

March 11, 2025 Meeting - Seattle Community Technology Advisory Board

Topics covered included: Presentation of the 2025 Digital Equity Grants - Award Recommendations; Digital Equity State Legislative Update; City of Seattle Artificial Intelligence (AI) Policy Update; Committee Updates

This meeting was held: March 11, 2025; 6:00-8:00 p.m., via Webex and in City Hall Room 370

Attending:

Board Members: Phillip Meng, Omari Stringer, Isabel Rodriguez, DeiMarlon Scisney, Aishah Bomani, Femi Adebayo

Public: Dorene Cornwell, Sanchit Gera, John Kelso, Richard, Call-in User_1, Carla, Lily Johnson, Rachel, Tricia Kuhn, Patrick O., Kate Bond, Lisa Rough, Friendship Circle, Bliss Collins, Jan Edrozo, Harte Daniels, David Keyes, Faye Chien, Muktar, Nathalie Chan, Rene Peters, Ginger, Ibram, Hughes, Srinivas, Kristen, Rene V., Assaye, Kevin Kiuchi

Staff: Rob Lloyd, Trayce Cantrell, Jon Morrison Winters, Sarah Carrier, Tara Zaremba, Meira Jough, Brenda Tate, Vinh Tang, Cass Magnuski

44 In Attendance

Phillip Meng: Good evening, everyone, and welcome to the March meeting of the Community Technology Advisory Board. We have a pretty packed agenda today. Let's get started with introductions. We will go alphabetically among the participants list first, and then to the room.

INTRODUCTIONS

Phillip Meng: Thank you all. We have such a fantastic audience here today. My name is Phillip Meng. I chair CTAB and am a member of the Digital Equity Committee. Let's jump right in. Can I get a motion to approve the February CTAB minutes?

DeiMarlon Scisney: I move to approve the CTAB minutes from February.

Phillip Meng: Thanks. Do I have a second?

Omari Stringer: Second.

Phillip Meng: Thanks. All in favor? Great. That's a majority. Can I get a motion to approve the agenda for this meeting?

Isabel Rodriguez: Motion to approve.

Phillip Meng: Thanks, Isabel. Do I have a second?

DeiMarlon Scisney: Second.

Phillip Meng: All in favor? Fantastic. One of the events that I know many of us have been waiting for for months is the presentation of the 2025 Technology Matching Fund grants. And in fact, in the audience today -- and I am certainly not in the best position to introduce this -- between Meira Jough, David Keyes, and Jon Morrison Winters and those folks, so Meira, the floor is yours.

PRESENTATION OF THE 2025 DIGITAL TECHNOLOGY MATCHING FUND GRANTS AWARD RECOMMENDATIONS

Meira Jough: Thank you so much, Phillip. I am going to share my PowerPoint, so you should be able to see it. I am Meria Jough, digital equity advisor for Seattle IT, and I am really excited to announce our Technology Matching Fund recommendations for 2025. We are going to make award recommendations and hopefully get approval for these recommendations tonight. Let's just start with the Technology Access and Adoption Study. It really gives us a background into what is going on in Seattle with the digital equity data. We did survey in focus groups with over 4,600 residents to better understand how residents are accessing and using technology, the barriers they face in using technology, and then, the support they need to make sure that they have access to all of the technology. In our study, we found that over the past five years, we have increased internet access from 95 percent to 98 percent. However, there are still a number of inequitably impacted populations that really need our help. So, those people who are living in poverty, 11 percent, do not have internet access. Primary languages, other than English, nine percent; six percent household members living with disability; six percent Black residents; five percent Native residents; and five percent of older adults do not have internet at home.

We also looked at internet on the go. So, not just do I have it t home, but do I have access to it as I move around the City. Eight percent of Seattle households, which is an estimated 25,000, do not have access to both internet at home and on the go. And then, we see very disproportionality with indigenous people of color, which is 11 percent, do not have it on the go and at home. Sixteen percent of older adults, 18 percent of households living with a disability, 25 percent of households speaking a language other than English do not have internet both at home and on the go. And then, 26 percent of households living in poverty.

Access to devices: We did look at whether members were sharing devices and if each member of the household had access to a device. We saw that 17,000 households had fewer than one internet-enabled device per household. And we see a disproportionally impact on people with children. Ten percent of those households are sharing devices. Fourteen percent of households living with a disability. Fifteen percent of Native

households. Nineteen percent of Black households. Twenty percent of households living in poverty. And then, 22 percent of households whose primary language is not English are sharing devices among family members.

Competence and basic skills: This is checking email and using the internet. Seventy-eight percent of individuals in Seattle said that they felt competent in using basic skills. However, that percentage drops when we are talking about people who are 65 and older. Forty percent said they felt competent in basic skills. Sixty-four percent of Black individuals. Forty-two percent if their primary language is not English. And then, forty-two percent of individuals living below the 150 percent of the federal poverty level do not feel like they have basic competence in basic digital skills.

I am also going to take this opportunity to update you all on the 2024 Technology Matching Fund projects, which are happening right now, (unintelligible) so I'm excited that these organizations have been providing digital equity programs and services throughout the City of Seattle. Casa Latina, Dabuli, Eritrean Community in Seattle and Vicinity, Ethnic Cultural Heritage Exchange, Evergreen Goodwill, KD Hall Foundation, Lao Senior Outreach, Literacy Source, Local Connectivity Lab, Oromo Cultural Center, Path with Art, Renaissance 21, Seattle Jobs Initiative, Serve Ethiopians Washington, Solid Ground Washington, Urban League of Metropolitan Seattle, Wasat Community, and YWCA Seattle King Snohomish. So far, we have distributed 596 devices, 1,037 Hotspots, we have provided 1,800 hours of digital literacy classes, and 1,300 hours of digital navigation. So, that's one-on-one or small group assistance. We have served 1,994 low-income residents. 345 residents living with a disability, 402 older adults, 1,555 with limited English, and 282 with no high school equivalency, and 1,876 BIPOC residents. These organization have served 33 languages, included Amharic, Chinese, Oromo, Somali, Spanish, Tigrinya, Vietnamese, and 26 additional languages. We know that Seattle is extremely diverse, and we have a lot of language groups and populations, so this is really exciting, that we are able to serve so many different language groups.

So, onto the 2025 Technology Matching Funds. These are award recommendations based on a review panel of community members, including: Community Technology Advisory Board, Seattle Pacific University Washington State Library, and other community organizations. Here are the organizations that we are recommending for funding. This is a really exciting slide because we see that our total community investment is almost \$1,952,000. How did we come up with this investment? Well, the City of Seattle is investing \$455,000; Comcast is investing \$60,000; Verizon is investment \$25,000. And then, all of the organizations that are recommended for funding are matching our contribution with \$412,000.

This is really exciting. The organizations were scored by a review panel, and these were the top scoring applications:

Cambodian American Community Council of Washington (CACCCA)

Technology as a Third Language

\$33,500.00

Eritrean Association in Greater Seattle

\$44,800.00

Ethiopian Community in Seattle

\$44,900.00

Kandelina

\$45,000.00

Lao Community Service Center

\$45,000.00

Marvin Thomas Memorial Fund

\$33,200.00

Multimedia Resources and Training Institute

\$45,000.00

National Asian Pacific Center on Aging

\$45,000.00

Refugee Women's Alliance

\$45,000.00

The Friendship Circle of Washington

\$28,600

The Lighthouse for the Blind, Inc.

\$45,000.00

Comcast/Verizon Projects

Kin On Health Care Center

\$30,000 (this amount to be confirmed)

Seattle Jobs Initiative

\$30,000 (this amount to be confirmed)

Pending confirmation from Verizon]

Rainier Avenue Business Coalition

\$25,000

Meira Jough: So, thank you so much Comcast and Verizon for your partnership. We couldn't do it without you, and the community couldn't do it without the City; and the City can't do it without the communities. It's a wonderful commitment to the community. So, a little bit about the organizations that are being funded.

Cambodian American Community Council of Washington (CACCWA)

Provide Khmer/Cambodian community internet-accessible tablets to low-income individuals and those with limited English skills; conduct workshops for adults and seniors; and provide one-on-one technical support during workshops and through outreach avenues.

Eritrean Association in Greater Seattle

Provide Eritrean community primarily low-income and limited English with digital literacy skills for older adults, coding for youth, a computer lab, and digital navigator services.

Ethiopian Community in Seattle

Provide Ethiopian community seniors with fixed broadband Internet service, digital literacy training; commercial website subscriptions for small business owners; and digital navigator services.

Kandelia

Provides caregivers of newly arrived refugee and immigrant students digital literacy classes, small group or one-on-one instruction.

Lao Community Service Center

Provide Lao refugees and immigrants, including seniors, low-income individuals, and recent immigrants living with digital literacy workshops, one-on-one or small group

support, and just-in-time assistance for immediate tech needs, device support and training on laptops, smartphones, and hotspots.

Marvin Thomas Memorial Fund

Provide low-income youth of Color educational platforms and collaborative tools, internet access, hotspots, and computers.

Multimedia Resources and Training Institute

Provide low-income BIPOC residents, individuals with disabilities, seniors, to help them find and apply for affordable connectivity, obtain low-cost or free computing devices, complete online tasks, and connect to digital skills training and technical support.

National Asian Pacific Center on Aging

Provides older adults from immigrant backgrounds and speak limited English with digital literacy classes and one-on-one assistance.

Refugee Women's Alliance

Provides an afterschool and summer Youth STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Math) Program to immigrant and refugee youth with digital literacy training and navigation.

The Friendship Circle of Washington

Provide teen and young adults with disabilities with group and one-on-one digital navigation training.

The Lighthouse for the Blind, Inc.

Provide staff who are DeafBlind with computer and technology skills training, access to community resources, and one-on-one training.

Comcast/Verizon Projects

Kin On Health Care Center Provide low-income, Asian, Chinese-speaking seniors with one-on-one tutoring and small group tech classes, device and hotspot loan program.

Seattle Jobs Initiative

Provides un/underemployed, predominantly immigrants/refugees, and justice impacted with training and devices, open lab time and remote tutoring for one-on-one support.

Rainier Avenue Business Coalition

Provide Southeast Seattle small business community through one-to-one engagement with business owners will help them improve their business's digital profile.

Meira Jough: Here is what we hope to accomplish with this funding. we are hoping to offer 3,698 hours of Digital Navigator services; 4,000 hours of digital literacy classes; almost 500 computing devices; hopefully, we will serve more than 4,000 residents citywide; over 4,000 low-income; 467 living with a disability, 2,517 older adults; more than 3,000 with limited English; 2,886 with no high school diploma; and 1,177 BIPOC residents. We also hope to serve 32 languages, including Amharic, Chinese, Oromo, Somali, Spanish, Tigrinya, Vietnamese, and 25 additional languages.

And I want to give a special thank you to our reviewers who invested a lot of time reviewing the applications. They participated in panel reviews, had conversations with each other about which ones to fund. So, I wanted to thank DeiMarlon Scisney, Dorene Cornwell, Friday, Harte Daniels, Isabel Rodriguez, John, Joey, Joyce, Mickey, Kai, Kristen, Latanya, Lily, Marguerite, (unintelligible), Patrick, Rene, Skylar, and Vicky Yuki. We could not do this without you all.

The 2025 Technology Matching Fund approval process: First we will ask CTAB to vote to approve the recommendations, and then we will ask the Seattle IT Chief Technology Officer Rob Lloyd to approve the recommended projects. So, I will turn that back to you, Phillip Meng.

Phillip Meng: Thank you so much, Meira. It's amazing to hear about the impact and the work that these organizations are doing. Moving this forward, I move to approve the 2025 digital equity grants, and recommend the awards as described. Do we have a second?

DeiMarlon Scisney: Second.

Phillip Meng: All in favor? Any abstentions? Any opposed? The motion carries. Thank you all so very much. Congratulations to everyone. I really appreciate everyone, all of the folks from organizations who are joining this Community Technology Advisory Board meeting today. As always, you are more than welcome to continue joining our sessions, and to get more involved with the work of the board. Moving onto our next agenda topic,....

Meira Jough: The CTO has to approve this. We need your approval, Rob.

From Chat: David Keyes (he/him) 3/11/2025 6:31 PM • Big congratulations to all and thanks to the organizations, City, Comcast and Verizon for the effort and digital equity commitment!

Rob Lloyd: Fantastic, Meira. I just want to say thank you. We've seen in recent years tremendous support and trusted partners and community participation to the impacts of education, the effects on health and how it influences access and how it shapes lives and families, especially in the most recent few years. These Technology Matching Funds and grants and projects go toward solving those gaps. I want to say that Meira Jough's presentation went into this year's aspirations, and we saw some of that history. But I also want to call out the serious work and hours that went into the grants, and say thank you to the Community Technology Advisory Board chair Phillip Meng, and co-chair Omari Stringer, and the CTAB members. I also want to say a special thanks to **Meira Jough**. You don't get thanked enough, so thank you. And also to Comcast, Carla, Jason, and Bliss from Verizon. And with that, I have some language here that Meira has given me to speak. With that, I, the City of Seattle chief technology officer do hereby approve the list of 2025 Technology Matching Fund grant projects that were recommended by the review committee, and endorsed by CTAB. So, congratulations, everyone.

From Chat: Kristi 3/11/2025 6:32 PM • This funding will make such a huge difference! Especially in a year when our immigrant and refugee communities are facing so much uncertainty.

Phillip Meng: Fantastic! Thanks so much, Rob and Meira. Now we are good to move onto the next agenda item, right? I don't know what to tell you. I'm too excited about the State legislative update, in truth. It's a rare opportunity that we get a presentation from one of our own CTAB board members. DeiMarlon, the floor is yours to introduce the digital equity legislative update.

DeiMarlon Scisney: Thank you so much, Phillip. Good evening, everyone. I want to take a few moments to give some shout-outs to the individuals that have been convening on a weekly basis. Sabina Roach, David Keyes, Will Booth, Jon Morrison Winters -- we have been meeting weekly to discuss the legislative process and getting the word out around the legislative process. So, I want to take a few moments to provide some updates on two key bills related to digital equity: House Bill 1503, which has successfully passed the House and is moving to the Senate; and House Bill 1517, which has been reintroduced for next session as a potential funding mechanism for digital equity initiatives. And then, I will also touch on CTAB's role in supporting these efforts, and how we can potentially amplify those and strategically engage in advocacy moving forward.

I have a few talking points that I will walk through. Can you all see my screen?

From Chat: DeiMarlon "D" Scisney- CTAB 3/11/2025 6:36 PM •
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/16hcgAZDedXBSXnMHHtfS32tJJXxXqFrWRf2MhBb8oil/edit?usp=sharing>

DeiMarlon Scisney: Starting with House Bill 1503, this bill is focused on expanding digital equity and opportunities across Washington State. It successfully passed, as I mentioned, the House on March 10 with a vote of 61 to 34, and now it's moving to the Senate. The next step is committee assignment, and it's likely to go to the Senate Environment, Energy, and Technology Committee. What this bill brings are five or six different things, and I've listed them in bold. One is really strengthening recognition of broadband adoption of digital equity. So, expanding State support and policy focus on broadband accessibility and digital inclusion. And then, moving the digital equity plan tracking to the Office of Equity, so really shifting the responsibility for monitoring the of the digital equity progress to the Office of Equity, ensuring the more integrated approach to addressing disparities. And the third thing is the Office of Equity to conduct outreach on broadband and digital equity services. It would require the Office of Equity to engage in public education in digital equity programs, really coordinating with other State agencies, as well. Recognizes the role of community anchor institutions and State agencies, allows the digital equity forum to report recommendations more often, so increasing the frequency of policy recommendations from the Washington Digital Equity (unintelligible), and enabling more responsive updates to digital equity strategies, as well. And then requiring a review and update of State broadband goals by 2028. So, really, mandating a comprehensive review and update of Washington State's broadband adoption of infrastructure goals, incorporating community and stakeholder input.

The key senators that we should focus on engaging -- and I will get into CTAB's role, and how we can amplify that in just a moment -- but the key senators that we should focus on engaging are Senator Sharon Shewmake, the chair of that committee; Senator Vendana Slatter, of the 48th Legislative District, who is the vice-chair of that committee, as well. And then, Senator Lisa Wellman, who is the 41st Legislative District member, and also a member of that committee.

Here is how CTAB can play an important role. There are three primary ways where we can take action. The first is through outreach, so one way is to reach out to senators and express support for House Bill 1503. This is especially important for those in the districts represented, so I will ask a little bit later if anyone lives in District 41 or 48 and really being able to pioneer or assist in that outreach engagement with those senators. A simple email emphasizing the importance of digital equity, and urging them to see the importance of digital equity and urging them to support the bill can definitely be impactful in furthering this bill. The second touchpoint is signing into hearings. So, once the bill is assigned to a Senate committee, we will have the opportunity to sign in, either pro or con, in the legislative record. The more people who sign in support of House Bill 1503, the stronger the public record of endorsement becomes. This is an easy but powerful way to demonstrate community backing for digital equity policy. And then, the third way is requesting meetings and testifying. Schedule meetings with the committee members or their legislative aides. And if anyone here has relationships with these senators or is willing to set up a meeting we can definitely coordinate on that. Additionally, once the meetings are scheduled, we should have individuals prepare to submit written testimony or testify in person to reinforce why this legislation is necessary. The next steps for House Bill 1503 is continuing to raise awareness and

encourage public support, monitoring the Senate committee assigned for the hearing schedule, and then, engaging with the Seattle Office of Intergovernmental Relations. I will get into that a little bit later, but David Keyes and I have had ample conversations around structure and things of that nature, and with his tenure, I have been able to learn a lot, just historically about CTAB operations on the advocacy side and policy side. And also interactions with CTAB with the Seattle Office of Intergovernmental Relations. I will get into that a little bit more in just a second.

I will move into the next bill, if there are no questions right now on HB 1503.

Dorene Cornwell: Was it 1503 or 1517 when I went to look to sign in? It had a huge number of people signed in against it. Does anybody remember? I don't remember which bill it was. And any explanation for why there were so many people signed in against it. Was that 1517 or was that 1503?

DeiMarlon Scisney: Senate Bill 1503, as of March 10, had a vote of 61-34. That was for the bill. Not 1503, so that could have been 1517. But I would refer to David Keyes to provide some context here.

Dorene Cornwell: Okay. Well, we can move on, and if it is 1517, then we can do that first and then answer the questions.

DeiMarlon Scisney: Moving on to House Bill 1517, which was the device tax bill. And this has been reintroduced for next session. This is the bill that aims to create a dedicated revenue stream for digital equity programs by implementing a small tax on devices. While it hasn't moved forward this session, it is expected to be back on the agenda for next year. So, it is currently in the House Finance Committee, and a public hearing was held on February 18. The challenge is really ensuring that it gains enough movement to next session to move forward beyond committee. It went to the House floor. And so, CTAB's role here is monitoring engagement and needing to track this bill closely and be prepared to advocate for its advancement next session. The City/State's liaison or lobbyist citywide -- and I will get into that with the department a little bit more -- can sign in and testify when hearings are scheduled. For example, working with Vinh Tang and Jon Morrison Winters and a CTAB presentative or a member of the Office of Interdepartmental Relations. I will just say OIR from here on out to keep me from saying that over and over. They could sit in and be present in hearings to provide public testimony in support of the bill's benefits, as well. So, we can kind of double-dip, and get CTAB advocating on one end and the backing of the City on the other.

That brings me into the collaboration or coordination with OIR, but before I move into that, I just wanted to pause. Dorene Cornwell, do you still have any questions about 1517?

Dorene Cornwell: Yes. My biggest question is, when we go to the legislative site, where I can sign in and put in the bill number, and then, there is a place where you can give an opinion, pro or con, or other, and when I went to sign in, there were 1,800

people signed in, and a huge percentage of them were signed in as 'con.' So, I was just wondering if you or David Keyes have any background on who they are and where they come from, and what they were upset about?

David Keyes: It was 1503 where there were quite a number of sign-ons against it. According to the State legislative liaison for the Washington State PTA, a lot of that was from organizations like Moms for Liberty, Concerned Ladies of Washington, and anti-tax people that were just signing into quite a number of bills.

From Chat: David Keyes (he/him) 3/11/2025 6:52 PM • Here is a link to HB 1503 "Furthering digital equity and opportunity in Washington state" where you can read the bill and staff summary, sign up for alerts and send email to legislators:
<https://app.leg.wa.gov/billsummary/?BillNumber=1503&Year=2025&Initiative=false>

You can also go to the proposed internet device fee bill (1517) that wasn't passed by the House this session by putting that number in the bill search.

Dorene Cornwell: Interesting. Thank you so much for that background.

DeiMarlon Scisney: Thank you, David. Always good to have a tenured veteran on here. Moving into the next part, just a coordination with Seattle's OIR, if there are no other questions. Any other questions before I move on? Awesome.

So, I want to highlight the role of the Office of Intergovernmental Relations, which works directly with State, local, Tribal, and federal governments on behalf of the City of Seattle. They track legislative and advocate for policies that align with the Mayor's and City Council's goals. CTAB can engage with OIR to ensure that House Bill 1503 and 1517 remain legislative priorities, but then also leverage OIR's connections to get City officials to testify on these bills, as well. I would love to figure out -- and I know that historically, we have done this from my conversations with Mr. Keyes, coordinate with Jon Morrison Winters, and finding who can help us to track bill progress and City engagement. And I have a little bit more around this, as well, but really some recommendations on potentially identifying one person who can take the lead on scheduling and educating these two senators going forward. And then, of course, leveraging CTAB relationships. So, anybody who is connected in the 41st District or 48th Legislative District, if you would please contact me or David Keyes, we would love to figure out a way to reach out to these senators directly. This was another piece, building a CTAB advocacy team. I would like to propose, and David Keyes and I were talking earlier about cultivating a small group of CTAB members who are willing to work with us on advocacy for House Bill 1503, but also for looking at bills that are coming, and just advocacy endeavors that are coming forward. We are definitely needing the support of CTAB, so how do we leverage that and also grow the relationship with and make sure that we have a relationship with the City, as I mentioned, to be able to double-dip and advocate or testify on behalf of CTAB, but also have the City officials in support of these bills. Then again, I put this here because I have been a part of different lobbying days. I serve with the Black Caucus. We have African-American Day, and

Black Lobby Day; there's also Cannabis Lobby Day, as well. I serve on the Cannabis Alliance that goes and advocates for cannabis. And so, just figuring out ways to strategically align from a legislative side, and advocacy side, as it trickles down to Olympia.

And then, outreach. Again, that approach to Senator Wellman and Senator Slatter, anybody who is connected there, we have some messaging that is already ready, and I can get that back to you. I will pause here for specific questions, and then, I would love to take some time to go over my recommendations, especially around building the advocacy team. If there is anyone who is here that is representative of these legislative districts, please let me know, from the CTAB side. And I will pause here.

From Chat: Isabel Rodriguez (they/them) 3/11/2025 6:53 PM •
<https://app.leg.wa.gov/DistrictFinder/>

Jon Morrison Winters: So, I guess I can start. First, thank you, D, for putting this together. I think this was really great. I think this a great step in the direction of CTAB continuing to be good advocates in advocating for public policy, and helping us as individual citizens and also as members of the board. I do believe that in the past, CTAB has written letters of support from the board, so I think that could be something we could get started and potentially bring to a vote for the broader board. I think that is a great way to get the full board sign-off on actions that we can do. I know that it ordinarily takes a point person or someone like that on the advocacy team to bring everything together for the board to vote on for approval, so I think that would be a great idea. I also think that having an advocacy team for the longer term would help us to build and continue informal lobbying chops. If we get people more familiar with the process of engaging. I know that during this presentation, I just looked up my legislative district because I think for a lot of us, we are probably familiar with what our federal and GC representatives are and I wasn't so sure locally. So, if someone could share a link in the chat, as well, for looking up your Washington State legislative districts, that would be super helpful. I'm in District 37, so it may not be super helpful for this vote, but it is important to know going forward.

Phillip Meng: Thank you both. And I want to second that, too. Often, we know our federal district and we know our City district, but this is a great way to focus us on the State legislative piece, as well. Would anyone else like to comment?

DeiMarlon Scisney: Before we move on, Phillip, I would like to understand how to move something like this forward. I understand the letters of support. In the past, there was a committee or something, which I know isn't a committee right now for advocacy, per se. I know we have diversity and inclusion, and then, outreach. There could be overlap there, but is there anything that we can do to really amplify the advocacy side of CTAB?

Harte Daniels: If you want DEI to become more active in it, then DEI needs more members. And because of the rules that changed, where only so many of the board

members can be on any one committee, you would need to ask the board members to bring in people from the community to sit on either DEI or any committee that you would wish to form, so that you would have more people that would actually be available to do the work. These are all volunteers. Everybody has a life, blah, blah, blah. But you have changed your rules such that you have prevented board members, so the board members' task now is to go out into the community and bring people who are not board members in onto whatever committee that you choose. It's just an observation.

DeiMarlon Scisney: Thank you, Harte. Phillip, I don't know what this would take to get this together. I would love to work with David Keyes on something like this, and continuing his legacy of what he was planning here every day. But also, in addition to that, I serve on the board for the 37th District, so I am very well-connected with State and local representatives with a lot of advocacy. And so, I don't know what that would look like, of if there is already something formed around this, but I do feel, just going forward, at least having advocacy on the agenda to talk about in discussion -- I'm not even saying form a whole committee, but these do need to be topics for discussion.

Phillip Meng: Let me take a moment to collect my thoughts on how we would do this practically. One point that Harte Daniels raises that I agree with is since so much of our work is done through committees, to be effective in the policy process, I think that we will want to relate this back to committee work. Maybe what this is is at the board level, bringing together these compilations of legislation and major policy decision points, and then starting to organize how that relates to each committee. Committees are also important conduits to a broader subset of the public. I think that's a first step. First, as a board, starting to think about which of these engagement pathways correspond to each committee, and then, we can start to make this a standard practice at the beginning of committee meetings to anchor the meeting on what is happening from a legislative perspective, both at the State and City level. That's a first thought. I want to give the rest a bit more thought, because I think that these are all really exciting ways to engage, and we will want to do that systematically. Another thought here is this kind of legislative update is fantastic. And it doesn't even need to be this detailed, but if we have something like this, five to ten minutes for every meeting, we can also split up the responsibilities as board members, so that it doesn't all fall on a few people. I think that would also be a step in the right direction. Thoughts on any of this?

From Chat: Harte Daniels 3/11/2025 6:59 PM • Could the multiple committees also sponsor a couple public events with the residents most affected to gain more public support and attendance at the bill support

From Chat: Harte Daniels 3/11/2025 7:01 PM • What I meant was the CTAB committees collaborate together creating this outreach

DeiMarlon Scisney: I love it. But I'm a firm believer in 'if it ain't broke, don't fix it.' How was it done in the past? If we can just replicate what was done -- David Keyes pioneered this whole committee, and so if we can replicate how it was done before, I am all for continuing it the way you just mentioned. And I know that we are pressed for time,

but if there was already a formal structure to begin with, I would like to continue with that, if possible. But if not, then yes.

Dorene Cornwell: Hey, D, I'm going to jump in here, because I think we are talking about a couple of things that are really important and one is just the background talking points, and who we all reach out to and connect with. And then, there are things like the schedule of what happens, as far as where a bill has to get through different committees at different times, where building awareness and getting people the technological access. For example, there are a bunch of people in the Oromo community who are really happy to connect with Moms Against Gun Violence because there are basically too many dead Brown children, and problems with investigations and autopsies and preferences about burial timing. So, a series of conversations. There were a mix of people who didn't have much English, and people who had a lot more English, and I think different ones would probably bring different communities. I am fairly connected with some of the faith communities, and most of the time when I talk about digital equity, their eyes glaze over. But if I had a set of bullet points that just say why it is important, sometimes people can sign on. Whereas, also, sometimes they go, 'Oh, right. This one got a poison pill and we actually don't like it anymore, that's another kind of important piece of background. And I think the 'pay attention to the timeline' when people are in their districts over the summer, that's a learning opportunity for basically anybody connected with CTAB, and how people use it in different communities is also a place where there can be learning and growth. Anyway, thank you all for bearing with my need to have a soapbox.

Phillip Meng: Thanks, Dorene. That's a good point. And D, to understand your question to the group earlier, are you referring to a dedicated committee on legislation and policy? I want to understand the proposal here.

DeiMarlon Scisney: It was a multitude of things. Within that, this could fall under Outreach, right? But there needs to be some type of lead person or point person to coordinate with senate outreach. That could fall under the Outreach Committee. I also had mentioned the advocacy, as well, so yes to building a CTAB advocacy team for Senate outreach, so creating some type of small group of CTAB members who are willing to work with us, or as part of that group, or on their own, just to support and advocate. I feel like there could be a point person from that group who is also doing that engagement. Is it something that falls under Outreach. Is it something that falls under DEI, or is it something that's its own thing, with advocacy as this umbrella that is all-encompassing of the now and the future when it comes to bills and things of that nature. I hope that that makes sense.

Phillip Meng: That's helpful.

Isabel Rodriguez: I think DeiMarlon Scisney has kind of clarified it. I have suggested as well that one idea being to have some kind of advocacy tied to an existing committee, like the Outreach Committee. I will second that it is important to have a core team of people who could really do the work of identifying and reaching out to other

partner organizations. And then supporting the other committees and providing some of these talking points and recommendations. Then the committees can work on other things. I am just seconding all of that.

Phillip Meng: Makes sense. Any other comments from board members? This is a great discussion on how we can make this activity more central to our work.

Harte Daniels: I took my hand down when Phillip said he wanted board members to reply.

Phillip Meng: No, board members or committee members. Everyone is welcome, of course.

Harte Daniels: I think that multiple people have stated about the Outreach Committee being a good place for the people to organize. I just want to point out that I always felt that part of the mission statement for the entire board, which would mean its committees, also, that advocacy was already part of it, so I wanted to lend support to what Phillip Meng mentioned, that as we go into this year, we consider that and the way he mentioned focusing is exactly the way a project manager would maybe go over what you are doing. But the last point was to prevent scattering that effort, that one of the points also should be collaborations across any groups that you are doing this with a point person, and having some public events where people that are really affected, so that they can understand this arcane system or something they are not familiar with to them, and creating their own agency and telling them how simple it is or teaching them how to sign up to have their voices heard, etc. And you might want to have at least two of those per year. That's my suggestion. I will yield.

Phillip Meng: Mindful that we are now two minutes past our planned time here, I am hearing a couple of themes, and I want to get a sense of whether this is a consensus on how we move forward. The first is that in the past we have had success with dedicated group of people who are focused on what is happening at a legislative level and how that relates to us. I want to clarify here that, at least in my tenure as part of CTAB, legislation we haven't had that much attention to our legislation. And so, in some ways we are bringing back concepts or doing something that is new to most of us. I think that it fits very well within the Outreach Committee, and we can orient the Outreach Committee's work to encompass this. I think the second thing, and where this also helps us to answer, too, is how to make the Outreach Committee's role and mission more relevant, which I know is something that you and I and Femi Adebayo have been thinking about. The second piece here, one of the responsibilities of the committee in doing this work can be to present to the full board and also relate to other committees that may want to get involved on, say, digital equity topics or privacy topics, and so forth, and making sure that we have collaboration across the committees in that way. Does that make sense to everyone as a way forward, so we can amend committees' roles accordingly, continue to bring more folks onto the Outreach Committee, and perhaps introduce these kinds of regular updates to the full board and to committees so that we can all be moving forward.

DeiMarlon Scisney: I love that, Phillip. And then, in addition to that, adding to the end of that and corresponding with internal committees and things of that nature, and also being able to correspond externally with legislative group meetings, like with Sabrina, and all of the key stakeholders that are working around digital equity, as well. So that person or group also being able to interact externally, as well.

Phillip Meng: Tremendous. And you are totally right about the stakeholders. I think, in this case, the Outreach Committee will also then take the lead in our membership and DELN and all of these groups where we have this kind of relations. Again, fantastic. Thanks, everyone, for entertaining this discussion. I think we have a great path forward on how to make this a bigger part of our work. And thanks so much, again, to DeiMarlon Scisney and David Keyes, and everyone for driving forward this conversation. Now, onto our final agenda topic for the evening, the City of Seattle AI policy update. Sarah Carrier, the floor is yours.

CITY OF SEATTLEARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) POLICY UPDATE

Sarah Carrier: Thank you. I'm going to leave the discussion to the end. Thank you for having us. I'm going to talk about myself for a minute. Thank you for having us to talk about the work we have been doing over the last ten months. We are working really hard on developing an AI policy. I know we have been to CTAB before, in years previous, to speak on Generative AI policy, and we have been working towards a broad policy.

Our goal for the policy are many goals. One of the things that we have quickly realized is that we need a broad AI policy. We need something that is more encompassing, which is Generative AI, a very small piece of the pie here. We think about what we can do with AI, the power of the tool, and how we can use it responsibly to access services, engage in the public. There is a myriad of uses for this.

We needed something that is a little bit broader and that was one of the goals in developing. In terms of the policy, we wanted to make sure that we could define policies for engineering responsible use of these tools across all City departments as a citywide policy in scope. And then we want to provide really clear guidance to departments and folks who are going to be using it, guidance that supports their decision-making, how we can get the most out of these tools, while also addressing some of the challenges we have that are related to government use of AI tools. It's really high level, but that is the goal of the policy.

We will just jump into a high level overview of what the process has been like, and then, some of the details of the policy, and what we are working on next.

This is a really rough high level of the policy process. Similarly to the Generative AI process, we wanted to make sure that we are doing as much due diligence as is

possible. The process we did for the Generative AI policy previously is to bring in external reviewers, which is something we don't always do as an IT department when we develop citywide policies. But this is really important, so we this and then some process to how we usually do policy development at the City, or in the IT department, for citywide policy. We started with a draft for which we worked very hard with the Gov AI Coalition. I don't know if we spoke about that previously in the work we've been doing with the coalition led out of San Jose, that is even international now. But we worked to develop a policy template that government agencies can use around AI tools. And so, we took that as a framework and adapted that to the City of Seattle and our specific context and we drafted that out. Now it's coming back as the first policy development on the left-hand side there. We also worked to see how are we going to do this. We don't want to do it just how we do every internal City policy. We want to do extras. So, we kind of developed a more robust concept for feedback on what the policy content was. And then, one of the things we needed to finalize was how are we going to socialize this? How are we going to get the word out to all of our City departments and all of our partners, and you guys? It is very important, and that was the first part of the process. And then we worked through internal stakeholder review. So, we got tons of City departments, not all 43, and there was a big chunk of them in a room together and it created feedback. We had a series of working sessions with them where they could provide feedback as a policy think tank. This is a really big consideration for all of the work that we do in this department, because with IT, sometimes we don't know what we don't know. And so, we are taking guidance from departments on how the language reads. Does it make sense? Does it not make sense? Is it going to stop business? How can we improve it? And getting that kind of feedback and buy-in from departments to help us to co-create what the language is. Then we bundle all of that up and update it, thanks to that feedback, and send it to the middle section there, which is executive review. We do a couple of rounds of executive review and feedback. It did go to the Conference of Mayors relatively recently in January. So, that was a pretty successful engagement, as well. Again, incorporating the feedback from that, and we did one more round of stakeholder review, because we wanted to make sure that everyone was in agreement with the establishment of the policy and the content of it over time.

So, number two in parallel, we did another internal review with the same stakeholders, who worked on it the first time. And then, we also actually went external, what we call external review, external from the City of Seattle. So, we had Omari Stringer and folks from CTAB provide some feedback, from folks from the Allen Institute for AI, UW Tech Policy Lab were invited, and we also added some folks and board members from the (unintelligible) AI Coalition, as well, to review. And so, we got all of that feedback from both the internal and the external. Reviewed it again, and this time, it was more minor changes at this point. The substantive changes were covered in the first part. That's kind of where we are at now, and hopefully, by the end of the week, we will process and dot the 'i's' with the signatures from Rob Lloyd and then start executing on what it is. We have an AI policy and here are the details about what that means, and how we can support you in the whirl of AI initiatives in a way that aligns with what our values are and what the policy says. That is the high level of the process.

I'm going to talk briefly. The details are not comprehensive, but the policy will be available publicly once we finalize it with the signature. But high level, here is the policy structure. We will have the regular policy things, purpose of justice, scope, definition, those types of things. Rules and responsibilities, principles that you will find in the policy, actually principles that were developed by the external advisory group that helped to craft the recommendations report for the Generative AI policy that led to that, because they were actually crafted as AI principles, not specifically Generative AI principles. Those still stand as our values, our north star, so those are in the policy, as well. There is something called policy provisions, which we will get into in the next slide. And then we have sections around prohibiting uses, high-risk uses, a section on environmental impact, which is important to us as a City value, and then, obviously, in true government fashion, a special section for records and production to make sure we check all of our compliance obligations around being a transparent government agency.

And I got a lot of flack earlier about these little icons, that people commented on. That's what you get when you hit 'icons.'

Phillip Meng: If it makes you feel better, I didn't notice it. Only now do I know what it meant.

Sarah Carrier: Listen. We need a little levity, right. Here are just some of the highlights from when I talk about the policy provisions in a general sense. It's just high level. It requires an AI review. We need to look at these that are being proposed to be used or procured. We need to evaluate the risks associated with them, or around them. We're saying we need to look at these things. It's what the provision highlights. We also have in there a requirement or a provision around requiring the need to complete a fact sheet, which is another template that came out of the AI Coalition work, and it helps support the City in understanding details about these tools that we are using, like what data was used to train the model, have you done bias evaluation; those types of details that we would ask the vendor, as we are typically procuring for use, and you may not have those types of details. There is a lot of work and a lot of coalition to leverage that template, as well. I don't know how many members there are now. I know that the member representation on the coalition, but now covers over a third of the US population. So, it's very big. It's a very big network. And the idea is that we are all asking vendors to fill out these questions, and that kind of becomes standard practice and helps support especially government agencies which don't necessarily have a strong individual voice when it comes to those types of things. So, that's one of the provisions, saying we are going to ask vendors questions and they will tell us all of the details about what we are getting into here. Speaking of which, the third item there is around terms and conditions in our contract. So, when we procure, and our systems we have developed and actually are implemented, is one of our first things that we did pre-policy are specific contract terms. They are baked into our standard City template around security, privacy, accessibility, language, that type of thing. We now have specific terms. So, they should be showing up in contracts of AI systems or tools that have AI features or functionality.

And then, another provision here is around incident monitoring. If we are leveraging an AI system, we want to make sure that we are watching it. If something goes awry, we want a backup to backup the backup plan. Just noting that there is an instance in the plan that is a little specific to AI, but also can dovetail with the same privacy incident response plan for cybersecurity incident response that we also have in place. Those are just some high level provisions. They are not comprehensive. Again, more details will be coming.

There is more than this. There is more detail. This is my shorthand synopsis. These are just high level examples of some of the things that are in the prohibited use section and the high risk section of the policy, itself. It is not just analysis, period; there are more details here, but I am summarizing. There are some specific prohibited uses. As you can see here, some of them are around facial recognition. Some of them are around creation or distribution of digitally-generated or altered images of individuals without consent. Emotion analysis is a very hot topic. And to be clear, emotion analysis could be a little different than (unintelligible) analysis. We are really trying to get at some of the work around making assumptions about folks, especially towards increase in bias, especially is we are doing it not textual enough (unintelligible), but more like I am analyzing (unintelligible) body language with this tool, and I'm making a lot of assumptions about how you feel. That can be pretty powerful, so there are some specific prohibitive uses that we can call out, and those are just some examples. And now we have the high-risk side of the house, which again, should distinguish it from prohibitive uses, (unintelligible), Some of the examples of high-risk, and these cases are fully automated decisions that don't have human oversight and have a high propensity for harm. And that, again, goes back to identifying and evaluating the risk of these systems and these cases, so that we can say we actually think that there is a pretty high risk or harm, or is not implementing correctly. And here is what we actually do because of the high-risk system. And some of those things will include a deeper dive on AI assessment. In the privacy world, we would call this a privacy impact assessment. Just some more granular detail around policies, practices that govern the use of the AI system and the technology itself, and also, the controls that we are putting in place to try to mitigate those harms that we think are driving the high-risk scenario. So, that is a bit of the (unintelligible). And also just speaking to the last two bullets, employment or work-related systems, such as performance indicators that result in discipline or termination, as a general rule, this kind of aligns with some of our general principles. Typically, these things are higher risk because they can make their advice decisions. And so, there needs to be, in our opinion, a little bit more due diligence around those things, because employment and opportunity are really, really sensitive areas. That's kind of why it is in the high-risk bucket, just a little bit more making sure that we are crossing our T's and dotting our I's. That's not only (unintelligible) AI systems that control critical infrastructure. Obviously, we are a City so that's a big deal for us. We especially (unintelligible) to have public utilities, which (unintelligible). And that work also references (unintelligible). Just noting that there is a heightened risk of a compromise of a solution (unintelligible) infrastructure.

Omari Stringer: I have a question. You mentioned the Gov AI Coalition template. And as I am looking at this is reminiscent of how the EU AI infrastructure and high-risk uses. I have two questions. One, does that influence the coalition as far as trying to align with some of the regulations that you are seeing out there?

Sarah Carrier: Yes. One hundred percent. None of these things were (unintelligible) on the policy, itself, is do we link to the URL references that we do not think is in a bubble? And we do. So, the Gov AI Coalition is 100 percent trying to align up and down. It also is the work, itself, aligning laterally with other municipalities across the country. So, it is absolutely the case. (unintelligible) We've done a lot of work with them, as well. It is also unique to us because there is actually not a high-risk section within our policy template. That was something that we haven't added. We think that there are certain things that we could specifically cull out if we actually do due diligence around them. And so, it's not a hard no. It's additional stuff we need to go through to make sure that we are using these things in an accountable way, in a responsible way, in a transparent way, and in a way that allows us to engage in feedback on the use of these tools and the protections. So, yes.

Omari Stringer: And then, the second question, not necessarily relative to the policy -- this may be more of a procedural question, and with CTO Lloyd in the audience. But thinking of this as, I assume, an IT policy that will be expanded citywide, has there been any engagement with Council as far as formalizing it or something like that, so as to say that we have the backing of the law, not just an executive policy to put these on the books. So, I guess that's a broader question for the IT team.

Rob Lloyd: So, we can go backwards before we go forwards. We have worked, under the Mayor's leadership, with Homeland Security and SISA on the AI security framework. That was specifically to take a pre-legalistic approach on how to use AI without imperiling critical infrastructure. And that was to ensure that lawyers don't get involved in AI prematurely, because when they do, they usually create some odd artifacts. Because we're still learning what AI can do, and how to manage it. So, we might be a little premature on some of that. But the AI framework is what Sarah Carrier was referring to. How well Homeland Security and SISA stand behind that is in question because of the federal -- how can we frame that..."

Omari Stringer: Chaos?

Rob Lloyd: ...with the changes. And even this has had mass axings of who we used to work with. As we settle this down, it is a question of two things. One is the hygiene we have internally and how we operationalize AI. Number two, conversations with Council on what we focus on. So, the real-time focus on crime where we use AI for tools to get to our goals, but where they might want to focus legislatively is something that we are just (unintelligible). So, I don't have a better answer.

Omari Stringer: That makes sense. I think there is some flexibility in the approach from the executive versus the legislative.

Dorene Cornwell: My question is always going to be, when the City is thinking about purchasing something, do you routinely say 'is this compliant with the standard, like WCAG to point out. I hope this is just a yes/no question. Because I have a number of blind friends who have been experimenting, and will tell me, "this one works really well, but a bunch of the other new ones don't." So, I'm just curious what the City is doing about that as far as the criteria for purchase or consideration or how it is deployed.

Sarah Carrier: I don't have any details, but I do know that when we talk about the standard terms and conditions in our contracts -- I mentioned privacy and cybersecurity because that is my area, but they are also inclusive in our contract terms. Aside from the AI contract terms, we do have accessibility requirements built into our contracts, so when it comes to the procurement process, those should be in City contracts when they come through the process.

Rob Lloyd: That's true. And also, the Mayor signed accessibility in a plain language mandate and directive just last month. And so, you will see us, during the course of the next year focus on this quite heavily. And those contract standards are there, and we are going to try to be a lot less forgiving on where those exceptions are made. We do still run into a lot of vendors where there are spaces where they just don't have the readiness, mapping technologies, data visualization. There are still spaces where the options just are not as plentiful as we would like. But there is a concerted effort between now and April 2026, and we hope that (unintelligible) don't stay away from it. Even if they do, from the Mayor's directive and Seattle's values, we are not stepping away from it, and we are going to keep on pushing towards that accessibility and plain language set of standards.

Dorene Cornwell: Thank you so much. I think, sometimes, it is going to be a case of not relying on what the government requires, but people deciding that standards are important, with or without the federal government. So, thank you so much.

Sarah Carrier: This is the last slide. So, what are we doing next? Getting a signature on the policy, itself; and then we are working on the socialization, letting people know the policy and what that means; and we will be doing things like trainings, resources and supplementals at the same time. So, we have a policy manual that goes along with the policy that helps City employees understand in more detail what we mean when we talk about risk. What are we looking at? How do we evaluate? What is the process? More details on the roles and responsibilities. It's the nitty-gritty of the business. So, that's going to be supplemental with these guidelines, which are never done; adaptive, and a little more flexible in the policy itself, which should be more evergreen in nature. And then, working on setting up a government board, which is something that goes along with the policy in a lot of this to really operationalize some of the things in the policy, itself, and make sure that we are doing it in alignment across the City. And not just doing it in a siloed IT department. So, that's where we are at? Anybody have any questions?

Phillip Meng: The floor is open. Thanks so much for the great presentation, including the creative graphics; and of course, all of the work that has gone into this policy manual and responsible use guidance.

DeiMarlon Scisney: I have multiple questions, and actually always have multiple questions. I would like to follow up. My first question is how does the City define responsible AI use in its policy, and what mechanisms will be in place to ensure compliance across the different departments?

Sarah Carrier: I don't know the definitions off the top. Responsible IA is making sure that we have a process, so whether the governance or the review process, to evaluate the use of these tools and how we use them. There are bits and bobs to that, in terms of how we think operationalizing it, there is a training and education component; there is an oversight component; there are controls around terms and conditions; having incident response. All of these pieces of the puzzle that really lead to what we consider responsible use of these tools. I think a piece of that is making sure that we are getting feedback from folks like you or other members of the community as we think to deploy these tools, particularly if they are in that high risk pocket, to say we think that this could impact you, and so we need your feedback on it. So, I think there are a lot of components of responsible use that come together. And I think the policy is the way that we are trying to drive that, to say here is what we need when we are talking about our responsible approach to AI at the City. It is enabling innovation and creativity and driving efficiency and better services and all of that in a way that is transparent, accountable, and all of those things that we value as a government agency. Did I answer your question?

DeiMarlon Scisney: It does. I know that you are presenting here, but will there be a formal write-up or any information that is accessible on your web page, or anything around that?

Sarah Carrier: Yes. We are looking to, once the policy is done, put it on our public web page or seattle.gov site. We know that the little bits that are up there are also due an update, so we are working on that, as well. But that is where you can actually go and find the details of the policy, instead of this highlight/high level stuff today. But that will be available publicly, as well. It was kind of a public process with review and socializing it and things like that, and so, we want to make sure that that is available for folks.

DeiMarlon Scisney: Okay. My next two questions are really specific around ethical frameworks and guidelines and different things around AI tools and systems complying with data privacy laws and things like the Washington State My Health, My Data stuff, but we can cover that a separate time. My other questions were more around where are the City's current and planned AI use cases across various departments. I'm curious. Will it be public safety, transportation, housing? What areas? And then, how will the City determine which AI projects would be prioritized for funding and development?

Sarah Carrier: That's a great question.

Rob Lloyd: We actually have a matrix. So, on the left side, learning, and on the left side, impact. What we've done as part of the IT strategic planning process that we presented earlier, is we asked everyone what are the things that you have on your agenda that you would like to solve? And where AI could make an impact? In quadrants, where we say, AI in 2024, going into 2025, is in this category of we're still learning. 2023 at the end is where it kind of burst onto the scene, where a lot of vendors emerged. And our prediction is, up until the middle of 2025, you still see 70 to 89 percent of AI companies are losing money. And we are going to see a lot of them disappear. So, we're going to put small amounts of money on a couple of different bets, where we are learning and seeing how we can solve problems, but being very careful about how we enter into this space. 2025/2026 is where we are going to say how that technology goes from helping us to see and make decisions, and how to use AI and the various science behind it to get at accessibility and decision-making to controlling things, and what the human oversight components are to agents and direct action. And that progression has in those quadrants a couple of things that we have to progress into. What are these frameworks? What are our oversight positions? There are some technical architectures that we have to build to do this well and consistently over time, and what vendors are actually going to last. There are a couple that we could probably say -- Microsoft has enough money to last a while, but there are quite a few small vendors we can't bet on. And that maturation is probably going to happen in 2025/2026. And the process that we are in right now, we have about 30 projects that are underway or completed where the goal is to learn and see if you can make impact; what are the lessons learned; and how do you turn that into a review process from that intake process, how do you review that and say lessons learned and operationalization. And then, once you have that framework, how do you have of process of then saying we're going to get rid of this on an ongoing basis. We are going to be very controlled, and not just scatter shot it, but be objectively clear on what we are going to prioritize across the City, and not have every sales person going across 40-plus departments and offices. There is also an overlaying piece where we have to teach ourselves how to approach AI. And so, fundamentally, what is the science behind it, what is bias, how does it affect our work processes, how does it affect our jobs. And once we understand that, how to use different types of AI to get at certain problem sets. Once we understand that, what are the various tools we use as implements to solve different problems. So, what products to problems? Right now, and I made this joke earlier, with Ginger and with Sarah and others, it's like a soccer field where we just put a ball in the field and we see all of these kids gathering around the ball and just running around the field. And that is like an AI salesperson putting AI on the field. And we really have to approach how to play AI as a sport. And what we have to teach as that sport in different positions and the guardrails on that field. And we're still getting good at that, to be honest with you.

But there are guardrails, there are controls with this policy, the technical infrastructure, the enablement -- that is all stuff that we have in play right now. The last thing I will say,

to your question, and then I've said too much, is that the investments that we make are things that we are coordinating with departments. And there are three things that we want to do. One is high impact, low learning. We call that the boring category. That's things like the note-taking, the translation, the things that do very simple things over and over again that really aren't going to blow people away, but are going to save us a lot of effort and time, and really make a day-to-day difference for folks. There are other places where the technology can make a lot of difference, like in translation, in records search, where it can really be a game changer. But we have to train it, and we have to get the right partner and the right solution. And then, the third is where we want to lean in and try to do some transformational game changing. And that is in our spectrum where we are going to make some decisions. But we can share that once we have said where we are going to make some of those small, medium, and big-sized plans.

DeiMarlon Scisney: Awesome. Thank you for the thorough response. I appreciate that. My last question is just around the AI government. Who will be on that board? And then, the make-up around that. Is that State and local entities, and also community member? What is the make-up of that AI governance board?

Rob Lloyd: All of us.

DeiMarlon Scisney: Wouldn't that be something. These AI agents are getting so good these days, you can have it running itself.

Sarah Carrier: I think the idea is to start and grow it, and see what makes the most sense. There were early stages on this. One thing at a time, so we are getting the policy done first before we step into that. We are admittedly starting small, internally through the City, with departments, IT representation, data science folks, a vast array of different roles and responsibilities within the departments and different functions, as well. I think there is opportunity for feedback as we work through that and ask what should this look like so that we can have the most effective governance structure for our organization.

Rob Lloyd: Yes. And I will add that we have created in the past three different types of folks that I would like in balance. One is practitioners, one is academics, one is activists and a community voice in all three of those. That gives us really good perspectives across all of the different types of thoughts. The practitioners ask how do we really apply this to solve problems. The academics occupy the cutting edge. The activists really say this is how it impacts community, but also, they are the voice that tells us to be the most careful. That's been the great push and pull, and it is also a great place for debates. If you want to come. It's going to be a really exciting meeting sometimes.

Ginger Armbruster: There are a couple of things I would like to say. As there was a cast of many to help the Technology Matching Fund with the wonderful work that this team has done, and all of those that are volunteers that are part of it, Sarah Carrier has led an incredible effort to get this policy for the Generative AI first, and it has been a cast of many, but you have done an excellent job of leading this effort. And the results show. There is a lot more to come, as this comes out in its launch, there will be more to

tell you about and more for you to see, but I just want to celebrate this team and the effort you have given this.

Phillip Meng: Thanks again for the presentation and great discussion here. I am sure that we will have more to say about the AI policy.

COMMITTEE UPDATES

DIGITAL EQUITY COMMITTEE

Phillip Meng: With this twelve minutes left, we want to move quickly to committee updates, starting with Digital Equity. Coleman Entringer has a schedule conflict today, so I will give a quick comment on his behalf. The telecom forum follow-up document is mostly written, which is really exciting. And we are still following up with the reps on a few loose end questions from the forum. The committee has also met on planning for next year. Harte Daniels? Dorene Cornwell? Anything else to add?

Harte Daniels: No. We are coming back to full strength after doing the TMF and we will be focusing on this year what you presented us, all of you, in this meeting. It is quite meaty and should be taken into consideration. And again, that appeal goes out that if you are not a board member, please come by and add your voice as much as possible. Many hands make light work. Thank you.

From Chat: Phillip Meng 3/11/2025 7:49 PM • On this subject: Everyone is invited to join sub-committees, which power much of CTAB's work! Please fill out this form to participate:

https://forms.office.com/pages/responsepage.aspx?id=DQSIkWdsW0yxEjajBLZtrQAAA_AAAAAAAAAAN_iIrZ_JUMIFTWDIHoe0TFIFU1BQM1I3SlpWWIFZMy4u&route=short_url

Feel free to reach out to me at phillipmeng98101@gmail.com if you have any questions / want to learn more.

OUTREACH COMMITTEE

Phillip Meng: I completely agree, Harte. And on that note, the form to participate in committees is in the chat, for anyone online. Any updates from the Outreach Committee?

DeiMarlon Scisney: I do want to emphasize the importance of a meeting time, so we haven't met as an Outreach Committee in quite some time. And so, I would just like to

see what's up with the meeting. I know that at one time, there weren't enough people for quorum. Maybe now we can get that on the advocacy side, but I would like to continue meetings so that we can discuss advocacy in our next Outreach meeting.

Phillip Meng: Great. A call, again, to please finalize committee selections, and we will certainly find a standard meeting time there, especially now that the legislative efforts will be front and center to the committee. Are there any other committee updates that folks would like to bring forward?

DeiMarlon Scisney: The other thing as part of Outreach was the repository that we had been discussing. I did put that together. I can drop it into the chat. I need to get with Vinh Tang to see if there is any tooling or anything that CTAB uses specifically. I just threw it into a Google sheet. Right now, we are at a total of about 528 contacts. So, we can go through those. It's a mixture of DELN and a slew of different databases that have been put together. So, we can go through that as part of the committee meetings.

Phillip Meng: Thanks so much, D. All right. Any other committee updates? If not, we can move to our final agenda item, public comment. The floor is open to public comment, if any.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Harte Daniels: There was an interesting conversation during the TMF from somebody who was born abroad, with one of the participants who was dealing with First Nations, and they were wondering why all of the languages were English. I didn't have an opportunity or foresight to offer to people the free symphony on March 7, at Benaroya Hall. A little old lady came up from Skagit and rescued the language and the culture, requisitioned a symphony, believe it or not, called The Healing Heart of the First Peoples of This Land. It was reprised almost 20 years later. And if you want to be inspired with this symphony, they did make a documentary <https://healingheartproject.org/> called The Healing Heart of Lushootseed. Lushootseed is the language of the people of this land, and that symphony truly does touch people for healing. It was first done when the towers came down in 9/11. But we are facing many of the same things emotionally at this point in time. So, if you have an opportunity, it would be grand to learn something about. Thank you.

Phillip Meng: Thank you for sharing, Harte. If no other public comment, I want to just thank everyone again for a fantastic meeting. It's so energizing to see all of the energy and activity around CTAB. With that, thank you everyone, and we look to reconvening in April at our next meeting. Have a great evening, everyone.

ADJOURNMENT