request of some metrics, and I can get into specifics later about each of the groups. And it would be really helpful to know all of that. And if you could in the chat or later, email link those equity assessment, that would be great. So, we can know a little bit more about how this program went, and maybe then we can provide more comments on what can be improved, being aware and acknowledging the limitations that are possible due to the logistics of this policy. So, thanks.

**Omari Stringer:**  Yes. I just want to go back to one part of your question that I didn't get to. The equity metrics are dependents on the departments submitting the SIRs, and so far, we have had not a lot of departments filling out that section of the SIRs. So, what we've seen via Council amendments is them requesting specific equity metrics that will be provided to us this year. Because recently, we've had them passed, previous equity reports won't have those metrics. But this year should be the first one when we have some robust metrics to begin reporting on. And that's something that the City Auditor and the Office of Inspector General will also be following up on for some specific SPD technologies that City Council has requested additional equity metrics on. We haven't received, so far, in our comments, depending on the technology, because some of these technologies are used in more of a data-centric way, I suppose. For example, the CAD, the Computer Aided Dispatch that the City uses and are on the master list, those aren't really deployed in a specific neighborhood, versus something like SDOT's license plate readers, which are being decommissioned, but there are certain physical devices that may be deployed, and that would be a good conversation to have around what kind of ideas of metrics went into those deployments. But we have seen a lot of these technologies that are used city-wide, and may require additional data collection in order to get those equity metrics. So, that's something that we're figuring out, with the departments.

**Tara Zaremba:**  Omari, this is Tara. There is another question in the chat here. Is there a timeline for when the work will be to define the processes around the prospective technologies for review?

**Omari Stringer:**  Yes, so there's no hard and fast timeline right now. I think that's something that we're working on in parallel with finishing up these retrospective reviews, just kind of preparing for what will the future look like. Again, process-wise, we're not going to change too much. I think it's more than looking back, we will be looking forward. Probably the most striking difference that the surveillance impact reports will have less information about policy, because there may not be any for some departments who are looking to acquire new technologies. I would imagine some component of extended public engagement and more deliberations around what that policy looks like is going to be likely. But I can't say for certain. Again, as we are considering that timeline, we will consider you all a partner and make sure to include you all in some of those conversations with the working group.

**Tara Zaremba:**  Thanks. Camille, did that answer your question?

**Camille Malonzo:**   It did. Thank you.

**Omari Stringer:**  All right! Everyone's favorite topic. So, Sarah, if you could move the next slide? I think we also have a follow-up on surveillance. So, facial recognition is obviously a very big topic for privacy and civil liberties. The City Council did pass a memo. I don't recall the date. I believe the end of last year. Just basically, it says that Council recognized the privacy and civil liberties concerns with facial recognition, and wanted to determine if that would be a surveillance technology under 1418, so any department's use of facial recognition would have to undergo the full surveillance impact report process. To our knowledge, as of this date, there are no facial recognition technologies in use at the City or on the master list that have been identified. King County Council has banned the use of facial recognition technologies by any of the County departments or offices. They just did an outright moratorium that we've seen in a couple of other places and jurisdictions. That ban does not apply to the City of Seattle or any City of Seattle offices or departments, however, it is both by ordinance and ITD policy that we advise departments to not acquire any facial recognition technologies. Again they would have to undergo the surveillance impact report process, as well as comply with, I believe, a State law outlining additional accountability reports for any public entities in facial recognition technologies. As to why the City of Seattle did not enact a ban, I'm not entirely certain, and I would advise reaching out to the City Council for why they chose to go that route versus the ban. So, that's all the insight that I have on that. I just wanted to call out that it would be identified as a surveillance technology, and undergo the rigorous policy review and public engagement process, and ultimately a Council up or down vote to say whether or not a department could acquire a facial recognition technology. So, if there are no questions on that -- I will pause just to see if there are any questions.

(From chat: Link to City Council designation of facial recognition technology as Surveillance Technology: <http://seattle.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5034258&GUID=884BBAF4-D2DD-4F01-978A-6F07B237C1F2&Options=ID|Text|&Search=314479>)

There American Data Privacy and Protection Act -- we are very closely tracking this. I can say in my personal capacity, not as a City employee, I am incredibly excited to see this come out. It is rare to see anything at this point that Congress has bi-partisan support for. To see a privacy bill that both parties can agree on, a lot of consumer groups, and business groups can agree, this is a good start. It's not perfect. I think there are some things that consumer rights groups want to see a little bit stronger, but at the same time, setting a floor for data rights for all Americans is something that is, in my opinion, long overdue. So, I'm very excited to see Congress getting to work for all of our data rights. As far as what the Privacy Office is up to, we are investigating some work and incorporating bias, and developing resources on educating departments, whether that's on some of the new AI, Artificial Intelligence or machine learning products that are coming out, being an adviser, working to grow that within IT and making people aware of outgroup bias and the potential for equity concerns, not just in technologies but as far as how data is processed and analyzed and used. That's something that we are working closely with some of the data engineers and the folks who get in there and are building databases. We are connecting with them on a fairly regular basis, keeping an eye on these projects coming through and really making sure that both the Privacy Office has a good lens in educating City employees on their responsibilities and commitments that we make to the public about how we will responsibly manage their data. This is another one that I'm very excited about, I think. Seattle has the opportunity to be a leader in the municipal privacy space by addressing some of these algorithmic impact concerns before it's too late. I think it's often reactive. I think in this case, as technology evolves and we try to keep up, this is certainly something that we want to be proactive on.

And then, finally, we are having continued internal discussions relating to data ethics. I believe I spoke to this group a couple of months ago, just bringing the idea around that are explicitly in the charter of the privacy program and may kind of fall outside the explicit scope, as certainly something that is adjacent, and something that I think not just public sector but private sector is also having to grapple with concerning ethics around technology, responsible use, not just for privacy commitments of how we're using data, but really the question of should we be using this way, should we be using data in this way. I feel like the Privacy Office would be a natural home for that, as we've kind of worn that hat a little bit. Just keeping an eye on how emergent technologies can have high potential impacts on disparate communities and marginalized communities. I think that fits well with the City's lens and program, and I think this is something that hopefully we will be hearing more about as we get more details on what a data ethics program would look like. And again, being a leader in the municipal space for setting up a model for what this could look like for other cities to consider what ethical use of technologies looks like. So, I think that's all that we had as far as updates on surveillance and our programs. I will pause for anyone who has a question.

**Nicole Espy:**   I have another question. This is sort of , because I don't know the process. It sounds like you guys are setting up some standards relating to data ethics, and maybe having some resources about algorithmic bias, but how is that tied to other organizations, like economic development, or not only technologies that the City onboards, but also technologies that are developed within City limit. I guess I'm wondering about the scope of providing these resources.

**Omari Stringer:**  The scope is that there be primarily internal for the 38 to 40 City departments. There's a lot of data floating in and out of the City, a lot of projects. I expect to see a lot more focus on technologies and digital solutions. So I think our scope is primarily for the City employees, but also being that bridge to you all as this body, to communicate to the public at large about the commitments that we are going to make as a City, and here is how we are looking out for your data rights. So, there may be explicit regulation for some of these technologies or companies that are developed within City limits, our regulatory scope for (unintelligible). I believe there are almost none for our program. We really are not scoped for that. i believe that would sit at the State level. But we have conversations with a lot of the big companies in the area, obviously, as a large municipal entity. And we have had conversations. We have some collaborations with these companies about what would the best way be for us to use it as a public entity, because we do know we have different standards, different commitments and expectations that we have, versus private entity. I think if the City wanted to use AI to do resources allocation, that's very different than a business using AI to hire. If the City wanted to use AI to hire, versus a private company, we have a lot more concerns that would be associated with that. Concerning taxpayer funding and input, and really exercising that community control. So, no external impact for the data ethics work, but hopefully we can set a model, and looking to some of these companies to see what I think is going to be a back and forth. They're the ones developing the technologies primarily. We will look to them to see what are their AI principles? Do they have an emphasis? Do they have governance around these? And I think that could impact what decisions that we decide, what companies we may want to do business with, making sure that they are also going to be good partners and stewards of City data. I hope that answers your question.

**Nicole Espy:**   It did. Thank you.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Are there questions in the room, as well?

**Omari Stringer:**  I'm not sure if they have a slide on this or if this is the end of the show. But again, anyone, CTAB or community members who are present, we do have a public-facing inbox, as well. privacy@seattle.gov. We want to hear from you. We want to take suggestions and feedback, particular concerns. You might want to invite us back for more conversations or topics. Again, please feel free to reach out. Those of you on the board who have my email, I'm happy to chat and follow up with any questions that you may have coming from this presentation.

**Nicole Espy:**   Well, I think from my perspective from Privacy and Cybersecurity, that last point about your interactions within the City of Seattle are not necessarily regulatory, but also interacts within technologies that have the same values and data ethics, I think that's an interesting topic. So, I would love to hear more about how these last two points on the slide that's presenting how that develops. So, whenever you have anything to show, we would be happy to look and learn. Thank you.

**Nicole Espy:**   May I ask one more question? On the topic of data ethics, I think what is really interesting about that is the opportunities for all of the different departments to contribute to that collaborative effort, being intentional with all kinds of user data that goes in and out of the City. What kind of models do you see working internally to achieve that cross-city work around ethics?

**Omari Stringer:** I think in my ideal world, and this is a very fledgling idea that hasn't been formalized or really even presented as a business function or even a privacy office, but essentially, similar to the approach to the privacy program as it was created, we had an interdepartmental team; there was an external advisory board made up of members of the media, members of privacy civil liberties groups, academia, public and private sector -- I would want a similar model. Again, a lot of departments use data. I would like to really bring all of those stakeholders in and getting them to agree on a set of principles or framework that the City would operate under. And then make sure that we have that body from all of the different departments, executive, City Council as well, just to make sure that this is something that the City will stand by, and also to get those different perspectives. Because all of these departments have different missions, but we are just looking at it through one angle, the privacy angle. But, we want to get that operational impact as well. I would also say that we are looking to other municipalities. I know that the City of Boston, their mayor campaigned on creating a citizens ethics board or technology advisory board, similar to this model, where they would have that external board to kind of bounce some ideas on and get input from a community standpoint. I think that would be an awesome idea, as well. And again, I see this body as a natural fit for having some of those conversations as a collaboration with the community technologists and concerned citizens. I've got a model where we have, similar to the surveillance working group, we can have a technology ethics working group or something similar to that. They can also, as experts in their fields, but also represent the public interests and give their feedback to the City, as well.

**Nicole Espy:**   That sounds great, and I would definitely like to continue this conversation. It's definitely a chief interest for the board.

**Omari Stringer:**   Well, if there are no more questions, I think that will conclude our presentation. Again, please reach out to privacy@seattle.gov, or myself with any comments or concerns. I want to thank you all for inviting us to speak with you and give you an update today.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Thank you, Omari. Thank you, Sarah. I think now we're going to get an update on the Technology Access and Adoption Survey from Brandon and Lassana.

**GET THE WORD OUT: INPUT FOR TECHNOLOGY ACCESS & ADOPTION SURVEY**

**Brandon Lindsey:**  Great. Good to see you all. I think many of you were here a couple of months ago when Lassana and I presented with David Keyes and a few folks from Inclusive Data and Pacific Market Research. As you know, the City completes a Technology Access and Adoption Survey every four to five years. So, right now, we're in the process of the planning of the survey. And so, Lassana and I have been attending weekly check-in meetings with Inclusive Data around the planning. i think a big piece of feedback from the last survey was that there wasn't enough community input, so what we're really working on right now is to get better community input. Inclusive Data has come up with a few different strategies, a lot of them were in person at first, but I think what I wanted to update a little bit on is just through the evolution of the process and how they really tried to flex and adapt to get better community input. And at the end, there is an ask. I'm going to show you a little survey.  They're really trying to reach out to target more under-represented communities, specifically BIPOC communities and the disability community, and the elder community, as well. So if there are people who have connections to that, I'm going to provide an email and you can try to reach out to them. One really interesting thing I wanted to show, and I'm going to share my screen, is Shawna from Data Solutions, instead of just sending dry emails and blasting it out to everybody, they came up with a cool tool. It's called videoask.com. So, I'm going to share so you can see what it looks like, and I'm going to drop the link into the chat. <https://www.videoask.com/fojcakr98>

The cool thing about this method that they're using is that you can respond by video, audio, or text, and that's kind of a cool method. So, they're sending out an audio, which I'm going to drop into the chat here in just a second. So that is what they're really hoping that everybody in the next week or so, by next Monday -- they're trying to close out getting that feedback. So here is a link to that. <https://www.videoask.com/fojcakr98>  If people want to just pop around and check that out for five or ten seconds. You can look at it more later. That's kind of a big thing that they're working on to try to get more input. And then, let me show you -- can you see that? I think I didn't share my screen correctly. Anyway, Shawna has been out in a lot of locations around the City with their team, sharing the survey with a big QR code, and asking, hey, do you want to do this survey? Participate in a raffle! And they're giving out prizes and things to people who participate. So, I think one of their big strategies is to avoid having a meeting about filling out a survey about technology. They are trying to go to other community meetings where other things are happening, where people actually already are, and get input in those locations. So, that's really kind of a cool strategy. Lassana, I wanted to give you a chance to weigh in a little bit about your participation and the things you've noticed, as well.

(From chat: Spanish version: <https://www.videoask.com/fgaiqwxzw>)

**Lassana Magassa:**  Thank you, Brandon. One of the things that I am most excited about is that Inclusive Data has unique strategies for engaging the community.  So not only getting people to come and respond to the tech survey, but they were given a training on another topic. I think it was fundraising. And during that session they made time for community members to get feedback on the survey. They could pursue the survey in real time and make an adjustment as necessary. An example of that is language accessibility. I sent out a message to one of the commissions and they responded back letting us know that it would be great if (unintelligible)...another language. Seattle has one of the most linguistically diverse zip codes in the country. So, as you all look at that link, let us know what you think would be useful to make the survey more accessible and get that back to us. That video is cool, but it is also less useful because it allows feedback in ways that is less comfortable. Are there any questions?

**Brandon Lindsey:**  So I see in the chat that if people don't have access to the internet, devices or literacy, QR code or URL is counter intuitive. I think part of it is that they're going out, Shawna and her team are going out to locations with devices, so they're not just sending this out. They're going places and helping people fill the survey out, as well. Typically, a lot of times with the survey, people will just send a blast out with a link. And so it's trying to get more input in a variety of ways. That being said, I do need help. If you do have connections to organizations or places where you think people might be able to assist community members to fill out a survey -- and again, this isn't a survey about the technology itself; this is really how do you like to give input? How should the City approach you to get this kind of data up?  One funny thing from some of the in-person mission was the comment, 'You should go places and give people stuff." So, it's like go and tell them to go to the park where there are a lot of people with dogs, and give people dog food, and ask them if they want to fill out a survey. So, a lot of the input that they've been getting is about going places and getting that. I'm going to put the email ask in the chat. <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ThbXKdhxi_GN_bOqShx6wSxnGL4oO1nIVVQAIkrlTtg/edit>  And if people have further questions, they can email me directly. I see that Camille had a question about whether there is a list of all of the languages available for the video. We have it in Spanish and English, but the Spanish was just something that was put together kind of on the fly. I think they were trying to connect with some folks with the City through the translation offices to see if there was more availability. The hope is that they can get some input and that this is going to be put together into a bigger set of recommendations that hopefully can get shared in July or August with this group.

**Lassana Magassa:**  Thank you, (unintelligible). If you are connecting electronically there is a population that may not be comfortable with the technology.

**Harte Daniels:**   Well, that's the purpose of the survey, to find out who doesn't have that, those three things. My follow-up is does the partners that you're working with at Inclusive Data or whatever give you a calendar of events that people are actually going to so that we know in advance so that we can try to get that out to specific groups so that they can participate in person? Bandon, it's not uncommon for a lot of these groups to need an incentive to be there in order to show up. So, that was actually a valid thing that they said. There is no way we can assist you on the in-person unless we know of their calendar of events, who they're going to talk to, etc. So, if you have that from them, maybe you could give that to us, because in-person is the only way when they don't have digital equity. Thank you.

**Brandon Lindsey:**  Sure. There is an in-person focus right now, and I think mostly the strategy that they're using is to use a lot of other existing events where people are being in community-related projects where they are, and add this, whether that's the input piece that's like a break-out session. But I don't have their direct calendar. That's a request that we can definitely make. I know, unfortunately, as with all things, I think they're trying to wrap up a lot of the feedback in the next week or two just from a City and project timeline perspective.

**Harte Daniels:**   That's always a problem when you ask for an ask and don't give us any time or ability to respond to you. Digital Equity gets that all of the time. Oh, we need somebody to talk to the State tomorrow. This Inclusive Data group is doing the exact same thing. They blind us to what they're doing until they're almost finished, and then they're asking us to give them input. Or to give us our networking contacts. It something for any kind of effort that we put forward.

**Brandon Lindsey:**  Sure. I think those are really valid points. I think that's always a really hard sell, just because the timelines creep up on things, and then a lot of these things that should have been planned for get eaten up by the timeline.

(From chat: **Dorene Cornwell** to everyone: Any plans for focus groups especially in languages other than English? It makes tabulating data different but I mean go through the survey in a community group.)

**Brandon Lindsey:**  To Dorene's question, I don't have the specific groups that they're reaching out to right now, other than English, but we can follow up with that question, as well. I know that they created that ask in dotcom all in Spanish as well. They were trying to visit different boards and commissions over the next weeks, as well. I will pass this feedback on, and if there is any additional comment, just throw it in the chat, or you can email me directly. [brandonlindsey@gmail.com](mailto:brandonlindsey@gmail.com)

**Harte Daniels:**   Great work, Brandon.

**Brandon Lindsey:**  Thanks so much!

**Camille Malonzo:**   Thank you, Brandon. Thank you, Lassana and all of those working on the Technology Access and Adoption Survey. Looking at the time, I think we're going to go straight into the update on the Technology Matching Fund.

**TMF & DIGITAL NAVIGATOR COHORT UPDATE**

**Meira Jough:**   Thanks, Camille. Hi, I'm Meira Jough, digital equity adviser at Seattle IT. I manage the digital equity grants that we offer every year, and for those of you who are new to CTAB, Seattle IT offers grants to community organizations to support community-driven initiatives to address digital equity gaps. And so we have a round of grants funding opened March 14. And that closed on May 13. We have seen 52 applications, which we're really excited about. There are 38 Technology Matching Fund grant applications, and 14 Digital Navigator Cohort grant applications. The Technology Matching Fund grants, they receive $25,000 for a year-long project; and then the Digital Navigator Cohort grants, the organizations receive $50,000 for an 18-month project. We have 15 reviewers. Many of the reviewers come from this CTAB group. Thank you very much, reviewers. And we will have recommendations on July 12 at our next CTAB meeting. So, after the reviewers made all of their scores, we will be calculating the top grants, and then present those on July 12 for the CTAB board to approve. And then the Seattle IT CTO, Jim Loter, will also be attending to approve the recommendations for funding. And seeing as we have some of our reviewers in the room, I wonder if anybody wants to share generally about going through the review panel with these applications? I know that a lot of us are really excited about the proposals that we got.

**Philip Meng:**   Sure, I'll say a couple of words. As a first-time reviewer, I've had the great pleasure of looking through some fantastic applications. There are proposals for devices, internet access, training for using digital services. There was one that I remember that extends internet access in lending libraries. It's just a really fantastic range. Honestly, it was initially pretty difficult to choose the most deserving among the grants, to identify, to prioritize. But the conversations with the members of the review board have also been very helpful. So, thanks to everyone for good conversations. Thanks to Meira and everyone for organizing.

**Camille Malonzo:**   I'd like to add that it has been such a great experience to review the robust applications for the TMF grants. It's really eye-opening, since you see where the rubber meets the road on digital equity. And it really makes what we talk about here real. Reiterating what Phil was saying, it's really critical work. I really appreciate that all of our conversations have been very thoughtful and intentional. Thank you, Meira, for organizing us all into a panel. I know logistically it has been very interesting, and so I really appreciate it.

**Meira Jough:**   Are there any questions about the digital equity grants from anybody who is new to CTAB or at their first meeting? Well, thank you. And I'm really excited for next month's meeting. Consider joining the review panel for the next round of digital equity grants. So, stay in touch with CTAB. I will put the digital equity grants page on the web site. Oh, great. Thank you so much, Camille, for adding the link. <https://www.seattle.gov/tech/initiatives/digital-equity/funding-opportunities>  There's a newsletter there that you can subscribe to and find out about future grant opportunities. Thank you.

**INTRODUCTION TO THE OUTREACH COMMITTEE**

**Camille Malonzo:**   Thank you, Meira. Now, we're excited to bring up Femi Adebayo to introduce us to our new committee. Femi?

**Femi Adebayo:**   Thank you. My name is Femi Adebayo. I'm the vice chair of the CTAB board. I'm here to introduce the Outreach Committee. This is a committee that we are introducing to CTAB this year. And generally, some committee cannot help us ramp up our engagement on the CTAB board. There are a couple of things I'll be sharing on what the Outreach Committee will do. Agendas, and (unintelligible) ...on today's agenda, there was a couple of things, a call to action, and any questions and answers that we have, I'll be glad to walk you through it.

Basically, our mission for this committee, I'm just going to read it. We are a board to the City of Seattle. Our policies are developing programs and committees to foster community engagement among CTAB. (Unintelligible) The purpose of this committee is to advise the City of Seattle, making recommendations regarding the promotion of CTAB initiatives and policies, develop programs and community events aimed to foster community engagement among CTAB, like minded civic tech organizations and Seattle residents.  CONTACT: [ctaboutreach@gmail.com](mailto:ctaboutreach@gmail.com)  We also need help in developing programs, community engagement. We are also looking to engage with other civic organizations, such as San Francisco, the City of Boston, to see what we can drive together as a board. These are the things we are looking to do. Basically, the idea is to look for ways to promote engagement within the board, to help foster communication within the board, the City of Seattle, and Seattle residents. We are still working to put this together. We look at this in three pillars. One is we are looking to educate and engage and promote the brand. What I mean by educate is basically, we are looking at (unintelligible) discussions of topics and find a way to channel it, maybe an agenda item where we can just talk about what the board does. Obviously, (unintelligible) in this kind of forum, (unintelligible) Also, we can bring speakers from communities in Seattle that we advocate for who have special things that they want to talk about. When I talk about engagement, I mean programs that we have physically build relationships with other boards and local municipalities where we drive broad engagement and broad interests. We are looking for people to get involved within the committee, and also with civil communities where we can help and drive to the board and the City of Seattle. We will be promoting the board. We did this with Digital Equity in a forum we have some time each year where we created posters and helped promote other official CTAB events. We use the CTAB web site, where we have board members' pictures. (unintelligible)

This is a call to action. We are looking leads to join our email list. I can put the link in the chat where you can join the committee, and we will definitely reach out. Obviously, we are looking for folks to get engaged and take a leadership opportunity. Please join and invite others. We are looking to have our meetings every third Wednesday of the month from 6:00 to 7:00 p.m. The first meeting will be in July. I will get the details and mail that out. We will make an agenda and talk about things we want to do within this committee. Obviously, if you have any questions around, you can email us. [ctaboutreach@gmail.com](mailto:ctaboutreach@gmail.com) (unintelligible) I think that's all I have today. Now for questions and answers.

(From chat: Join email list to get specific, agenda & updates before mtgs.  from Camille Malonzo:

<https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSenOiWkR3C-Fyv3XxSIBS46wzeTxTNlgcD9A341MRwc_QOhlQ/viewform?vc=0&c=0&w=1&flr=0> )

**Camille Malonzo:**   Femi, there's a question in the chat from Harte Daniels.

(From chat: **Harte Daniels**:  This sounds like board to board and board to municipality relationships. Do I have that right? What about engaging residents directly?

**Femi Adebayo:**   I think I spelled that out. Maybe I was unclear. The plan is not to just engage other boards, but the plan is also to engage residents of Seattle. So, basically, we are looking at how do we continue dialogue and empower residents of the City of Seattle to be able to also contribute to this community. So, it's not really only board to board, but it is also to find residents to engage with the issues.

**Harte Daniels:**  Thank you. That wasn't clear during your presentation. I did see that Seattle residents was sort of tossed in there, but you emphasized more the other relationships. For equity, lived experience and knowing exactly how to engage the board is an issue or something that we as committee members need to learn more about. I'd like to see some work done on equity and approaching people with lived experience, as opposed to having a board that is almost represented by big tech companies. It's supposed to be for Seattle residents, and it would be nice to see how we could take what we've learned about equity and apply it to engagement of Seattle residents. Thank you very much.

**Femi Adebayo:**   Thank you for the thought, Harte. That was just sort of a goal, but this is just a quick framework to think about it. Thank you for the question and comment. I'll try to bake that in  as we craft our committee structure. We will take that into consideration.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Yes, Harte, that's definitely a motivating intention for this new committee. We are the Community Technology Advisory Board, and I think that the community aspect is a goal for this new outreach and engagement community to foster. I would definitely love to partner to make sure that, as you said, we take what we've learned around digital equity and really make it work for all of our community members. It is hard to understand what CTAB does sometimes, and I think we could be doing a better job doing that outreach. I know that committee is already doing a lot of great work there, so thank you to you, Harte, and Coleman Entringer, and all of the folks at DEI; as well as Nicole Espy and Erik, doing a really great job there to do some outreach to communities that are impacted by Privacy and Cybersecurity. So, I definitely wanted to organize it in a way that all of the committees are having the same conversation within outreach and engagement. I want to thank Femi for organizing this together. It is a really important part of our board. And it's really huge that we are starting this up, since I think that's going to have a huge impact on our work here. So, thank you, Femi. We've gotten a lot of feedback on this from other folks, as well. So, I want to just say thank you to them. The link was already posted, but I posted it again. I would definitely love for folks to click on that forum and start getting emails from Femi and the team around joining this new committee.  <https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSenOiWkR3C-Fyv3XxSIBS46wzeTxTNlgcD9A341MRwc_QOhlQ/viewform?vc=0&c=0&w=1&flr=0>

[camillemalonzo@gmail.com](mailto:camillemalonzo@gmail.com)

**Femi Adebayo:**   Thank you, Camille. And thank you for listening to this. Please click the link and join. We definitely want your input and your feedback. We're going to make this thing go, and we're going to make the committee better. Thank you.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Thank you, Femi. Something that I notice is that folks in the room haven't probably stood up in an hour and a half. If you'd like to stand up, shake it out -- usually around this time, if we were in person, we would have a break and share some sandwiches and pizza, and mingle a bit. I also want to be mindful of the time, so take a stretch. This goes for those who are calling in, as well. Maybe one day, we all will come in person and have some snacks. So, thank you again, Femi. Now we are going to a floor vote tonight. At the beginning of our agenda, we heard a presentation on the Seattle IT Privacy Office, including the Surveillance Ordinance. And the committee often writes up a memo organizing their comments. It's up for a vote. Nicole Espy and Eryk Waligora, who are co-chairs for the Privacy and Cybersecurity Committee to talk through the Group 4B memo for discussion and then a board vote from CTAB members.

**SURVEILLANCE ORDINANCE GROUP 4B MEMO DISCUSSION AND BOARD VOTE**

**Nicole Espy:**  Hi. The Group 4B technologies under review -- public comment for it has already closed, as Omari mentioned. Usually, we like to get feedback from board members on any sort of memos, any sort of comments, if they want to combine into a larger memo from the board. Just in case our board members aren't super-familiar with the technologies under review. I am pulling up the Seattle IT page with the technologies under review. And one of our major comments on Group 4B was that a lot of the technologies were grouped into unspecific technology types and list the vendor that is providing. In one case, there was, but in most it was generalized technologies. The memo that was distributed to the board yesterday basically echoes previous that had already been mentioned but our summary statement is that the vendors for these five technologies are not indicated in the SIRs and the lack of transparency hinders our ability to provide detailed comments on these tools. And it builds on previous memos where we had much more general guidance on what our major concerns are. Some of these include understanding for each vendor how they hold or retain data from use of these technologies, and what their data governance standards are, whether or not there is a schedule of regular external security audits. And then also, if there is acknowledgement of any previous or pending mergers and acquisitions of those vendors that could affect the data security of that technology. This is what we're voting on. I'd appreciate any feedback.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Nicole, could you also talk through some of the reflections from the public comment period?

**Nicole Espy:**  Yes. The public comment period was much more robust than previously. And I think a lot of that can be attributed to the Washington People's Privacy Network. They had a great webinar, and I will link that here. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_TAqj5LSS5g>  There's a YouTube of this webinar where there is a nice, detailed review of each of the technologies. A lot of it does pertain to data governance, the use, technologies' retention of data outside of individuals that are considered suspects in a crime. But I don't want to go too detailed into all of the different ones. I think particular interesting finding was for some of the crash recording devices. So in an automobile accident, there are sort of like black boxes within a lot of cars where you can retrieve the crash data. But that includes, let's say, if you link your phone to your car and your car records all of your use of your phone, it can help officers identify whether or not you were using your phone while the crash occurred. But it also can retrieve all use, all data that has been linked to your car, including other passengers, etc. If you were a victim, it can obtain all of that data, as well. Each one of these technologies is so broad, and also there are so many different vendors that could be used, and so the lack of transparency on who these vendors are was my biggest observation. A lot of the technologies can be very useful, but a lot of our concerns seem to be about that public/private partnership, and whether or not these private companies are working for the best interests of our Seattle residents.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Do folks have questions for Nicole on the memo that we will be voting on tonight? I have a question. In the SIRs -- I'm trying to find them -- did they have equity metrics on the impact of these technologies, or does that come later in the SIRs?

**Nicole Espy:**  I believe they come later. They should be included, but I don't remember seeing them when I was reviewing.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Okay. I think that's what Omari was talking about earlier, about how the equity metrics come after in previous reviews. And then for folks who are interested, this is the link to the Surveillance Ordinance. <https://www.seattle.gov/tech/initiatives/privacy/surveillance-technologies>  And I think, if you scroll down, you'll also see the list of the SIRs (Surveillance Impact Reports) which go through each technology.

**Nicole Espy:**  So, that's our basic memo, and I think from my questions earlier n the meeting, I do think that our group would be interested in an overall review of this process. This board has voted on quite a few memos on these technologies. I think all of us would probably appreciate an overall evaluation of, not necessarily per technology, but timelines, how much engagement has occurred for the SIRs, how City Council has evaluated these SIRs and this process, how many amendments were proposed. And I think we want to know whether or not this process is working for all involved, and whether this process is working over time. I think an overall metrics assessment would be really helpful.

**Camille Malonzo:**   For sure. I think we will move on to a vote, though I don't know if we have quorum. That's my concern. We have four, so we're missing one person for quorum.

**Cass Magnuski:**   Can you do it by email?

**Camille Malonzo:**   I do not believe so. I also know that Vinh Tang sent some edits for the bottom.

**Nicole Espy:**  Yes, I emailed that to you.

**Camille Malonzo:**   I know Femi had a hard stop at 7:30, as well. Maybe we can move on to committee updates, and then circle back to get quorum.

**Vinh Tang:** I recommend you wait for quorum.

**Nicole Espy:**  My worry is that we wanted it to be included in the SIRs prior to them being moved to committee, but I guess Omari did say that that might not be until September.

**Vinh Tang:** Nicole, yes. We're not going to submit to Council until the end of August or early September.

**Nicole Espy:**  Okay, so then we may have until the next meeting to vote.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Okay, let's table it until July, and I'll make sure to have it done in the early part of our agenda. Thank you so much, Nicole, for all of your work here. This is a really big set of technologies, so thank you for your diligence. I'm going to hand this over first to Coleman and Harte for an update on the Digital Equity Committee.

**COMMITTEE UPDATES**

**DIGITAL EQUITY COMMITTEE**

**Harte Daniels:**   Thank you. The first agenda item on our last meeting is the finalization of our compilation of the panel. I was wondering if Philip would like to give the update and conclusion from our meeting. The things we discussed on how to move forward with that. Go ahead, Philip.

**Philip Meng:**   We're just playing a little bit of microphone theater here. So just a quick update. We met to finalize the Digital Equity in telecom compilation at the last meeting, and we will be presenting it at the July CTAB meeting. The main addition this time is we made some plans to continue updating the document with information from telecom companies as part of our committee work. And also, thank you to everyone who has been reviewing. thank you to Meira Jough for providing feedback. We look forward to incorporating them ahead of next meeting. And Harte, the other thing from our meeting, do we want to briefly go over the forum ideas?

**Harte Daniels:**   Sure. I was going to an addendum to what he said. We did discuss the dispersal of this . Meira came up with some ideas, and also discussed about it being a snapshot of a living document, that type of thing. Those are concepts that we're going through. But one of the suggestions was that the board keep engaging the telecoms. These are the reasons why CTAB, 25 years ago, was originally formed. And to keep them engaged seems to be the only way to keep them focused on our neediest residents. Go ahead, Philip. You had the minutes from Kai. You and Brandon can talk about our discussion on looking forward to the rest of the year for DEI. Thank you.

**Philip Meng:**   Absolutely. So, the other agenda item there is that we're interested in a new forum. Broadly in the committee, there is interest in education-related topics. We're still at an early stage in these discussions, so if you have any thoughts on education and digital equity, or ideas for a forum design, please get in touch with us. We will be coming back with more information on our thoughts and deliberations there. Thanks, everyone.

**Harte Daniels:**   In addition to that, we're again taking a focus on not just having CBOs present on behalf of the residents, but having the residents, themselves being able to contribute with their lived experience in the way that they can communicate, and making it a welcoming an inclusive space so that we have to learn how to listen to them. That type of thing. That was one of the ideas. And then after that, we discussed the TMF, which you heard a lot about going on from Meira. And that was in addition to the ongoing awards system, we are gearing up in our future meetings, thinking about how to improve this process of engagement. I think that finished the agenda for May. Thank you very much.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Thank you, Harte. Thank you, Philip. And thanks to the Digital Equity Committee for that. We really looking forward to the read-out on the compilation next meeting. Thank you for all of that effort. It's really important. And also, let me know about planning for the forum. I'd love to assemble some ideas. Let's work together to find a good time for that. Nicole? Privacy and Cybersecurity?

**PRIVACY AND CYBERSECURITY COMMITTEE**

**Nicole Espy:**  Our main topic was the 4B technologies. we are super interested in the Outreach and Engagement Committee, and I think they're going to definitely need a lot of assistance in getting all of our Privacy and Cybersecurity needs addressed with the Outreach and Engagement Committee. So, that's it. Thank you,

**Camille Malonzo:**   Thank you, Nicole. All right. Now we have some time for public comment and announcements. The floor is open.

**PUBLIC COMMENT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Harte Daniels:**   Just on a personal note, my brother-in-law received a Peacemaker Award from Pax Christi in New York yesterday for his lifetime work. Basically, he's an immigrant, and so reaching across groups and working with various departments in such a large city, and also a documentary film maker. He is the one that started St. Patrick's For All March. Both children in motorized vehicles as well as LGBT were banned. And he had quite a few people from around the world always started off the march with the Choctaw, who supported the Irish during the famine, believe it or not, given the atrocities and dire conditions that they were in. And he worked with national leaders, as well, in that parade until there was inclusion in this last two years. So, for a lifetime achievement. Sorry to do a personal plug, but thank you.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Thank you. That's awesome. Congratulations. That's wonderful. If you have any links to share, that would be wonderful. All right. Thank you so much, everyone, for a great June CTAB meeting. It's great to see you all in person. Maybe one day I will come out, as well. Thanks, everyone. Thank you, Vinh, for organizing this, and I'll see you all next month.

**ADJOURNMENT 7:30**