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**Camille Malonzo:**   Hi, everyone! We will begin the July CTAB meeting with introductions, approval of the minutes, and approval of the agenda. We're going to start with those in the room. I'll go around the room this way.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

**Camille Malonzo:**   Next up on our agenda is the approval of minutes. So, can I please get a member of the board to make a motion to approve last meeting's minutes?

**Phillip Meng:**  I move to approve.

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

**Femi Adebayo:**   Second.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Thanks, Femi. All those in favor?  Hearing all in favor, this motion passes. Can I please get a motion from a board member to approve today's agenda?

**Isabel Rodriguez:**  I move to approve.

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

**Phillip Meng:**  Second.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Thanks, Phillip. All those in favor? Hearing all in favor, this motion also passes. First up on our agenda is a presentation from Professor Jan Whittington, from the University of Washington, on Generative Artificial Intelligence.

**GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE**

**Prof. Jan Whittington:**   Can everyone hear me okay? That's great. I'm going to start sharing my screen presentation. Can you all see my presentation? Okay.

Somehow, I think that you guys have already oversold this presentation. When I agree to give a presentation to a group that I'm not really sure of the varieties of peoples' backgrounds are going to be, I just go for the lowest common denominator. So, for many of you, this will sound like a pretty simple presentation, trying to use language on a topical topic, I have some implicit desires that are baked into this presentation that will hopefully help us to elicit comments and help tee up the discussion that follows this presentation about government and AI.

I actually prepared a script. Very unlike me, but you know I care if I bother to do that. Brief introduction about myself: I'm a professor of urban design and infrastructure economist at the University of Washington. I've been at UW since 2005. One of my areas of research is application of economics to problems that arise from the various uses and markets from the internet, so, the economics of privacy, the economics of cybersecurity. And more recently, I have been asked to talk about questions of Artificial Intelligence. But mainly, my area of focus in this is about cities and other entities and how they can adjust to problems and try to receive some of the positive benefits in changing technologies. That's a quick introduction.

What are we talking about? We're talking about systems that have limited (unintelligible) and narrow intelligence, which is to say that they don't come anywhere close to the capabilities of the human brain, but they really do have just enough of some of those features. So, they have been trained on a data set of some kind, and the content might be the corpus of data that's covered on the internet or some smaller subset. And it could be whatever a company could buy to be able to put it together as training data. The point is for the system, itself, to respond to prompts and review (unintelligible) probability as a function of what the data is and the algorithms that have been built around it to guess, and to be trained as interactive to what the next word should be, or what the modification ought to be to some particular design or drawing, or what the next step in the program ought to be. I would invite you all to contemplate whether you have been in a circumstance where you get part way through the sentence, and you are trying to think of what you want the next word to be. It's very easy for AI systems available today to be able to go through that process iteratively over and over and over again, and produce something that seems familiar to us. But the human brain does spend a lot of energy doing a lot of that, but a human brain also looks ahead and adds abstract concepts and general speech that reflects what we value. It reflects the moral censoring that individual writers want to project into the world. When we do the writing ourselves, we only produce what we know or reasonably expect to be true. We feel the need to check our thoughts if we are unsure, and really choose statements to make that fit the sources of information that we are familiar with that we can count on as sources of truth. These tools, like Chat GPT inspire awe. Giving GPT a prompt and watching the text output going down the screen is like watching the steering wheel of an automated vehicle move on its own, without a human driving it. It inspires awe and it triggers the imagination, and a very real human optimism for technological prowess and tack into a dream of a more (unintelligible) future.

This is a result of the evolution of technology. Technology evolves, from a distance might seem entirely unpredictable, but up close it's not so unpredictable. This is what the technology does. We design it augment our human functions. It evolves by appending new functions to existing systems, augmenting them in a very recursive way, giving those systems (unintelligible) a way of using these tools. So, what was once a machine learning operation looking for patterns could be augmented in terms of its many uses to something we ask for replies. Better statistically, but a little ballistically accurate in the data that the system has and according to the training that the system receives.

We're talking about a variety of systems, but kind of the same limitations. GPT is defined as a computer system that like an automated vehicle is imperfect, and doesn't do a myriad of things that our brains actually do in order to drive safely. (unintelligible)  Like entering a search or getting well-organized with (unintelligible). That used to feel like magic way back then. The text GPT produced had some outrageously overstated benefits of AI, which got a laugh out of me. Apparently, AI is a tool that has been accused of climate change and can eradicate disease. Okay. But I also felt like I was watching a really expensive parlor trick. If I were asked to take this output seriously, as in being asked to use this tool for my job, my job would be transformed from a writer to one of a fact checker. And a fact checker would be outraged to think that this is an easy job. I know better than to think that AI is going to solve climate change and eradicate disease. But in truth, I don't like fact checking, and I don't want that job. So, there are outrageous errors, but also many subtle errors. And GPT is borrowing from unfamiliar sources, sources that don't represent my (unintelligible) and just accepting this text might cause me to misrepresent my values to others. But if I felt enticed at all to use this text this evening, I was pressed for time, or maybe I was in need of help. Maybe I would only bother to fact check the outrageous bits and leave the rest intact. I feel like I would be a passenger in an automated vehicle, or maybe be a person who is taking a nap while barreling down a highway. I would know necessarily where it would take me. As a professor, I wonder whose writings were being plagiarized in the text that it was providing to me. These were not my words, what you see on the screen. How could I represent as my own. As a person, I couldn't see that. My moral compass doesn't head in that direction. But there are some really high-powered incentives that set people up to reap as much profit as possible, and at the end of the day, we're still just talking about apps. Chat GPT is just one of many apps that are out there like any other free to play app. It takes our information. It identifies us. The company that owns and operates the app can tie what it collects about us to our identity. If a company ever wanted to cash in on this data, it could. Like any search engine, it collects our prompts. If its owners were really greedy and it is in their collection of valuable information, they would have the app quietly collect additional information from our devices, like why we go on the internet and what we do. In service to collecting revenue. Let's be clear about what our data can do, it could become part of the 200-plus billion dollar data broker industry that would append this data to existing dossiers of individuals and resell it on the open market. As a company out there, intent on earning profits, there may be some lag time between what we give that company in terms of our data today and whether or not the data actually ends up with the data broker industry. Firms don't usually intend to be the bottom feeders in the industry, but maybe they're going to figure out a real legitimate way to serve their needs. But who knows? It's a risk that this could be a way that they want to earn revenue. So, I received warnings as someone signing up to use this system. It's good to be warned. I wonder how any human brains remember these warnings, or how deeply we think about them as we read the output of GPT, or watch an image emerge from (unintelligible), or see a system debug or spit out code to help solve a vexing problem. Yes, I got that warning: Don't share sensitive information. It's a very pleasantly stated warning. But yes, it's just an app. It can do some really interesting, but limited, things. It can solve some problems, and at the same time, create other problems.

So, what is my responsibility? I asked myself what is my responsibility. The purpose of this presentation is to ask what is the City's responsibility. The City's responsibility is to govern in the best interests of our residents. Think about the Tesla. They used to call it auto-pilot. They don't quite call it that anymore. Who is behind the wheel? So, we're talking about the employees of the City, and our elected leadership of the City in terms of putting together governance of these systems, and who is the passenger? The City residents are the passenger of our Tesla. Teslas are pretty cool, but there are some features I wouldn't want to use. But, what does governance look like? The City of Seattle has a history of leadership in local governmental regulation of technology. It's something to be proud of, actually. A history of regulation of technology in the public interest. One example that I want to talk about is the privacy program you have, which is also applicable to AI, by the way. The City's privacy program is interested in protecting the privacy of persons represented in the data that the City collects, processes and releases. And the formation of principles was an important starting point that those principles simultaneously (unintelligible) to City employees and residents the nature of our shared commitment to privacy like an expression of rights, but deeper, like a basis for trust, our social compact. There are training programs for City employees, famously completed by nearly all of the City employees, programs implemented by people with particular goals and responsibilities that fit with and even inform industry standards. So, what it means to conduct an analysis of the impact to privacy, that's what these programs do, from collecting, processing, and sharing data, covering the whole life cycle of data. So, Seattle already recognizes how such (unintelligible) can be successful. That includes extending these principles and implementation to contracts, with suppliers and vendors of technology and how those contracts -- what the terms are in the contracts and how they're enforced. They have to reflect the values and interests of residents. And the privacy principles, themselves, are this real nice way of understanding and grounding what you're setting up for, and then how to evaluate how the programs are being designed and implemented at the same time. So, I just thought I would pull them up, because even just the way they are worded is meant to make it plain that the City is equal to (unintelligible) at the same time that it is formulating its ideas of ways to govern technology.

So, we value your privacy. We collect from people what we need. We tell you how we will use your information in order to be accountable. We tell you how we will share your information. And accuracy is important. Now AI will call for some different things, because we're talking about a different set of (unintelligible). We're talking about a different set of ordinances. We're talking about some different things to watch out for. I just thought this would be helpful to review and get us into the right frame of mind.

So, the City needs principles for governing AI, and why. There are many possible harms and benefits from AI that relate to each tool'[s content, algorithms and applications or uses. Misinformation and bias loom large in this, and we're just beginning to see how these problems pervade the information that we generate and rely on. So, these are early days for thinking about what misinformation means in this context, what bias really means, and how to do the basics of spotting it and responding to it. Impacts to the workforce in relying in a tool instead of a person for all of the tasks that we have in mind is another potential harm. Or more immediately, how uses of the tool, whether we see it or not, or whether we like it or not, change the job a person has to do. You can only change one action at a time.

When I think about the elements that ought to be present in some way when it comes to AI governance, I think about the principles providing a beginning and a foundation. But then, what the City puts together in terms of policy should provide everyone with very clear mapping of how the City's governance of AI can be expected to very thoroughly implement the City's principles to avoid harm from AI, first and foremost, as the City seeks to improve its provision of services and the use of AI. so, there are elements to guidance, like mechanics. Disclosure is something to consistently and thoroughly do, and that means the City keeping up to date on the systems and usage. What is the provenance, the training that's being used, the algorithms. Not just a firm by firm account, but what are these different systems that are in use, or that people want to make use of. They're made to be training programs once you set up governance structures. What does accountability mean in process and criteria to universally apply in the process to be able to assess what you're looking at, and what you're doing? There is decision making, and some entity within the City or people and various entities within the City being given the authority to make the decisions about whether to accept something or not, or use something. Decisions have to be made. There will have to be monitoring and enforcement. Are the contractors and vendors giving you a chance to look under the hood? They're not going to like that, but you just have to decide where you're going to draw the line. And then, of course, transparency, which is letting people know what you're doing and how you are doing it.

So, that's my very light, and hopefully, entertaining introduction to government and AI. I am happy to take questions, or comments on discussions that you've been having about governance and policies. Thank you for this opportunity. If any of you in the room or in the virtual room have questions, please just raise your hands.

**Dorene Cornwell:**   One of the reasons I am hugely skeptical of Generative AI is that there is so much information that already isn't represented in existing beta sources. This afternoon, I was at a meeting with a bunch of planners and transportation people, and they were all talking about how they have these data sets that are really heavy on high capacity transportation, and really light on information about the value of good pedestrian networks. I don't want my Generative AI just recycling crap data. As you already said, I am not crazy about fact checking. So, I want you to say a little bit more about how we ensure there's good content feeding the Generative AI.

**Prof. Jan Whittington:**   Thanks for the question. If you can't get your hands on the training data, which is anathema. Getting your hands on the training data is not something that any firm out there has been ready and willing to do. There are a couple of things to think about, like if the City is going to try to get their hands on some data sets that could be used as a basis for developing algorithms, or to try to develop its own homemade tools fit for purpose of analysis, then you would know for sure. But otherwise, you would have to go in and be allowed to audit the content of the training data that is running your system. And you're right. Omissions of data and even just different frequencies of the sampling of data can be a big source of bias in AI systems.

**Dorene Cornwell:**   Thank you.

**Member:**   I have a question. the last one you were talking about representing harms, you talked about workplace harms and bias, I am worried that these technologies, you don't always know the harms until they're really fully deployed. So, is there a framework to understand potential harms before we even have them?

**Prof. Jan Whittington:**   Okay. Not really a snarky laugh, but that is hard to imagine. What would have to happen for you to be able to recognize harms before they happen, you would probably have to have access to that training data and do tests in advance, and have some kind of very sophisticated system for being able to recognize bias in the output of the system. When I think about how people like to use tools, or the way people like to rely on data sets for decision-making in government, we are not usually relying of those tools for answering the same questions all of the time. One of the allures of GPT and generated systems is that we can ask novel questions and still get reliable answers. That's not really true. When you ask novel questions, you will get answers, but you have to rely on the same old basic knowledge set that you already have to be able to confirm whether or not those are reliable answers. Does that make sense? If we are going to ask the same types of questions over and over, we could set up the data, do some machine learning, pattern with the mission: boom. You have answers. And they're reliable. It's the combination of what we want out of this system and what the system is designed to do.

**Member:**   And I guess the follow-up question is in generating policy, or principles, I imagine that the risk/tolerance of the City would be expressed through those principles with respect to the harms. So, how do we, as a City, consider that risk tolerance? Where in the scale would be appropriate?

**Prof. Jan Whittington:**   That's a great question. So, if I go back to the example of the privacy program, back when the City was evaluating that program, I co-authored a study with Ryan Calo and a few others from UW, called Push Pull and Spill. <https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/faculty-articles/19/>  It's about all of the different ways that cities end up somehow releasing data that they otherwise would want to stay privately held to protect the privacy of the people represented in the data. We push it out to opening portals. People can pull it out through public records requests. And it can be leaked in a data breach. So, very similar to this case, because you have all of these tools like the open data repository that could save time and energy. You could give yourself an efficiency argument for using them. But the harms, to understand the harms in this relationship to what Seattle's commitment would be. More privacy. We did a lot of interviews around the City with folks in the City and did an analysis of the corpus of open data for its re-identifiability to persons, and we did an analysis of contracts for the different sources. It was a quick and simple assessment. That was the lay of the land for this problem, and set up a series of (unintelligible). The City has implemented six out of seven recommendations that reflect your policy today. Some of the choices you need to make are going to be choices where you have to be able to tell yourself that there's a meaningful public policy reason for you to divulge the data. This idea is striking a balance between protecting residents' privacy, which is going to be your go-to the vast majority of the time if it is one of those cases that is in the public interest for you to share the data. I think local governments are about finding that dividing line. There are going to be some use cases that you can set up to be one of those iconic use cases for divulging information. So, in this case, it would be what would be those use cases, and how would you manage those use cases. Under what circumstances would we find it potentially so beneficial for the public good, whatever that argument is, that we would want to use AI. And then, how would we want to manage or govern those uses to ensure that the public related benefits are accruing without significant other harms.

**Mark DeLoura:**   Thank you for breaking that down. I appreciate that. There were things that I keyed in on, the response of government (unintelligible). One of the things was surveillance technology, to not put in cameras (unintelligible)....

**Prof. Jan Whittington:**   Well, I think it's fairly simple. Your principles really have to be timeless. You should be able to understand the basics of (unintelligible), to be able to devise principles that are timeless. Principles are really more an expression of your values that you share and want to project out to the residents. But then, the evolution of the rest of the government structure will have to grow and change with the tech and with your awareness and desires and development. Keep that idea that you don't starve your principles because that really shouldn't change. Even though we're feeling that the pace of development is rapid, it always feels like the pace is rapid when we've reached some kind of new plateau of technology being able to perform something that it hadn't before. So, we're in a moment where it feels that way. When people first shared clips of a car driving itself, we had that feeling. Right? And now, how many times have we turned around and asked ourselves, well, when are they really going to be driving. That is part of that technological evolution. We're at a plateau and we're all checking it out at the same time. I'm not so sure that we're going to see the next plateau any time soon. We're going to be living with this narrow intelligence in the systems and limited (unintelligible) on the corpus of the data that they work with for a while. The principles have to matter. And to help you navigate this slippery slope of deciding that some service you want to provide is going to be a reason to do something different than what the public expressly wants. Surveillance technology -- if you guys have a system for making information public without what you're evaluating and taking a close look at it, and that's actually really meaningful for establishing some basis of shared understanding about what these technologies are and why you are using them. It means a lot to the people that you're dealing with. It doesn't always feel that way in cybersecurity, I'm sure.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Unfortunately, we're at time. Thank you so much for the start of this conversation. I think it reminds us of the importance and the impact of the Generative AI working group and the City. So, thank you so much for the presentation.

**Prof. Jan Whittington:**   You're welcome. Thanks for having me.

**Camille Malonzo:**   I think tonight's theme is Generative AI, so next up on our agenda is an update on  the progress of the advisory team on Generative AI systems, and a progress update on that. So, I'm going to hand it over to Sarah Carrier and Eleonor Bounds.

**SEATTLE IT CTO'S POLICY ADVISORY TEAM ON GENERATIVE AI SYSTEMS PROGRESS UPDATE**

**Sarah Carrier:**   Wonderful. Thank you.

Eleonor Bounds and I are here to give everyone an update. I think everyone here is currently aware that we have been working with a diverse set of folks who are the Generative AI advisory group that was put together by our CTO Jim Loter.

I will give you a brief overview of what the group was tasked to do specifically. Basically, the group of folks who are working on this on behalf of the City are really tasked with understanding what the policy bifurcations are for the City government, City of Seattle's use of Generative AI, basically delivering at the end of our work, creating a set of recommendations or best practices that essentially amount to the responsible use of AI that the CTO could then leverage to build into a longer-term policy around Generative AI specifically for City employees to use. That's the high level overview of what this team is tasked with working on, and we've been really busy. I would think we are about halfway through. If we hit the slide, I will talk about what we've done and where we're going.

**Eleonor Bounds:**  Before we go through who is involved in this, we have a lot of internal City stakeholders that we've been very fortunate to have. Sarah Carrier is the lead of this group. We also have a core group representing legal applications, race and social justice, security infrastructure, privacy, the Mayor's Office with a liaison to other members. We also have organizations change management at the table. We also have architecture. And also, based on the topics that we're discussing every week, we have additional guests. This can be public disclosure, retention, contracting, vendor management law, and others. These are all kind of broken up and delved into by this group. We've also been very, very lucky to have stakeholders from CTAB, and also researchers and leaders from the UW. Thank you so much, Jan Whittington, and everyone. It has been a boon to be able to utilize your knowledge. We've also got some folks from the Allen Institute that will be joining us for AI. And we can look at the next slide. What we landed on, I think, what was really important to land on was to decide what specifically we're talking about. So, we took a variety of really great definitions and we were able to land on, with some conversation on what we would define this particular system as. We define them as a class of AI systems, including algorithms, deep learning, and machine learning models that are capable of generating new content, including, but not limited to text, images, video, and audio-based inputs of training data sets. These also include systems that are capable of ingesting input and translating that input into other forms such as text systems. And I think that we were really mindful and it was a really good call not to enter more (unintelligible), because I think that's something that we're seeing, so I think it was really helpful to dig in and focus. We can go to the next slide, which is actually our last slide because it's high level, and we want you to have time for questions and so and so forth.

The way we've broken it up is that every two weeks we would discuss different topics, high level recommendations, questions to ask as well, in terms of risk, etc. So, things that we've gone through thus far are acquisition and contracting for City youth, and to rental property, attribution of accountability and transparency of authorship, bias and harm. And this week, we're going to be talking about privacy and public records. The following week we will be talking about cybersecurity, labor, personnel, HR, impact. And then we will be presenting our recommendations to the CTO, who then can take them and respond back to the group, and then do with them as he is planning. So, that's kind of a summary and overview information as to what this group is doing. And with that, I am happy to be quiet and take questions. Thank you for your time.

**From Chat:** from Tang, Vinh to everyone:    6:58 PM

Link to CTO Loter's Geekwire podcast on generative ai: <https://www.geekwire.com/2023/what-generative-ai-means-for-cities-municipal-tech-leaders-face-unique-workplace-and-policy-issues/>

**Eleonor Bounds:**   Thank you, Sarah. Do you folks have questions? If you have a question, please raise your hand.

**Camille Malonzo:**   I have a question. That list that you have on topics, how did you land on those lists, and are there any that didn't make the list, given deadlines or whatever?

**Sarah Carrier:**   We started with, basically, for lack of a better term, the direction of the CTO. When we originally put the group together, we laid out the intention, right? Here are some ideas for areas for you guys to discuss. I think we've all been hearing that the technology in this emergent field has started to explode. And so, we took those kinds of initial prompts that he had provided us in topical areas. And then we discussed in one of our first meetings what is missing here. is there anything else that we need to discuss, any other topics we need to add. And we specifically, I believe, added additional topics around cybersecurity, as well as the labor and HR impacts, as well, because those were also called out from a City use perspective that we should be cognizant of as we move forward to how we can responsibly use these kinds of tools and what kinds of controls we should put in place around use and implementation. Does that answer your question?

**Camille Malonzo:**   Yes.

**Mark DeLorean:**   I have a small question. I thought there was an original from Jim Loter from a policy manual or something like that. What are the standards for the use of AI? Is it being used for continuity or ..?

**Sarah Carrier:**   Well, that's an interesting question. When it comes to we're a Microsoft shop, and we know that they're our existing vendor, so we use their technology when we know these things are coming. We are working closely with those identified vendors. On timeline applications, we do diligence that they have put on the vendor side around controls. Microsoft has the responsibility for AI programs, so what have they done, or how do they evaluate this before they decide to roll it out to folks. So, we're working with them on that kind of thing. Internal policy is still in effect. I believe to or through October. Due diligence meaning being aware. Don't put in any confidential or sensitive information and that kind of thing, being high level. But note that just like with any other technology acquisition of the City, there are defined IT processes and other things to go through. Generative AI is no exception to that rule. So, should Generative AI be requested to be in use or acquired, it will have privacy as part of that review process, cybersecurity as part of that review process, operational support, and others. So, that's kind of where we're at right now. As I may have mentioned in the beginning, the goal is for these best practices and recommendations to come out of this advisement group's work, to build a perhaps detailed and granular and robust longer-term policy and approach speaking to some of the things that Jan Whittington was talking about. How do I implement things in this context, and what might that look like?

**Member:**   I have a question. It sounds like, just to be clear, when the outcomes of the group are best practices, and that includes a set of principles that you talked about in the presentation, is that right?

**Sarah Carrier:**   So, the scope of the work is really focused, first of all, on Generative AI, not AI wrote broadly. Additionally, around the context of a CTO developing the citywide IT policy around the use of Generative AI. So, we're looking at an IT policy, and what would be acceptable provisions of controls or things that we could put in place that apply to the technology evaluation processes that should go through things that are in IT purview, but also rules of the road to some extent for end users, as well. I will say that I do think we have had many conversations in the group around what those principles might be, what they might look like. Those types of things. There have been a lot of discussions on things we strive for, I think the kinds of things (unintelligible)...for its approach to government is something I think we have been discussing a lot in that group. While it may not be entirely bespoke for what was originally asked, it seems important to represent that additional recommendation that we're hearing, as well.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Is it appropriate? Is it necessary to have the back channels for residents to respond to these kinds of uses of technology? I'm thinking specifically about the Surveillance Ordinance, where there was room I guess, for public engagement on particular technologies. So, is that necessary or good for residents to comment on technologies used even after use principles or best practices (unintelligible)?

**Sarah Carrier:**   Well, I think I don't know for certain what accommodations will be added. So, I think the work of the group is here are the set of recommendations and what makes sense in the application within the scope. What are we able to do practically or what is pie in the sky, in terms of what our recommendations are? I can say personally, I think that public input is super important. We are public servants and we provide public services. But, ultimately, I just don't know what the results will look like, the end product.

**Harte Daniels:**   I have a question. You have been very polite in talking about the discussion around creating principles. As a project manager, I am often asked to be able to navigate stakeholders with conflicting interests. When you are making the principle, going through the process of choosing principles, can you share wit us -- and I want to put the caveat in that I'm not trying to seek dirty linen or anything of that nature, but more looking at the situation when somebody talks about security to common knowledge conflicting interests around security to tighten things down so much that people can't use a product. Do you have that type, when looking at Generative AI, do you have that complex of balance of what you have to do to work between different groups that have come to the table to talk about principles. Do you have conflicting interests that you are still working on?

**Sarah Carrier:**   It's either diverse perspectives represented in the group and they are part of the discussion around what potential principles might look like in Generative AI, or AI generally. Is that what I'm hearing?

**Harte Daniels:**   No.  You're always going to get diversity, but there will be times when one group says XYZ and another group says, no, it's completely against our groups principles or policies in which we act. As an example, I was working on having two sponsors on a large federal application. Sponsors are pretty (unintelligible). One of them has a state law against using certain identifiable information. The other one can only perform their work when they use that forbidden identification. So, how do you balance that? How do you put it in an application when you have those two conflicts? The other example I gave was that some people will want security to be so restrictive that the application then becomes unusable. Those are conflicting interests. They're not good. They're not bad. And it doesn't reflect diversity as much as it reflects either policies that are already in existence, or methods of operation, or in talking about residents is reassurances, especially with certain groups and things of that nature. Have you started looking at your principles, and addressing your (unintelligible) those groups that might have needs, conflicting thought processes, informing your principles?

**Eleonor Bounds:**   I think, and honestly, if I am not in any way touching what you are talking about, please forgive me -- I I think one thing that does surface is that we haven't come up, necessarily, with principles. That's important to call out because the whole role of this group is to identify, and ask really meaningful questions about the use of the technology. That's one thing that this group wants to have, these conversations. We want to pull things apart, because that's healthy. That what we want. We certainly know how to ask uncomfortable questions. I think, to your point, having different interests, maybe, at a table -- I don't know that this group necessarily represents that in the sense that no one may be pushed to do something that may need to satisfy someone else's needs, if that makes sense. Our sole purpose exists to serve the public. That's it. And so, I think a lot of us come together with best practices from a lot of different areas from IT. I think from apps, from infrastructure. We have to use that body of knowledge to ask really hard questions. And it's not to place a solution out of them but we want to have the debate, we want to have the conversation, we want peoples' wisdom. But I don't know if it's that level of conflict. We'll see how the policy develops, and maybe also have principles around it, but I think that's about (unintelligible). But I don't really have the (unintelligible) to answer that.

**Harte Daniels:**   You used some good words in there about (unintelligible). But it boils down to you don't know what you don't know. And the age-old problem that techies have, we'll be finding out later. So, how do you invite or listen to people who don't talk like this does, or talk like cybersecurity does, o talk like the University of Washington researchers do? How do you bring those in to seek other voices? Not just to be egalitarians, or diverse, or whatnot, but to avoid failure. As I always say, the proof is in the pudding, the rubber hits the road, whatever you want. We can theorize as much as we want at this stage, but if you wait too long to try to have some research out, how do the potentialities that the eggheads -- I'm trying not to use pejorative words, but you know, people that have lived and breathed this to the extent that sometimes you may not think of what will happen when you truly to put it into action. I always have a view on end results. Everything that you've done so far is great, in your thought processes and what you're looking at. But to avoid failure, looking for some of these other voices you may not have thought of that will produce conflict. Conflict is not a bad thing. It produces innovation and you can be truly creative and lauded across the fifty states if you solve something that other people -- you know. Otherwise, everybody else, especially the academics and all are just regurgitating. Right? So, you need to be creative and innovative by looking at the end product and thinking about when the rubber hits the road or how will the people that suffer from inequities in digital work, if they have a different viewpoint than what you're talking about, and seeking that just to test yourselves, to strengthen yourselves, to push yourselves, that's where I'm going. I'm not trying to be pejorative, etc. It's just suggesting that sometimes we get locked up in our words or in our own inner circle.  You've done a great deal to try to avoid that. I can see that in your work, and even in your in your outline that you've got. So, I'm just asking you to always be looking in that regard. Thank you.

**Camille Malonzo:**   I think we're out of time, so if folks have questions, please contact Sarah Carrier. Thanks so much to both of you and to everyone in the working group for what they have done so far. Thank you for the clarification that this presentation brought. We're going to take a two-minute break and then at 7:18, we'll go to the next agenda item, which is a review of our bylaws going forward.

**From Chat:**  from Bounds, Eleonor to everyone:    7:19 PM

Thank you so much for your feedback and the conversation - you can always ping us at privacy@seattle.gov

**Camille Malonzo:**   I think it's time. I hope everyone got a chance to stretch their legs a little bit.

**CTAB RULES OF PROCEDURE UPDATE**

**Vinh Tang:**  At the last meeting, we were able to complete the work plan for CTAB, and as a continuation of that is a clean-up of governance. And the next thing that we want to do for this group is to clean up the CTAB bylaws. The last time we did this was many years ago. I think it was around 2014 or 2015, when Mark DeLoura might have been here. If you go to the CTAB web site, there's a link for the rules. We show that screen here in the form of a PDF. It's about nine pages and was last revised in 2014-2015 years. And what the bylaws define at a high level describes elections, when we elect a chair and a vice chair. I'm going to go through each of these line items for bylaws. Bylaws provide us with structure and accountability, how and when we open the meeting, etc. It sets those rules in place for the meeting. Section two relates to the meetings, how we write the agenda (unintelligible),..and how we vote on a new bylaws at the August meeting or the September meeting.

What is really relevant here, without changing much - I think the rule will stay the same in terms of the quorum and the members that are (unintelligible) and really just attendance. You guys will notice that I sent out an email before the meeting to be looked at at the meeting or in the first week of the month that just asks you to RSVP because we want to make sure we have good attendance at these meetings. But that's just one part of it. If a board member is unable to attend the regular board meeting, he or she (unintelligible) designated staff members (unintelligible).

Any comments from the group on that edit? Going once, going twice?

All right. The other priority is subcommittees. So, right now, on the subcommittees, we have Privacy and Cybersecurity Committee, the Digital Equity Committee, and the Outreach Committee. We had others years ago, but they are not currently active. I think Digital Equity kind of took that over. So, for the three subcommittees, I think the recommendation is that each subcommittee has participation and at least one of the chairs be a CTAB member. I think what we were planning for the staffing at the meeting in June is that we have a high level major top three items that the board will work on, and then the subcommittees. That's not in this main body. They will make recommendations and bring it back to this main committee. So, we're hoping that we have this in place (unintelligible)...  Any comments or edits by CTAB members?

**Camille Malonzo:**   I agree. But the subcommittee meets (unintelligible). But my question was around the second sentence: "No more than three can participate in a CTAB subcommittee. What was the thinking behind that one?

**Vinh Tang:**  Well, four is a quorum, so once you get four, it becomes a public meeting under the act. We can't do that. My thinking is that maybe two or three.

**Camille Malonzo:**   I guess I just don't want to tie -- we said in the bylaws the number of members. So, that's kind of tied together with the number for quorum. I just want to say that if the number of members changes, then that number, the quorum number, also changes.

**Vinh Tang:**  Do you mean the number of members on a subcommittee?

**Camille Malonzo:**   On CTAB.  so, we have ten. If that ten number is in the bylaws, then I'm okay with the three.

**Vinh Tang:**  Okay, I'm not sure that we want to finish this now. We can work offline. We can just delete that line if that's what you want. I just want to make sure that we have three members being a part of a subcommittee.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Yes. I think that's a good idea. My feedback was just do we want to set three, or some language (unintelligible).

**Vinh Tang:**  Okay. Those are the only edits I had from my end. And I would love for all nine members of CTAB -- you will get a copy either tonight or tomorrow. And if you can think of anything else that we want to put in writing, please send me your observations so that we can be sure to have the rules in place for CTAB.

**Phillip Meng:**   I agree that it might be better to, with the subcommittee language, maybe just use the 'quorum' term. The one committee that coming up to the numbers, we've got three CTAB members of the Digital Equity Committee. Essentially, if there were more members of the board, that could change, so we need to stay on the quorum, but have as much flexibility there as possible.

**Vinh Tang:**  Well, the thing is, the board knows about bylaws at any meeting. And to find out that we haven't done this in a long time. Right now, the Seattle Municipal Code defines CTAB as ten members. If that were to ever change, that would be another opportunity for you to update the bylaws again. In my opinion, I think right now with ten members, we allow no more than three. But there's already three members on the Digital Equity Committee. I think we want to keep that three then. It should not be more than three. If there is, then you need to take one of them off, because we don't allow that. Any questions from the group? I will send this around. We've got to do it in a public setting, and then we will bring this back to the next CTAB meeting for any different comments, and hopefully adopt these bylaws. That's it for me, Camille. Thank you.

**From Chat:** from Tang, Vinh (privately):    7:33 PM

I will upload the PowerPoints as PDF for the presentations to the CTAB agenda later tonight or this week. So you will see the PDF of the presentation in the agenda at <https://ctab.seattle.gov/2023/07/10/july-11-2023-agenda/>

**Camille Malonzo:**   Thanks, Vinh. I just want to say thank you so much for doing this. We've been talking about bylaws for so long. I really appreciate it. Okay, so next is committee updates. Would the Digital Equity folks provide an update?

**COMMITTEE UPDATES**

**DIGITAL EQUITY COMMITTEE**

**Harte Daniels:**   We spent the last Digital Equity meeting with a CBO. We learned quite a bit and had plans to visualize future work. We had very little time for telecommunications in that meeting. We have asked people to take work items offline, and that has not yet materialized because the project manager (unintelligible), deadline, as Phillip Meng had suggested, for good reason, that at the beginning of September or beginning of October with the telecommunications forum. So, we'll try harder before I have to leave again for a medical leave to get that rolling. Dorene Cornwell did some excellent work with a survey being done, and at first blush, it looks like seniors and the disabled were not consulted, but researchers had gathered the information from other areas. And for good measure, Dorene put in extra effort and put together a panel of people that were able to help those. I also presented some information on training at Fred Hutch and others on trauma-informed care. Looking at the corollaries between health care policies and what the City government has to do with it, and whether we could formulate educational policies and proposals, based on that large body of knowledge. Primarily, the group is supposed to be focused on the telecommunications forum, and hopefully, there will be no more interruptions, so that we can finish that work. Anybody else willing to -- I know none of you can, because that would make us a quorum, but if you have other people that would suggest as volunteers to work on that. We have spoken in the past -- you already have minutes on the body of work that we have done on changing the forum so that it asks more poignant questions on our governance stance. That's all been done. It is now just down to the work. Thank you.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Thanks, Harte. (unintelligible) Let me know when this is happening.

**Philllip Meng:**   We will connect offline (unintelligible) We're very excited about this forum. Our emphasis was on bringing in more of the (unintelligible) and providing more opportunities for you to ask questions about what (unintelligible). Even if you're not involved in the project, we really welcome input from the rest of the committee and community members on what would be most valuable (unintelligible).

**Harte Daniels:**   One last thing that might be relevant to I think it was Omari Stringer or someone else, talking about tolls. It's my bad that I introduced the concept of a toll, but I have been so busy that I have not actually given it to the group, but I could send it to you, Camille, or Vinh Tang, when you were asking about project management goals that are easier to use in tracking down a project like this. It's my bad for not having met with this committee, but it can also be useful to Camille and Vinh. Thank you.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Thanks, Harte. Next up is Isabel Rodriguez for Privacy and Cybersecurity.

**PRIVACY AND CYBERSECURITY COMMITTEE**

**Isabel Rodriguez:**   Thanks, Camille. I'll keep my camera off for this one. We are undergoing a leadership chair transition. I am stepping down as chair of this committee, and Omari Stringer has graciously agreed to take up the mantle. I'm supporting that transition, which will happen in August. That's it.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Thanks, Isabel. Outreach?

**OUTREACH COMMITTEE**

**Femi Adebayo:**   Thank you. We were unable to get our Webex web link, so I sent out an email this week about the agenda for next meeting. Next one will be July 19, which is next week Wednesday. We sent out a meeting invite to everyone, and please feel free to attend or stop by. We will probably meet up to set up a debrief of items we want to talk about. A couple of things we have narrowed down this year that we want to go after. Please feel free to join. I'm looking forward to seeing you next Wednesday.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Thanks, Femi. So, last we have a couple of comments. Anyone can provide comment or announcements, but I know first up, I'm going to hand it over to Cass Magnuski.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Cass Magnuski:**   Hello, all. I have been with CTAB for the last 23 years. I pretty much don't speak, except at the beginning of the meetings with regard to sound almost always. However, CTAB, the Community Technology Advisory Board should be taking care of the people in the community. And what has been happening here in my apartment -- and I live right downtown, 3rd and Pine, is that I am paying Astound/Wave -- Wave backs Astound -- as Astound can't apparently provide us with what they are selling. And what they are selling to me is 5G 100 mbps into my apartment, and what I'm getting is pretty much 15 up and 15 down. And this is the second time this year. This has been going on in my apartment this time for like two and a half weeks. I work form home. If I don't have internet, I don't have the ability to work from home. I want you guys to investigate this. I don't want to wait for any committee to do it. I want you guys to bring them in and question them on this. A couple of months ago, they were completely down for two weeks. I had no internet whatsoever in my apartment, while paying for it. I spoke to Brenda Tate, who is in charge of all of that. She made them call me, and I spoke to this woman, who sounded a lot like a vice president, however she was screaming at me as if I had done something wrong. She said that I hadn't complained. Well, I had complained daily, sometimes twice daily, but of course, I was speaking to robots. Then in the end, when she decided that I wasn't lying to her, she said, "Be that as it may." What I got back was $10 off my bill, which I couldn't care less about. What I want is for CTAB to bring these people in and for you guys to talk to them and find out what the heck is going on. I'm furious about this. I must have internet in my house, and they are not providing it. They are selling something that they cannot provide. So how about it? I'm not on your board. I'm not on your committees. I don't want to wait for your committees to bring it up sometime in future. I want you to confront them. I don't get to vote, but would you possibly consider this? If we don't have internet, we don't have technology. Enough. I'm done.

**Harte Daniels:**  What Cass has mentioned has happened before, so you do have something to go back to before you address how CTAB addressed it by working with the City. It happened on Beacon Hill. Ten bucks is fine, but they're ruining her business. More and more people are having to work from home since the pandemic. Telehealth for Seniors and other people, one of the questions I ask the people when I'm trying to connect with providers is do you have transportation. I know this is a big one for Dorene Cornwell. Because if I don't have a provider in their area, I am terribly limited, and the only way that I can connect them is digitally. So, health is no small thing. My group was down for about four days, plus the speed. These businesses are advertising one speed and delivering another. This board and the City has addressed that before, so you can go back and look at that. There was a broadband committee, and they moved that stuff into digital equity, and it's just too much. We have to rely on the City, We can't be as active as when we had a committee for broadband to keep our vendors honest and to be able to answer our questions. It's part of why we looked at reformulating the telecom forum so as not to get Pablum back, but to actually have good interaction with them. All I can do is add to Cass, who it sounds like has a history of this. Wave is a smaller company that has been struggling to enter the market against great barriers. But, still, when you advertise one thing and deliver another, it's time to get involved. It has happened in the past and you have a model to look at in order to respond.

**Cass Magnuski:**  I would like to say that I pay for 100 mbps. Every day I pay for that, and I get 15 up, 16 down. When I leave my computer in the evening, I go to watch streaming TV. And it cuts out, it cuts out, it cuts out because it's 15 up and 16 down. They are ripping us off. What is CTAB for? It's not for greasing the City. And I love my folks at the City. They're great, but this is community technology. so, how about thinking about that? If you would drag them in here and give them a lot of, shall we say, hassle, we might get something out of that. Anyway, thank you.

**Brenda Tate:**  Hi, Cass. This is Brenda. I will get with you and I'll reach back out to Astound, okay? Let me see what I can do on my end again also.

**Cass Magnuski:**  I know you will. The last time you did, you made them call me. And they screamed at me as if I were one of their employees. I think it was a vice president who called me. She was furious. That is not how we talk to anybody, much less a client.

**Brenda Tate:**  Absolutely.  We'll be in touch, okay?

**Cass Magnuski:**  Okay. I already sent you an email.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Cass, I totally hear you. And definitely to your call of what is CTAB for, I agree. Thank you to Brenda Tate for connecting. CTAB will take it offline to figure out next steps. I will email you.

**Cass Magnuski:**  Excellent. Thank you.

**Camille Malonzo:**   Thanks, Cass. Next up, do we having any more public comment?

**Dorene Cornwell:**  Cass, I'm glad that Brenda Tate spoke up, because this is job-related. You're relying on it to do your job, and you're not the only employer who has probably got people working at home and getting not astounding service from Astound. I know in the area where I live, Astound is kind of in and out, not like two weeks of in and out, but is spotty sometimes. Long ago, I used to do tech support, and so my brain is always on the 'is this a one person problem, or a many people problem’. And I think we're in the space of it probably is a many people problem. And I really appreciate Brenda speaking up. But we have an activist attorney general in this State, and this is the sort of consumer complaint that you sometimes take to the attorney general. But I think the other question is -- and maybe this is a question that Camille Malonzo and Brenda Tate can think about. What exactly does the City do as far as being able to regulate entities like Astound right now. I think that part of why the broadband committee went away is that the definition of how cable franchising changed. So, there is some piece that still needs a follow-up. Like I say, I am a big one for collecting anecdotal data from different places. So, I would love to hear next month how it comes out. I'm also happy to give this one to other people for right now.

**Vinh Tang:**   Unfortunately, the City is hampered by federal law in terms of broadband. We talked at length about this, but that's the ..(unintelligible).

**Cass Magnuski:**  Do you think I should contact the AG, Vinh?

**Vinh Tang:**   There is no harm in doing so.

**Brenda Tate:**  Sure. I think that you should. You can do that. One of the things on our end is that we try to work closely with the providers on the internet, making sure that the customers are happy with their internet services. I try to work with them to try to get a resolution for you. I have also had residents in the past to go applying to the Attorney General.

**Cass Magnuski:**  I shall do that, Brenda. Thank you.

**Harte Daniels:**  And to this point, they are regulated by the feds. Up and down speed, etc., that's what was discussed, the caps and all of that, by the FCC board. So, we not only have an Attorney General, but if we think we want to boot it upwards, go to the feds. Go to the FCC and make those comments there.

**Dorene Cornwell:**  Another point would be if they're marketing it as 100 mbps and they're only delivering 15 or whatever, that's misrepresentation. Hopefully, that's not preempted by the feds. Not being a lawyer, and having reactions off the cuff.

**Cass Magnuski:**   Thank you, Dorene.

**Vinh Tang:**   What I would recommend, is to invite them to a CTAB meeting here next month. There was a conversation where we (unintelligible). I think there were a couple of months where we had someone present on the speed (unintelligible)...where we asked all of the households about their speeds. The State Broadband net would present broadband speeds. So, maybe we can bring that conversation back to next month.

**Harte Daniels:**  How we solved the problem the last time, there was a tool for installers to test and see whether they were getting what was advertised to them. All of these roll into one. Thank you again, Cass, for speaking up. If it's happening to you, it's happening to others.

**Camille Malonzo:**   I think we have clear follow-ups. I will be in contact, Cass. do folks have other comments? Thank you all for really engaging in the July meeting. We have some work to do. I'll see you all at the next meeting. Hope you all have a great, sunny day. Thank you.

**ADJOURNMENT**