

November 18, 2025 Meeting - Seattle Community Technology Advisory Board

Topics covered included: 2026 TMF Grant process; Responsible Artificial Intelligence Update

This meeting was held: November 18, 2025; 6:00-7:30 p.m., via Webex and in City Hall Room 370

Attending:

Board Members: Phillip Meng, Aishah Bomani, DeiMarlon Scisney, Omari Stringer

Public: Dorene Cornwell, David, Mark Foster, Ryan Burns, C. Brewer, Desiree Walker, Grace B., Soumyajyoti Bhattacharya, Call-in User 1, Melissa

Staff: Ginger Armbruster, Tara Zaremba, Brenda Tate, Meira Jough, Jon Morrison Winters, Vinh Tang, Cass Magnuski

21 In Attendance

Phillip Meng: Welcome, everybody! Good evening! Welcome to the November 18 meeting of the Community Technology Advisory Board. It's great to see everybody. Let's start with a quick round of introductions. I will go in the order that I see on the screen.

INTRODUCTIONS

From chat: C Brewer 11/18/2025 6:09 PM • I don't have my mic/cam enabled. My name is (also) Cass. I'm a community member in North Seattle, just here to observe.

Phillip Meng: The first item on the agenda will be the meeting minutes from our September and October meetings to approve. Do I have a motion from a board member to approve these minutes?

DeiMarlon Scisney: I move to approve.

Aishah Bomani: Second.

Phillip Meng: All in favor? That's everybody. Motion passes. Can I have a motion to approve the agenda for today's meeting?

Omari Stringer: I move to approve.

Phillip Meng: Thank you, Omari. Do I have a second?

DeiMarlon Scisney: Second.

Phillip Meng: All in favor? That's everybody. Motion passes. Let's get started. The Technology Matching Fund is very important to the full board, and particularly to the Outreach Committee. We always look forward to the update on the TMF, as do the organizations that benefit from it. Jon, the floor is yours.

2026 TMF GRANT PROCESS UPDATE

Jon Morrison Winters: For today, we are just dipping our toe in a little bit. And then, depending on what the interest of the board is, I am happy to come back at a future meeting, either if you want to report out on a current project, or more information about upcoming awards for 2026. But for today, I just want to announce the 2026 Tech Matching Fund RFP is open. There are a lot of things that are going to look more similar in this RFP to past RFPs. One thing in particular we were talking about is a little bit different. In terms of what has not changed, the eligible project areas have not changed from last year, and so the focus continues to be on supporting Internet for All goals, of increasing internet access and adoption in the Seattle community. So, the types of eligible projects haven't really changed. It's Digital Navigator services, digital literacy training; devices and technical support, and internet connectivity. So, that really hasn't changed. The word of mouth has not changed. We are looking at funding grants of up to \$45,000 for eligible digital equity projects. And the total amount of grant awards also is staying the same at \$455,000. The community match requirement at 25 percent has not changed. So, a lot of things haven't changed; similarly, in terms of how to apply through the City's Flex system, which is the same as before, and so that is the very high level overview of what hasn't changed. If you want more information on TMF, you can go to

seattle.gov/tech. It's the top banner on our home page at seattle.gov/tech, or if you go to seattle.gov/tech/grant-opportunities, that will drill down to another level. It's right there on the home page, as well.

I also wanted to announce -- and I reached out to Phillip Meng and shared this information, but what is changing this year is just a little bit different is that we're partnering with the Department of Neighborhoods for the Technology Matching Fund. And the idea here and the reason for this is just to streamline the process. The Department of Neighborhoods has a lot of grant expertise that we want to leverage and really learn from. It's just kind of a pilot as a way to explore and align closely with other City grant programs. There are a lot of programs across the City, not just in the Department of Neighborhoods, but in other departments, as well. We fund a lot of great work. Obviously, the distinction of the Tech Matching Fund is the emphasis on technology and Internet for All. But in a lot of other ways, there are some similarities. We are just looking at ways to align and partner together. In this partnership with DON, it is actually called out as a shared responsibility to continue to coordinate and communicate with CTAB. That's part of the reason I am here this evening, and also if you want to invite the staff from the Department of Neighborhoods in to talk about their participation on the work, that could be an option. I certainly would suggest that you invite them to attend a future CTAB meeting. We are certainly planning to present and share the list of selected projects to CTAB for your review and approval. That would most likely happen in March of 2026 at the CTAB meeting, if that works for your schedule. One last note I wanted to make because I know that many of you have participated. And as Phillip Meng said, it is definitely of interest for CTAB. If you have participated in the review committee in the past. This time, because DON is really taking the lead on running the RFP process, they are going to be doing the review committee recruitment. And as we get more information on exactly what that looks like, I would be happy to share that, in terms of how those of you who are interested in participating this year, how that is going to go. They really want to focus on getting TMF out there and open. I know they are pivoting to doing recruitment for the review committee. Let me know and I can put you in touch with DON staff, or share information as I get it. We don't know exactly what that is going to look like. If you are looking for more information, like I said, seattle.gov/tech is a great place to go. There is also going to be information sessions coming up. There is a virtual information session this Thursday, November 20, at 2:00 p.m. That is typically recorded. That's my understanding. And that is expected to happen this time, to record that. Also, this is part of coming out of Covid. We wanted to provide an in-person option, as well, for anybody who would prefer to go in person. I know that DON is facilitating that, as well, on Monday, December 8, from 10:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m., as an in-person option for those for whom it works. The virtual information

session is recorded, and we are always available to answer questions, as well. For tonight, that's really what I have. Like I said, the whole idea is just to (unintelligible). If you have questions about current TMF projects and how things are going -- I know (unintelligible) here is on the call, as well, and she continues to be the primary person on the Seattle IT side for TMF. But in terms of 2026 TMF, I am happy to come back on an invite to the Department of Neighborhoods.

Phillip Meng: Meira Jough, do you have anything to add before we go to questions?

Meira Jough: Thanks. No, I don't have anything, but I am happy to be here to answer any questions that you all might have.

Phillip Meng: Before we go to Dorene, just super-quick. What does it mean that Seattle IT is partnering with the Department of Neighborhoods. DON is now part of the evaluation process for the grants. Is that the main component? And the administrative?

Jon Morrison Winters: There is a whole memorandum of agreement. The two departments have different roles and responsibilities, but they are taking the lead on administering the RFP process this year, and recognizing that they have Neighborhood Matching Fund; they have other grant programs all the time. So, we're just looking to learn and see how this goes as a pilot, but it is mostly an administrative piece in running the RFP. From an applicant's perspective, it's still what happens on the back end. It's a little bit different this year.

Dorene Cornwell: Two questions: One is the submission deadline; and the other is -- I know over the last couple of years there has been a lot of effort to support people submitting applications, as far as structuring how they are going to evaluate their own projects. I don't really want to lose track of that if the process is being handled by the Department of Neighborhoods instead of Seattle IT. So, I guess I am curious. Can someone say something about to what extent that is being preserved in the current arrangement?

Jon Morrison Winters: Thank you, Dorene. I realize that I skipped over the application deadline here on my notes, which is January 13, 2026. There is a recognition that this

project is happening over the holidays, so we wanted to get it open in mid-November and have it be open through mid-January. So those are the dates. In terms of your other question, I think I heard you ask about how applicants are supported throughout the process by staff. Is that right?

Dorene Cornwell: Yes, that's part of it. I think there were some people from outside. You were able to support some of the applicants just in terms of designing how they want to evaluate the success of their program. And being able to do that seems like a really important part of showing value. So, I would like to make sure that that is preserved going forward. I don't know if that is only staff, or whether it is somehow the whole framework of the whole project.

From chat: C Brewer 11/18/2025 6:09 PM • I don't have my mic/cam enabled. My name is (also) Cass. I'm a community member in North Seattle, just here to observe.

From chat: DeiMarlon "D" Scisney 11/18/2025 6:20 PM •
https://www.seattle.gov/tech/grant-opportunities/digital-equity-grant-opportunities#tmf_apply2026_sit

Session

Thursday, November 20, 2025, 2:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.

In-person Information Session

Monday, December 8, 2025, 10:30 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.

Jon Morrison Winters: I will be honest. I don't recall exactly what kinds of support may have been provided in the past for TMF. In terms of assisting people with applications at the staff level, that absolutely will be continuing. I think it's a good question in terms of whether or not that might look a little bit different, with DON taking the lead on the RFP, compared to what support we provided in the past. So, I think that's a good question for them. Again, they're taking the lead on the administrative side of the RFP, but it is certainly something we can ask about and make sure that that is included at some level. Certainly, there still is an emphasis on making sure we are funding smaller organizations. Maybe this is their first grant application, or maybe they don't have access to other funding. That is emphasis, and they definitely do understand that. But in

terms of exactly what support looks like, I think that's a good question to follow up with them.

Meira Jough: Dorene, I can just chime in. In the past what we've done is we've got a preliminary application. Organizations have submitted a draft proposal, and then I have met with the organization, and then they are able to submit the final application. So, DON is handling the Request for Proposals. As Jon said, they have been focused on getting the application cycle opened. I have not yet met with them, but they have reached out to me and are ready to move forward with that discussion. So, I agree with Jon. that if you are interested, inviting them to CTAB to talk about that process. I think you raise good questions.

Dorene Cornwell: Thank you.

Phillip Meng: Any other questions, particularly on applying for organizations? I want to make sure we're leaving the space here. Please feel free to introduce yourself, as well. I think we missed you in introductions.

Ryan Burns: Yes. That's okay. No worries. I am Ryan Burns, just an interested citizen. I'm calling in from Kirkland right now. Did you mention that the recruitment process for reviewers is currently open? And if so, how do people express interest in getting on the review panel?

Jon Morrison Winters: Thanks for asking about that. I don't know is the short answer. I do know that when I spoke with DON, there was interest that I heard from somebody else. I spoke with them about this probably two or three weeks ago, and at that time, they said that they were not starting the reviewer recruitment yet, because they wanted to focus on getting the RFP open. My understanding is that now that the RFP is up and open, that they would be beginning that process. I think I will follow up with them to see if they are putting that information out, or if they want to put any information out or share any information with CTAB, I'm about that. But we definitely have, throughout this process, been communicating with them about the important role of CTAB in the process, and to make sure that that is incorporated is understood.

Phillip Meng: Thank you. A more general question than these specific policy changes: Based on the applications that we saw last year, is there anything that you want to see more of? Any recommendations, technical or otherwise, for organizations, that would be good to keep in mind if you are submitting applications?

Jon Morrison Winters: Yes. You might ask Meira Jough if she can speak to anything she saw last year/

Meira Jough: The grant guidelines are staying, for the most part. I don't want to lead any applicants astray, so I think the best thing is to email communitytechnology@seattle.gov because the Department of Neighborhoods is handling the application review process. And so I thin it would probably be best if you get directly from them what their priorities are, and how they are handling their process.

From chat: Jough, Meira 11/18/2025 6:24 PM • Email
communitytechnology@seattle.gov with questions. Best thing. email
communitytechnology@seattle.gov

Jon Morrison Winters: Yes. Thanks Meira. But in terms of Seattle IT priorities, they haven't changed at all. There weren't any changes based on last year. The next info session is this Thursday.

Dorene Cornwell: Pro tip: Don't use Chat G{T to write your application.

Phillip Meng: Thank you. If there are no other questions, folks, I think that's a pretty fantastic segue into the next part of our agenda. Once again, thank you Jon and Meira for this overview. Next, we talk about GPT and other related technologies. We are thrilled to have Ginger Armbruster, the chief privacy officer for the City of Seattle, for an update on AI and how that is being deployed across the City. Ginger, the floor is yours.

RESPONSIBLE ARTIIICAL INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM UPDATE

Ginger Armbruster: Thank you. I'm happy to be here. I know some of you. I have met some of you, and am happy to see that you are here, and am happy to hear the voices of those I have not met or seen before.

I have a team, a division of Seattle IT, that really works on issues of transparency, regulatory compliance, outward-facing requests from citizen residents around public records. So, I have the Responsible AI team, I have a privacy team that does privacy reviews. They are responsible for policy and other compliance related issues. data compliance dealing with data security standards for payment card information. We have digital engagement, which is Jon and Meira, and then we have digital equity (excuse me), and then we have the group that is responsible for public records, as I mentioned. So, supporting about 100 public records officers around the City. It's a bit of a diverse group, but all of it is around how we communicate outward, and what we commit to around data collection and use at the City, making records available, or making sure that reviewing for our obligations around privacy and responsibility, and those kinds of things. I'm going to take a little time to talk to you about activity around AI that has been going on around the City, and what we're up to, and how we're organizing ourselves to look into how AI can be useful and how we can best use resources, AKA how we use our budget best, as we look at how this technology can help us do our work, extend resources, provide better service to our community. So, I'm going to share my slides. I'm not really good with Webex. Not my normal thing. So, forgive me for just taking a minute here to get myself organized. There we go into slideshow mode.

Please ask questions as we go along. I can't really see raised hands, so those of you in the room or those who are watching a regular screen, let me know when questions come up. I am happy to take them.

So, I will take some time to talk to you about the updated AI policy and the plan for AI, what we're doing at Seattle IT, and how we're supporting different departments as they look at this technology and how they help with service delivery. This is what we're going to do. Talk a little bit about how we align with other initiatives around data and the IT strategic plan, what this might mean for the work force concerns and considerations around AI, partnerships, priorities in our roadmap, and how we're moving things along, proof of value, how we determine actually how these technologies are working for us. And then, we have a little bit of a communications plan. I'll talk to you a bit about that. And then some other things that have been coming up along the way.

This may not be new to you all, so forgive me if I go over territory that you've already seen. My team was instrumental in crafting the first Generative AI policy that came out in 2023, and updating to reflect all AI, or at least a broader vision of AI at the City. And that is a policy here. There is a link to it. You can Google or Bing or any other search engine you care to use and look for details on this. I'm just going to go at a high level. I try to do this in every presentation I have with internal and external folks to get to the high points. This policy, the Generative AI policy, and the subsequent one were informed by a large group of folks. You see the rest of the web content. We spent a lot of time with experts in the areas of -- we worked with academia, we worked with industry, we worked with Ephesus, we worked with diverse foundations that specify AI policy. We worked with a group of folks over a period of several weeks a couple of years ago to come up with a Generative AI policy. Those are principles that we develop at the start. What do you stand for? What don't you stand for? What is allowed? What is not allowed? What is your general approach to a new technology or initiative? And in this case, the guiding principles all have paragraphs to explain what they are, but I wanted to review those with you quickly. We talked about innovation sustainability, so our work toward innovating and using new technology as available, but in a sustainable manner. And that means a lot in AI. Everything from environmental sustainability to being able to maintain your technologies. We talked about transparency and accountability, how we use the tool, how we determine how we use the tool, and how it is actually being deployed. So, we can speak to that. In terms of validity and reliability with AI, always a concern in making sure that we're getting accurate information but being also aware that there are ways that we can get inaccurate information straight up from hallucinations to data that is not accurate. We speak to bias, harm reduction and fairness so that AI is not inadvertently baking in bias that is already out there with algorithm abuse or other ways that can happen. We speak about privacy and making sure that we are aware of privacy along the way, because a lot of data can be used; a lot of data can be scooped up in the course of AI use, so we want to be aware of that. Being able to explain: Explainability and interpretability, what we are doing, and what data we are collecting and gathering. And finally, with an eye towards security and resiliency. Everything we do at the City has to go through this series of reviews to ensure that we're not bringing something harmful to the environment. It can be kind of an octopus, a little tangled web, and that is what we are concerned about.

Just at a high level, we have requirements for bringing AI technologies, and we have prohibited uses. I'm going to take a moment on those. So, in general, if you are deploying or exploring AI solutions, following and upholding the guiding principles and be able to explain the course of your business case and how you are doing that. Adhering to our security, privacy, and responsible practices and principles and review

processes that we go through. No bringing something in that hasn't been reviewed to make sure that it conforms to our standards and expectations. We have access and control for risks at every stage, from procurement when you are first looking at something, all the way to going live. So, making sure that we are looking at our principles and all of the review requirements along the way for a new technology from development or position to deployment. And then making sure our monitoring and managing performance and impact throughout its life cycle. Things change. Companies sell themselves off to others. Contract terms change. So, we need to make sure we're being aware of all of this along the way.

And then, prohibitive uses are listed here. So, emotion analysis, social scoring, behavioral manipulation, things that are antithetical to this kind of service that we are trying to provide, and protections that we provide the people who use our services. Directing autonomous weapons systems. I had to ask my team! Wow! and Okay! We don't have autonomous weapons systems. But what I think about the use and the interest in the use of other technologies, it makes sense to be clear about what we are and are not allowing. Making sure that there is always a human in the loop, so that decisions that are made that impact individuals are not made purely by Artificial Intelligence but has a human making sure that we are following along with our principles and obligations. Looking at anything having to do with contributing, disclosing, creating, or distributing any digital generated or digital altered pictures of an individual without their consent, and the use of mass media sources for facial recognition data not allowed. And biometric and social (unintelligible) or scoring. So anything that can be detrimental to a person receiving services or working with the City, not allowed. Now that I'm giving you the rules of the road, pull up that document. There's a lot more in it.

Phillip Meng: I'm going to take you up on your offer to answer questions as we go along. And I encourage folks to please raise your hand. On a previous page, assessing control for risks. Who assesses control for risks at every stage. Is this mostly a responsibility for the person who is using the AI tools?

Ginger Armbruster: As we bring in the tools and go through the reviews, or as we are developing new solutions, as is the case with a lot of AI platforms that allow you to build on them, those projects have a review and a continual loop back process, so that we begin something with an idea like I'm going to do this thing, by the time you get to the (unintelligible) portion of the project, things will have changed. Data collection may have changed, data sharing, vendors that are participating may have changed. So, from

the time that you are conceptualizing to the time that you are actually deploying it, a lot of things can change along the way. So, our review process links and loops back to ensure that we are capturing new information, new intention, new data, new capabilities, and that is what we are speaking to there. Because you have a concept of the time that you are actually deployed, a lot can change in a lot of ways.

Phillip Meng: I see. Thanks.

From chat: C Brewer 11/18/2025 6:37 PM • Are you using any particular AI risk assessment standard, such as NIST? 11/18/2025 6:37 PM • Also, should "Use Human in the Loop" be a requirement, not a prohibition?

it's listed as a prohibition

From chat: C Brewer: You mentioned in an earlier slide that you won't use data from public sources? Is the city using AI with private commercial sources, such as commercial data brokers?

Ginger Armbruster: Yes. This is part of our risk standards, and we are also looking at how we can incorporate the new EU AI standards. So, yes, we are using not of our own devising, but pulling in standards such as (unintelligible) are also being developed. Any other questions? I'm going to move ahead with another provision. It is a requirement to have a human in the loop. And yes, 'prohibited uses' I think really speaks to not having a human in the loop. You are right. It should be listed as a requirement. That may have been my error in making these slides. Thank you. I'm going to move on a little bit, if I may, unless there are more questions.

I want to talk about the 2025-2026 AI plan. We are really looking at the maturation of our interaction with AI piloting and determining how tools make sense coming into the environment. 2025 and 2026 are about moving to action. There are really four strategic pillars that we are focusing on. Making sure that we are getting our data pulled together and are using good data as we are using any kind of solution, doing analysis, or helping us to answer a question. Infrastructure compliance, not only about our own policies and principles but about how we are protecting data, making sure that privacy and security are compliant. Work force up-skilling and capacity building as we move toward a new way of doing things: We need a staff and resources to be educated about it and to be

able to support new platforms and new solutions. And then, working as we can with partners, some vendor partnerships, consulting partnerships, to help us move more quickly through evaluation and determination if something is right for us. And then, we have other strategic plan items to think about. There is a three-year IT strategic plan that is available for you to also take a look. We're talking about adopting digital and artificial intelligence services to improve efficiency and decision-making, enhancing cybersecurity to make sure that we are protecting infrastructure and resident data, and building integrated and personalized delivery systems so that we increase and improve access to City services. That is part of our strategic plan that also talks about other things that IT is focusing on. And I invite you to take a look at that strategic plan to better understand how this fits into our larger vision. And, for those who are not aware, we won't use data from public sources. Can you say that again? Mine just disappeared off my screen,

Tara Zaremba: You mentioned on your slide that you won't use data from public sources. Is the City using AI with private commercial sources, such as commercial data brokers?

Ginger Armbruster: We do use public data. We use our own data, of course, and we use data sources shared from other agencies. But it really depends on what sort of solution we are looking at. Data brokers are not something that we move toward. That information can be variously correct and accurate. But I don't know if that answers your question, but it might bring forward questions about data. That is really one of the things we are working with right now. And most of the solutions we are looking at, how to use the data we already have and already collected to help us make decisions about policy, make decisions about improving traffic, improving response in customer service situations, those kinds of things. So, it's data we already have.

Tara Zaremba: Also, if you want to talk more about it, feel free to contact any of us at the City of Seattle. We can find the information and get answers back to you.

Ginger Armbruster: Absolutely. And let me tell you a little bit more about where we are looking at different pilots to help you understand and put in context what we're focusing on.

The One Seattle data strategy is also something that's out there. I think we're in the last year of this strategy. The work being done that was grant funded to look at how we can be better stewards and users of the data we collect at the City, talks about data quality, talks data literacy, talks about equity and community engagement and how we use data, look at data, improve data, and make it a part of our decision-making adequately. That's something else that we've aligned with here that speaks to the data quality.

So, now we pull forward to talk a little bit about infrastructure readiness and compliance. One of the things we've done right away is AI is going to make us do some things that maybe we had not already got in place. We are thinking about how to be adaptable, to make sure we are doing whatever enhancements are required to make AI safe and a good choice for our service delivery and our technology. Looking at platforms may make sense and to standardize on those, looking at what storage requirements we're going to need, whatever resources we need to support and help develop solutions. Being sure that we are adequately assessing our cybersecurity risks that can be magnified with Artificial Intelligence and provide new vectors to increase landscape of possible risk. Privacy and legal compliance, of course, become as much of a concern. Data sharing agreements and considering public records that are being requested. So, a lot of folks want to know how we're using how we're using AI, or if AI has been used in the course of developing something, those kinds of questions. And how do we make sure that we are capturing the data that may be requested from the public records. So, that's a consideration. And then we get into the issues of work force. And I think that all of us were aware of AI and its potential to change how we do work. We immediately saw concerns all over the world. And I know that there have been several attempts at looking at AI. A piece of legislation in the State of Washington, taking into consideration how AI may shift jobs. And so, we are also considering and looking closely at what job impacts we might need to be considering. What jobs may be automated, which opens up our work force to the higher level considerations that may change the nature of what they do, how we might be able to increase productivity for those same individuals. What transitions might we need to think about in terms of how our staff can be made ready for this new environment. There are ethical considerations about how and when and why we deploy AI for our own work force, as well as for residents we are supplying services to, what policies need to be in place. We're on that side, at least with public facing policies, and what laws are developing and coming into fruition that we need to be aware of. There's training that's being planned. I didn't include that in my slides. But we have upscaling in our departments. We are looking at different levels of that from kind of an entry level to more informed programs to help staff, who are going to be working on delivering solutions and developing that. So, a lot of considerations going on into what this means for our work force.

I did speak a little bit about the training. We're leading an effort to train and upscale our staff, and it's really a three-phase approach. The first one I mentioned is a statewide introductory AI overview. We're developing that in-house with very specific (unintelligible), old obligations and value and how we look at how we use data when we consider our own obligations around that. Phase two is upscaling workshops. We've already done several of these at the upper levels of our leadership team. So, they understand the considerations about AI. That's often where the interest starts. We need to make sure that they are aware of, familiar with, responsible use, focusing on what data science is and what operational support is required for these kinds of things. We've done some of these workshops. We continue to do these workshops. We've done partnerships with several vendors. Phase three is how we can partner with academic and industrial institutions to create curriculum. And that is something that we are looking at now. Some of those are very specific to certain solutions. We are looking as well as we can to find technology-agnostic solutions out there. And I know there's quite a lot. So, those are all things that are in process right now. We're getting ready to launch the AI overview training, and we will be incorporating that into our privacy and security training that is put out every January for everybody in the City.

Phillip Meng: What are these upscaling workshops? Is there any support to help City employees identify specific use cases for these AI technologies? And if so, any that you can share?

Ginger Armbruster: I haven't been able to attend the workshops. The workshops that I understand have happened have been more on the 'what is AI' and how can we use it? Let's do some prompts. Let's sit in a room and have some ideas about how we can see potential for AI, and also perhaps the considerations and concerns people have about what we shouldn't be doing with it. So, I haven't been able to attend. I don't know, Tara Zaremba, if you went to any of those. I know we had them in different departments and at different levels for leadership.

Tara Zaremba: We didn't have them either.

Ginger Armbruster: Okay. We haven't been able to deploy it. We will soon. These were designed to be introductory to get us on the same playing field in terms of what are the possibilities for AI, and what are the things we can make available at the City

now, things that we will do in the future by requiring more upscaling actually making things available because we've got security in place, we've considered the data. These workshops will continue to develop and be given out over the year, but they are designed to help bring everybody up to the same literacy level. Not everybody is going to be a developer, but we do want folks to have a good idea of what the limits and the (unintelligible) will be for AI. Does that make sense?

Phillip Meng: Yes, absolutely.

Ginger Armbruster: How do you use the chat? How can you consider what your prompts ought to be? What do the prompts change? Those kinds of things when we get our hands on it. I think with the new technology there are different levels of eagerness for adoption. We have some members of our leadership team that are in there. They've been in there for three years, driving, really wanting all of it. Other people are 'hmm, 'm not really sure about that. I didn't grow up with it and I'm not sure that I'm ready.' So, we want to try to get some cohesion around our leadership team about what is out there.

Phillip Meng: We've got to start somewhere, and that might be application basics. Do you have a sense of, for folks who are more advanced in that AI journey, who are actively using these principles to think about their AI uses, what is AI good for?

Ginger Armbruster: That's part of what we're trying to do, trying to provide leadership not only for the pilot process that everyone participates in. You want to do a pilot, you come to us. We help figure that out with you, and/or help you determine what the considerations ought to be for the pilot's success. What are you looking for this thing to do? Did it do the thing you thought it would do? We have various pilots that have been going on, either department-specific or enterprise level. I'll give you a list of those in just a moment, so you can get an idea of where the interests are. We have 39 or 40 departments that all have different missions. So, it's almost like 39 or 40 different companies with very different activities. Some of them are more related. Public safety tends to be together, but they have different ways that they deliver service. We offer everything from dog licenses to pea patches, to emergency medical service delivery. We really offer so much. Every department has a different view of what we are trying to do. Some commonalities we are seeing is how can we get rid of some of the repetitive processes? How can we help with communications? Those are some of the ones that are very interesting. How can we use AI for training? That might help us to do more

tailored training that can be quite expensive to outsource. All the way down to how can we improve our own resource allocation and delivery by being better at understanding how we are doing that. There are traffic improvements. How do we optimize other resources, everything from utilities and how they can improve what they're doing, permitting, and how we allow people to consume services when they are needing something from the City? It's a broad range. It really depends on what the area of interest is, and we have right now a cabinet level -- the IT cabinet and the sub-cabinet in the Mayor's Office -- to help us look at where the priorities are, where the resources should be spent, how can we provide enterprise-wide services that will then also answer some of the common needs we have and then free up some time and interest and see how we prioritize the more specific needs. I will show you the list in a few minutes about where the priorities are.

Partnerships: Academia, industry, communities help us with cutting edge research. They help us with expertise, different perspectives, and help shape solutions and how we want to deliver them. How can the University of Washington, how can Seattle University, how can some of those help us out? How about partnerships across sectors? Where can we get some help from other folks that are doing this, from private to public, to other, help us with what their experience has been? Industry engagement: lots of vendors are in these spaces to know. 65,000 AI companies are delivering services. How can we work over some of those to make sense about the things we're trying to bring forward? And finally, community and nonprofit partnerships to work on public values, digital equity, advocacy, and those kinds of things? So, lots of areas of potential for us to partnership. We've done some of that now, especially around, as I mentioned, those workshops, and more opportunity, I think, as we get a little more sophisticated about what we're looking for.

So, where are we now? From 2025 to 2026, we've been doing a lot of early experiences. I'll talk to you about some of those specific ones in a minute. More needs to be done in a success criteria looking at a few big bets. That's kind of where we are now. Proof of value. Does this make sense? We've looked at some solutions. One was for immediate communications AI tool, and found that it doesn't really do what we thought it would do, really nothing that makes sense for everybody, but a few departments. So, it's kind of teasing apart where the value is, versus the hype. And finally, where we would like to our standard solutions and platforms that we can support. We can't support everything all of the time, but it would be really good to get to see platforms that make development easier and give us some standards around that. And so we can support them from an IT perspective. I talked to you about where some of our

priorities in a little more detail than this, but public safety communications. There's a chatbot that has been looked at about how to communicate better with the public, not on its own, but to have a human in the middle there to help provide information. The chatbot is still in pilot form. We've just been streamlining and permitting, so there are some solutions here that are designed to make the permitting process a little easier to communicate through, and improve it. Utilities are looking at how they can increase efficiency, work force, and pipe assessments, even down to are our pipes okay, and how can we use AI tools to help us do that. Improving government access, business directory, public records efficiencies -- we are looking at ways that AI can improve some of the communications we have from the public. Data analytics can be improved. There are some chatbots performance dashboard metrics that help us to determine whether we are being successful or not in certain areas, surface deliveries, and then employee productivity, GIS, which is the geographic spatial information system. So, we are providing those maps that we all like to look at that show us different areas of need or service provision. How can we make those better? Generative AI solutions that we're looking at: I mentioned that we've been looking at some of those, and we have some pilots that are in process right now. And then we have the unified (unintelligible) contact system that I think is in process right now to improve community support, and how we actually allow people to interact with that. So, just some general ideas. These are the ones that float up and have become consistently of interest. And then next is proof of value. How do we determine that something is successful? What is our adoption criteria? So, while we have pilots going on. we are getting much more standardized on what are the metrics that we want to be concerned about? How do we measure accuracy and reliability? How do we see if this thing really works? We have to do some quantitative and also some qualitative assessments to see if the solution we are considering really works and to make sure we can measure that benefit. I still believe we have 14,000 people working at the City, and 750,000 to 800,000 residents in the immediate area and the greater Seattle area, so we've got to make sure that the solutions we look at can scale. Return on investment can be really interesting with AI, because it can take you a very long time to get to that ROI number, but we need to at least think about the investment we may make in the development of a new solution. How are we going to see that that pays off and is a good use for our resources? And finally, making sure that we are aligning with our goals. I know that business isn't something we always look at in government, but in terms of our priorities, are we aligning with the ones that are most important to what we're trying to do for the City? So, those are what we are looking at. We're getting more and more specific in a couple of pilots now.

So, we have an AI opportunity review process. We are looking at shared intake that helps us get reviews done, helps to gather ideas, looks at real needs, and we want to improve the set of those going forward. AI is too expensive and too counterproductive to let people do just whatever interests them. You really need to make decisions for scale. So, doing things that make sense and use our resources correctly. We have responsible use reviews to weigh all of the things we always do, but include also community engagement and equity before we proceed with something. We can't wait for market maturity. One of the things you realize is there are 65,000 AI companies that are going to condense down. Not all companies survive, as you know. So, making sure we are making critical challenges really being addressed as we are able to move forward, even though we are waiting for that market maturity to happen. In terms of operationalization, (unintelligible) where the tools are delivered on their promise and can really scale in a sustainable way -- those are the three things that we are focusing on in our review process and some of the details about what that means. We're really looking at how we can build for future use. And that doesn't work when you just start grabbing sparkly things. But when a vendor comes and calls and has something fabulous to offer. It could be fabulous, but it needs to learn the priorities.

So, that is kind of how we look at that. I promised you that I was going to show you some of the AI pilots we have going on right now. Some of these are closing; some of them are still in process. But I mentioned some of the priorities we have now: Improving permitting, so when you try to do business with the City and get stuck. Community support -- we have some contact system work we have been doing in piloting. Transportation safety: there is a lot of work going on at SDOT around Vision Zero and reducing the number of accidents that are out there. Public safety is doing some work with chatbot consideration for business use. Those kinds of things for emergency response or for business use. Work for efficiency. SPU has some tools they are looking at. I mentioned the pipe camera that is allowing us to look at assessment robotic vision that uses AI. And then, public access. We have some pilots that are going around right now for those who are interested in public records and speeding up that process, which can be slower than some want. We'll see what AI can help us with. Administrative recruitment overall. So, we're looking at (unintelligible); we're looking at a development over Copilot and some of the suite of tools on the Microsoft platform. We are adding a Chat GPT pilot that will happen in the near future, and we're looking at what Tableau and Power Bi can be added onto a lot of the programs. So, we're looking at data analytics and how can those help us do our jobs better. So, I wanted to give you a little view of those, then I will go back to questions, comments, and feedback. But what can I help you with?

Phillip Meng: Well, I've been talking. So, I want to give a chance for folks in the room to speak up. There is no need to raise your hand.

Ginger Armbruster: I'm not presenting, so I can see things better.

Phillip Meng: And thank you for such a substantive and very interesting presentation.

Ginger Armbruster: I think I went a little bit over my time, so I apologize if I did. I think we haven't brought information to this group in quite a while. I invite all of you, if you don't want to reach out, to use my email address.

DeiMarlon Scisney: I was just waiting for everybody. I know that a lot of things around AI from a City level would be solidified, once the new AI officers came in. I appreciate all of the work that you are doing, Ginger, but from work force perspective, some of the things that you touched on would be further solidified once that AI officer is being brought in, but my question is, I guess from transparency perspective, and this will be more up your alley with records and things of that nature. Will there be a public facing AI system registry, similar to what New York City is doing, or Amsterdam, so that residents can see exactly which AI systems are being used, where, how privacy is protected, etc. And then, a follow-up question to that behind the registry is fails. So, knowing that in 2024, over 80 percent of the AI that is out there has failed. I understand that there is going to be a lot of internal development that's going on, but what are you expressly calling kill criteria that (unintelligible) will stop a pilot early if privacy bias or security issues, whatever that is may emerge, or whatever that may be. So, the registry, and kill criteria.

Ginger Armbruster: And, for everyone who is not aware, there is a hiring process which we're going through right now to get a single human to be responsible as our AI officer in the City who will report to the Chief Technology Officer in IT. And then, a human is going to be responsible to helping altogether our efforts around AI, coordinating and communicating, and helping us get pilots through. They're going to be kind of a central clearing house for our process for piloting. We are in the middle of that process now. In terms of (unintelligible), we haven't really landed on too many solutions to do that, but we do have the beginnings of that. We have available online -- here are some of the companies we have piloted with. We haven't landed on enough solutions

that are scalable and make sense, but I love your idea, D, and I'm going to take that right to my boss, because I think he's going to love that idea. I like the idea and I'm going to go get familiar with what New York and Amsterdam are doing, because I think that's a terrific idea. And then, the next question was what do we do when we run into a problem in the pilot process. Part of the reason that the piloting process is so important, and a review before that to hopefully catch any concerns we might have before we even put that much resource effort into piloting. Then the pilot process has review, surveys among folks to see how this thing is going, looking at outputs and an ongoing evaluation of the outputs of the pilot. Some of our pilots are going to run two to three months at a time. And at the end of that, there is a 'what are we doing, and is this what we're going to go forward with.' Limiting exposure to public and its data, making sure that we haven't gone live in a grand scale until we have made sure we have covered all of the concerns around our privacy and responsible AI considerations. So, we don't just throw a tool in and run it for a while, then in two months, check back in. It is an iterative process in terms of evaluating how things go. So, any one of those bias problems, algorithmic problems, accuracy issues, any one of those along the way will be hopefully unearthed in the process of this pilot ongoing evaluation, if that answers the question. For example, right now, we are having copilot ongoing meetings on consideration of how this meets outputs, trying to get as much qualitative data as we can. Any qualitative data around how this tool is actually working. And that is where the assessment process is so important, in talking to folks using the tool to get their expertise on it. I hope that answers some of that.

DeiMarlon Scisney: Thank you, Ginger. Awesome.

Phillip Meng: I want to second that that 80 percent figure is striking. I think in a lot of ways I am happy to see that in the sense that it means that folks are being selective. While I'm looking at the implementation roadmap on 17, priority pilots on 12, it looks like we're tackling a pretty broad range of undermined data here. Does, at the City level or at department level, are there guidelines for certain types of data that they just cannot go to, or that cannot be used to train a chatbot, or AI model on?

Ginger Armbruster: Yes. Let me even go further into that. We have not put LLMs or any AI solution that will alter data out generally, because we have not put it in data protection, data loss prevention, information detection, data classification placed to allow us to do that. We are being very cautious about the data, whether it is synthetic data, or we are sandboxing the solution until we are ready to go live, or it is already

open public data. And that is really what many of our pilot folks are using. This is already on open data. You know we have an open data portal. Let's use the data that's already out there. Can't because it is already available. We're not crawling through and accidentally finding classified or critical infrastructure information. So, while we are working in AI, we are a parallel and very fast moving path to protect data to ensure we do not introduce anything before we are ready, like in call through information. Does that answer that for you?

In the broadness of the pilot information or pilot approach, are those 39 different departments that all have a different mission all looking at similar different views of how they can get their work done. But we are moving in data. Does that help a bit?

Phillip Meng: Absolutely.

Dorene Cornwell: I'm always concerned when we're working on something like AI, about representation. For example, sidewalks. I'm a big sidewalk data junky. And the people who are going to be most impacted by sidewalks are non-drivers and people with disabilities. So, there's a question about if you just put something into a model, and you don't take into account categories of users, whether or not you have any data about them, there is a concern that really important considerations are going to get kind of peanut buttered over. So, I guess part of my question is when you're thinking about quality data, what are you thinking about as far as representation of who you think might be most impacted? And then I have a second question.

Ginger Armbruster: I'm not going to find as complete an answer as I would like to right now, because we are still building our pilot process. We have just stood up this evaluation group out of the Mayor's subcabinet. We have a new Mayor coming. We may have to change priorities. However, what I can say is that we have representation across the Office of Civil Rights included; we have HR included; we are represented at that level of departments which have concern and consideration for some of the items that I think you're speaking about. Human service delivery, public safety, all of those refer to our public evaluation criteria. And then, in terms of the future state, we would like to be able to involve. That's why we are coming to CTAB. to be able to involve community members and solutions before they come out. And I think ICS has done a terrific job of before they bring anything out, having conversations with their constituents and their residents. I think, when we get to those larger bets and things that we want to

be involved with, there will be opportunities that we will make happen with community to make sure that we are considering the things that maybe we missed, or that we need to hear from people like you. Does that make some sense?

Dorene Cornwell: Sure. So, my second question is kind of the converse of that, which is if somebody shares their -- I've heard representatives of tribal communities talk about this particularly, that is you share data, there is still an aspect of data sovereignty. Can you get your tools? Can you get your data back with whatever tools are being applied from the AI so that you can look at your own unique situation with added value from the AI. I mean there's pluses and minuses for why you would want to do that, but where is that in your thinking?

Ginger Armbruster: Well, we're moving closer and better every day toward a more mature model of how data may be used in terms of personal information, versus putting it all together as some kind of average. I don't have any examples right now, pilots that may make sense that way, but data sovereignty, data privacy are part of the evaluation of every pilot that we do to ensure that we don't make mistakes that can happen when you, as you say, can't butter over and individuals have different experiences. So, I think that's really important. That's why I don't think AI works everywhere for everything. And we are far enough along to be able to realize that. It doesn't mean we're not going to find value, but we may not find value everywhere. And we don't want to lose resources where it doesn't make sense. So, it's those considerations. We also need that help from those departments that have different service delivery maybe speaks to some of those issues to help figure out where they're really trying to find value. And at this point, we're trying what's really important productivity, repetitive process, and anything to do with streamlined interactions with our residents as they're trying to get services is really where we are putting our priorities at this point. I think you are asking really thoughtful questions, and I want to be able to come back to you when we're further along on some of the pilots in your vision. Then I think it would be an opportunity to come back to CTAB and give more insight. You all have a lot to offer that way.

Dorene Cornwell: Thank you.

Phillip Meng: Anyone else? Thanks, Dorene, that was a great question. One last thing. I refer to something DeiMarlon Scisney mentioned on resources. I have also seen enough of these implementations to know that between people there are meaningful

costs here. When I look at this list of pilots, I'm also seeing a mix of -- on one hand there is a chatbot, something that is already built in, that you can either build into this existing application or that you can buy, and on the other hand, you mentioned a (unintelligible) and in that case you have to build it out yourself. It's a pretty ambitious project. Are you noticing any patterns so far on preferences for whether it makes more sense to just use out of the box solutions, or should the City be investing in its own technology, its own models, its own applications?

Ginger Armbruster: I think this has been a question since forever. What do you want to build? Because now you've got to maintain it. What can be out of the box. And I think it can always be less expensive but on the other hand the terms and conditions with some of those out of the box solutions that are generic, aren't ready for environment or the government cloud even, so we find ourselves, sometimes, because of such specialized service delivery that we have to consider building and that makes me want to go to a common platform, that we're building on something that we can support. And then, whatever solutions we build on top. So I don't think I have an answer for you quite yet, but that is definitely part of trying to find where the value is, and I showed you that one chart, and we would like to see standards so that we are not splitting our resources and maintenance around too many disparate solutions, and that we're not building out too much. We don't have enough people for it, first of all. We don't really want to have that kind of diversity among the things we support. So, we're still finding it out, and that is the key question in terms of priorities and where we use our resources.

Phillip Meng: Thanks. That makes sense. Once again, a huge thanks for this very interesting conversation.

Ginger Armbruster: Reach out to me through CTAB if you have more questions. We don't have all of the answers yet. We're still finding out some of the questions.

Phillip Meng: Well, thanks so much. Now moving onto our last agenda item of the evening, committee updates, starting with Outreach and Engagement, and to discuss the master list, DeiMarlon Scisney, the floor is yours.

COMMITTEE UPDATES

Outreach and Engagement Committee

DeiMarlon Scisney: The list was created as part of the Outreach and Engagement Committee working on centralizing all of key external partners that CTAB will or need to engage with as we drive things in Digital Equity or broadband, or AI, or community technology access, whatever that may mean. And so, that has been done, and you all can take a look.

Phillip Meng: I know that board members already have a link to this.

DeiMarlon Scisney: Yes. You should have a link to it as well. We don't technically have to share the screen. What is in the outreach list? Essentially, it is organized into different tabs. So, the first one is on the legislative side, looking at City of Seattle partners. There are King County partners, Washington State agencies are in there, broadband and technical structure partners, education and work force partners across the different colleges. Say for instance that DELN or other facets as well, in working in this space. And then, even partnerships that I have, like Seattle Colleges and things like that. Tribal governments, consortium partners, and federal partners, as well, as it pertains to Senate offices like Cantwell and Murray, all of whom should be digital equity act funding, national broadband, policy, all of those things. And then, within that, creating a power mapping tab that really tracks influence aligned with region and outreach status as it pertains to CTAB. there is a community-based organization piece that has about 80 percent. A lot of them are classified as buying for organizations, to the Department of Commerce, and a couple of other criteria around that, but it's about 80 percent of grassroots to grassroots organizations in the broader Seattle and greater Seattle area as well. And at the end is a living, breathing document. So we would love anybody to add. I think everybody has commenting privileges around this, but I really wanted us to devise this, and then within that, we will coordinate as a group and prioritize engagement. So that we can find which partners CTAB should engage first across the City or County or State. And then, to what extent or degree these will serve in different facets, which would be my understanding. And then, what does that relationship look like now.

Phillip Meng: Thanks, D. I think this is superb. I'm just on the nonprofits and community-based organizations tab right now, and it's amazing to have contacts of a lot of organizations that we know we want to work with, that we want to be closer with in

thinking about community engagement. Maybe if we ask for board members as well as the broader community to help us add more specific names of people, that would be good to add to the catalog. For instance, I know if the Digital Equity Committee, we have additional contact points that we have worked with year over year on our telecom forum. We will certainly get that into the section of the list. And the other ask, of course, is to make good use of this as an enabler for our programs and for outreach.

DeiMarlon Scisney: Yes. Please go in and add. Next steps on my end in mapping this out, now we have a repository for outreach and engagement. From this, now how do we categorize that. Within that, also as you add people, be commenting or thinking about, as we move into the legislative process and in my understanding, I have grouped them as that. So Legislative, and much more community engagement, so if there is, for example, the Technology Matching Fund, we can get that information out to that list or whatever that may be that has direct effect to community, and be able to differentiate between the audiences that are there.

Phillip Meng: Absolutely. Thanks so much, D. Any other asks that we should take on? Or questions from the broader group?

DeiMarlon Scisney: This will always be a living, breathing document, but can we look to have this solidified by next meeting with updates and things?

Phillip Meng: I think that's exactly the right timeline, so by our December 9 meeting, I agree with using that as a (unintelligible).

DeiMarlon Scisney: Awesome. Please let me know if you need access. Everybody should have access. And then for the purpose of minutes, if we wanted to drop this list or make it publicly available, I don't think that that may be the intention, Phillip, for now. to embrace this as a CTAB marketing mechanism, but you let me know.

Phillip Meng: I think that the use space we've carved out now is more internal. But of course, let us know if there is (unintelligible) otherwise. Thanks so much, D. I want to turn it over to other members for updates. Maybe as we go into that, I want to reiterate a call for members for the Digital Equity Committee, which is open both to board members

and members of the community. If you are interested, please get in touch with me. I'm dropping my email in the chat. We, of course, are looking for long term members of the committee, but we're particularly looking for all hands on deck for a couple of recurring priorities, the Digital Equity Telecom Forum, as well as the digital equity questionnaire that we have prepared. Okay. If no other updates, I will go to the last item on the agenda, public comment.

From chat: phillipmeng98101@gmail.com

PUBLIC COMMENT

Phillip Meng: Does anybody have anything that they would like to share with the group? All right! Perfect. Thanks for such an informative and engaging meeting. I will see you next month. The December meeting is December 9. Have a great rest of the day.

ADJOURNMENT 7:23

