

**CITIZENS' TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND TECHNOLOGY
ADVISORY BOARD (CTTAB)**

**Minutes
January 11, 2010
6:30 - 8:30 p.m.**

**Garfield Community Center
2323 East Cherry St, Seattle, 98122**

Attending

<p>Members: Ted Schmitt, Chair Roni Ayalla Karen Manuel Stacey Wedlake (pending appointment) Brian Hsi (pending appointment)</p> <p>Absent Will Pugh Rob Dolin (pending appointment) Eric Koester (pending appointment) Marina Martin (pending appointment)</p>	<p>Public: See attachment for sign in list</p> <p>City Staff David Keyes Tony Perez Bill Schrier Brenda Tate Derrick Hall</p>
---	---

Note web link to Public access survey at www.seattle.gov/cable/publicaccesssv.htm

6:37PM meeting called to order

AGENDA

1) Welcome and Board business

- Ted announced pending members and current members and introduced those who were attending the meeting.
- Roni motioned to approve November 2010 minutes. Karen seconded. Minutes approved from November 2010 CTTAB meeting.
- David announced that the Technology Matching Fund application date is going to be moved. The application opening date will be early April for applications due mid-May. The Fund is also moving to an online application system called WebGrants and this will enable time to complete the transition. The online application process should speed up the review process and enable applicants to maintain accounts for their applications to the Tech Matching Funds and Department of Neighborhoods Matching Fund grants. Also, a decision has to be made about the final budget for the grants. The funding was initially reduced by

\$75,000 to \$225,000. However, City Council, through a Council “Green Sheet” Statement of Legislative Intent, approved an increase in the franchise fee with the proviso that the CTTAB provide a recommendation on distribution of a portion of those additional funds received to the TMF and to public access to television efforts.

[Provided for reference: Council Statement of Legislative Intent (SLI) excerpt. See full original at <http://clerk.seattle.gov/~scripts/nph-brs.exe?s1=&S2=&S3=&S4=Approved&S5=&S6=&S7=&s8=2011.CYCL.&Sect4=AND&l=50&Sect6=HITOFF&Sect5=BUDGET&Sect3=PLURON&d=BUDG&p=2&u=%2F%7Epublic%2Fbudget.htm&r=72&f=G>]

2011 - 2012 Seattle City Council Green Sheet

38 2 A 1

Budget Action Title:

Appropriate revenue from 0.2% increase in cable franchise fee rate to support City external e-mail (\$138K per year) freeing up GSF, and request that DoIT and CTTAB propose use(s) for remaining portion (\$182K per year)

Budget Action description:

This green sheet appropriates \$138,000 of the new revenue generated by a 0.2 percent increase in the cable franchise fee rate (from 4.2 percent to 4.4 percent) that results from approval of green sheet 38-1-A, freeing up GSF. It requests a proposal from the Department of Information Technology (DoIT) and the Citizens Telecommunications and Technology Advisory Board (CTTAB) about how best to spend the remaining \$182,000. The 0.2 percent increase generates \$320,000 per year for the Cable Subfund.

This green sheet appropriates \$138,000 per year to support a portion of City external e-mail, freeing up the same amount of GSF. This amount, along with the \$400,000 of Cable Subfund support to City external e-mail already reflected in the Mayor’s 2011-2012 Proposed Budget, would allocate to the Cable Subfund the full cost of City external e-mail related to GSF departments.

- This green sheet leaves the remaining \$182,000 per year from the franchise fee rate increase in the fund balance of the Cable Subfund. The Council requests that DoIT consult with CTTAB about how best to spend the \$182,000. Candidates for this funding include the Technology Matching Fund grant program, and services to be provided by the public access television operator. The Council requests that in the first quarter of 2011, DoIT report back and submit proposed legislation that would appropriate the \$182,000.

a) Public Access to Television public input session (CTTAB Public Access Committee and Tony Perez, Cable Communications Director)

Background and process

Ted Schmitt explained that the purpose of the meeting is to get input on the future of public access television given that the City has reduced the budget and that there was a Council Statement of Legislative Intent asking that CTTAB gather input and provide recommendations to them about what should go in the request for proposals (RFP)

- Ted reviewed the Council Statement of Legislative Intent (SLI) (**Attached**)
- CTTAB and Department of Information Technology staff, including Bill Schrier, the Chief Technology Officer, are here to get input from the community about the public access RFP process.
- Fill out the survey at www.seattle.gov/cable/publicaccessstv.htm to provide input. Survey has been divided into two pieces—one multiple choice and one more open-ended questions.
- Opened it up for introductions
- Members attending can fill out the sign-in sheet at the door and can be notified about information as this process moves forward.
- Tony: introduced the RFP, mentioned that council significantly reduced the amount of public money going towards public access. Purpose of session to get ideas of how we can move public access forward in environment with reduced public funding and gather ideas about how we can leverage recent technology advances to support reduced funding costs. Want to learn from community about what they value in public access. Information gathered from this and the surveys will inform the RFP.

- Elements of the RFP and tentative timeline:
 - (1) March 7: advertise and post RFP
 - (2) Pre-proposal conference: March 15th
 - (3) Interviews with finalists: April 12-14
 - (4) Announcement of successful bidder: April 29th
 - (5) Agreement in place with selected operator: June 1
 - (6) Selected operator begins operations: July 11

- Discussion will be framed around three areas coinciding with SLI:
 - (1) how do we continue to fulfill the mission for public access given the budget constraints
 - (2) how do we (and should we) incorporate new media into public access
 - (3) financial—how do we encourage other sources of funding to support public access, how else can we fund it
 - (4) outreach—how do we outreach to important and diverse populations

Polling tool - Participants were given a polling selection remote and instructions were given that we have starter multiple questions to vote on to get the conversation going. After tallying each vote, we will have a discussion around the questions.

Polling and Discussion

[The notes on the discussion are captured in two sections. The first results and discussion notes for each question were collected by CTTAB member Karen Manuel.

The second additional notes were collected by City staff and CTTAB liaison David Keyes. Both are included here so that we best reflect the input from the public participants at the meeting. The meeting polling results are included for recording purposes, but note the method and the reservations from participants about use of this data. At the meeting Tony and Ted described the polling as a tool used to foster more in depth discussion and idea generation.]

- **Question 1: What is the most critical element of public access services?**
 - Studios came out with the highest at 38%. However, after discussion and clarification, participants responded strongly that the polling results, held before discussions, are not an accurate representation of the participant views.

Discussion: Someone said most people chose studios because you need a space to be able to do the other activities. Comment that the SLI – studio might need to be re-defined to meet the legislative intent.

Has cameras and equipment to be able to produce a live program, telephone for live calls. Someone said Seattle used to have one of the highest live program ratios in the nation. Comment that you have to have training in order to be able to use the studio. Question asked if people who chose other wanted to elaborate on that: one person suggested that all of the above answers were important, so that is why she chose other. Someone chose other because they felt that use of the studio to outreach to his population/audience was important.

Comment that producers should have data available to them about the viewers.

Comment that city and cable companies won't give them that data. One of the producers has his program online and generates high viewer numbers. Comment that public access should have capability to generate visitor revenue for the city.

Q1 Critical elements: Additional notes on first question discussion:

- Cablecasting was missing from the polling choices.
- Many of these choices are actually a progression of learning and producing. Hard to be forced into single choice.
- From the question, those who chose studio may have picked it because this was the only option that reflected that public access had a facility, a place to gather, train, produce, and cablecast.
- Studio was also cited because it represents only opportunity for live production
- Large studio and small studio serve somewhat different purposes.
- Why was field equipment and editing not selected: Because without training, the other tools are not very useful to many.
- Discussion of why some people chose "Other": If you value public access in the first place, you have to commit to provide the full range of services to make it effective.
- Note that outreach to community was not an option here, but is very important.
- Producers will be unable to critique their productions if data about the viewing is not available.

- PA has potential to generate revenue for the community by promoting the city and encouraging visitors. Note that some shows are distributed across the country and to other countries (Africa cited).

Someone asked what the status of the SCAN contract and whether studio is still available. Tony Perez answered: There is an agreement in place for SCAN to provide whatever services they can for the money provided.

- **Question 2: Which distribution channel best extends public access beyond cable television?**

- Internet video came out the highest at 60%. 40% listed other
- *Discussion:* people said direct TV, on demand, and cable fell into other. Other things can help but we're not using them right now. Comment that public access should be accessible on demand. Ted access whether there could be an online channel for public access. Channel can currently be archived for a couple of weeks—started recently. Can't be seen again after a program airs. John said that there are many national distribution models for things to show after airing via DVD, online, or via satellite. Comment that these may carry a cost that would be unaffordable to producers. Can do free upload to internet archives (national resource) and David mentioned some other options as well. Comment that Netflix is a good idea, but the challenge is the cost of producing with covers and labels. For internet/blogging, when would we have enough money to hire people with tech skills to support those costs—people coming to produce shows are not techies and don't know how to do that. Comment: someone wants to see rabbit ears because you don't have to pay for it, method to keep it affordable. People are able to find things on TV because there is a schedule. Public library kiosk could be a resource to access public access content. Comment that accessibility and affordability is important. Comment that the majority of viewers of public access are watching TV and are not on the internet. Several people agreed. Immigrant populations don't have the computer skills and access. Comment that there are packages sold to seniors that do not include a public access channel. Tony said that both cable operators are contractually required to offer public access channel. People should contact his office if they do not have access to that channel. Comment that public access is a community.

Q2 Distribution outlets: Additional notes on second question discussion:

- Primary answers were Internet video and Other
- DirectTV/Satellite was pointed out as option
- Other things can help that aren't being used now. Ted mentioned Facebook
- On demand would be nice with program information.
- PA has been for those without the funding or access to commercial tv and this is their low cost accessible network. There is no similar model.
- Programs are being encoded now and aired, but aren't kept in a public library available for ongoing on-demand.

- Question raised about shelf life: Do you want to see this year's Tibet fest 10 years from now?
 - Question and discussion of what distribution and hosting options are there and for how much money? (John Klockner from Puget Sound Access mentioned public access media option) Costs need clarification. Also issue raised of YouTube not hosting longer videos. Also need to provide or help people to learn to post for streaming (issues: money, time, skill).
 - Over the air, regular programming has benefit of serendipitous exposure.
 - Ability to see schedule or list of programs is important.
 - Library - could they put in a video kiosk with the ability to buy a video copy (kind of like RedBox).
 - Access distribution needs a menu system which is disabilities accessible.
 - Could you make it affordable but let producers have the option for revenue sharing if the video goes viral?
 - Many people still getting significant amount of info via TV, so it's important to maintain this cable TV distribution outlet.
 - This was pointed out as very important for immigrant community.
 - Public access is community of people that help each other learn and produce - so need to maintain that opportunity and climate.
- **Question 3: Viewing video: Please indicate the primary method you use other than traditional over the air broadcasting, cable or satellite to view video programming?**
- 36% said DVD or other portable device came out the highest. Split between other categories. Internet on my smart phone, tablet, laptop or other portable device 29%
 - *Discussion:* Comment that people are recording using DVR. Public access resources are listed as 12 hour or 24-hour blocks so that they are harder to record. Comment that there are a lot of seniors that don't know how to work the cable box. Someone did a series on homelessness and people cannot afford housing, so questioning what percent of population has high-tech devices. City's 2009 Technology Indicators Report showed data on technology access and cable access. Also included a couple questions on public access. Report is online at www.seattle.gov/tech/indicators but also available via print for anyone who wants to read it. Comment that publicity for the public access channel is needed. Question whether there should be a public access source for content for people who do not have cable or Internet.

Q3 Additional notes on third question discussion about where to view video:

- Use DVR, but challenge in programming because the on cable program guides don't break up pa into hourly or half hour blocks.
- Use multiple platforms, including checking out dvd's from library.
- From a producer of program on homelessness, wondering how big the population is that has the hi tech devices
- Need greater publicity to distribute info about programs in other venues.
- Want download locations.

○ **Question 4: Which non-City of Seattle revenue source could best help sustain public access?**

- Other came out the highest at 33%. 27% said grants and underwriting. 20% said fee for service.
- *Discussion:* Previously a person mentioned that his community could possibly pay some dollars to support programming for his immigrant community. Comment that it take skills to write grants. Comment that general public doesn't have the grant writing skills. People who said other mentioned things like a designation on the cable bill that could support public access costs. Comment that the music commission would have music playing in public venues. Could do something similar with cable access. Could create a funding source to expand access to public access. Free wi-fi for city would increase access to information. Question whether other public stations do underwriting. Comment that there is a fine line with public access to make sure you don't go over the "commercial" line. Question how long will the contract be. Answer that it hasn't been determined yet. Question whether there is a way in the RFP process to weight providers who are willing to stay and offer programming for multiple years. Could add a sustainability question to the RFP to support. Question whether people who have programs are allowed to charge people who want to order their show—this needs to be answered.
- (note: should the survey be also be administered via paper? Or do focus groups cover that?)

Q4 Revenue sources: Additional notes on fourth question discussions

- One comment was that if need be some producers would pay a small fee for playing their program.
- Takes staff or volunteers with expertise to write grants. Producers may not have this expertise.
- Suggestion: Donation option on cable operators billings (check if you want to contribute a dollar to access). There could be advantage to todo this where it would be tax deduction vs franchise fee model which is not a tax deduction.
- City music commission is talking about Seattle music in airports and hotels. Could there be a video rotation sponsored by these locations and others?
- Underwriting could be revenue benefit but also brings challenge if underwriter isn't happy with the programming.
- How do we keep the non-commercial free speech channel identity as we seek additional fund support.
- Ability to order and buy copies of shows are vague now. If it was clarified, this could bring in additional revenue.

Participant question: How long is the new access contract going to be?

Answer from Tony Perez: This is not set yet and could be based on negotiations with the provider. The City Council did not set a time period.

- Participant suggestion: consider having the RFP give weight to commitment to provide service for a longer period, as well as how the service would be maintained. Longer contract may be more efficient as it gives greater stability and continuity in delivering services.
- **Question 5: What non-monetary strategy could best help sustain public access?**
 - Forming partnerships came out the highest at 46%. Second choice was streamlining operations at 23%.
 - *Discussion:* When people think about forming partnerships, they think about some of the conversations SCAN folks have been having. Problem with partnerships is need to have consistency and needs not to compete with true public access. Someone talked to NSCC librarian and they said they had a lot of editing equipment that goes unused. Training needed to make this resource usable. Training facilities at SCAN could be used by their students. Perhaps the North Seattle Community College could be used. Someone put other because 1985 wouldn't allow streamlining because need to have a wide variety of information and services. Answer was that streamlining was allowed due to funding constraints. Schools will not send students to SCAN to learn without a certified teacher. Someone chose other because they felt publicity and branding was important.

Q5 Non-monetary strategies: Additional notes from fifth question discussion:

- Partnerships could help both. Eg Schools where students need projects. Challenge is rotation and consistency, which is needed.
 - Someone talked to North Seattle Community College, which is not using editing equipment currently.
 - Public access classes could be combined in some way with other classes being offered.
 - Partnership challenge is that partners may not be committed to implementing free-speech, diverse tv, open to all.
 - There's a potential challenge for training if access tries to use students, but can't afford certified/qualified teachers.
 - We are coming up with ideas, but it's frustrating : **Tony Perez:** Hope is that an operator could leverage the money city provides to get additional support.
 - Publicity could be a non-monetary resource if creative.
- **Question 6: Diversity and Outreach: What are the best strategies that the public access provider can use for reaching out to refugee, immigrant, and disadvantaged communities to ensure that they are represented on public access? What special needs in these communities can be addressed through training in various video technologies?**
- *Discussion:* Need to have the ability to change with the times and serve whatever community or individual comes in. Comment that a member of the Hispanic community requested several hour block for his community so that they can tune in to the programming then. Other immigrant/refugee

communities could be put into a block program schedule. Comment that the providers and producers should do outreach. Also need to have resources for a staff person to do this. Comment that SCAN's funding has been cut in this area. Need to have technology workshops for general purposes too, to teach people how to do email, etc. Need to market through the existing channels. Ask in the RFP how people will do outreach. Try to get people involved in all phases not just the consuming of the resource. Suggestion that the City could exercise its franchise requirements to improve fiber optic lines and create better access to the people—people could go to festivals and film them, people could work with the Department of Neighborhoods, local meetings, need to make sure broadband lines and fiber optics are there to provide a good signal for public access. Comment that people should get better notification of public events so they can film them.

Q6 Outreach: Additional notes on second question discussion:

- Needs to be somewhat flexible to respond to different communities and changing communities.
- Blocks of hours of programming for a particular language or culture could attract and retain greater and reliable audience from a community.
- Utilize the current producers for greater outreach into their own communities and into other communities since they can speak to benefits.
- Need someone to do the outreach, but it could be a full time job and this is just wishful thinking without the funding.
- We're a tech town and having tech workshops in other areas (eg email) could broaden attractiveness of the program. (points in RFP?)
- Market that Public Access is useful for both the production side and as a way to get out and hear what is going on in your community or other useful info.
- Collection of individuals that are gathering to put on festivals and events, but they don't have much time, experience or tech skills to create the programs, so need matching and addressing how to help these folks get others to create the programs with them.
- Festivals are a good outlet.
- Other City departments could help match and provide other resources in partnership with the groups they are working with, they could do this to help with outreach.
- Access to the infrastructure is something that communities can't provide, so City needs to continue helping and ensure that transmission capacity is put into place.
- Need a good way to promote what events are upcoming so that people who want to produce them could find ideas for things to cover. (Could this be an online feed or volunteer match app?)
- Programming could help and be promoted to immigrant communities to learn more about Seattle and their communities here.
- I can't even check out a camera right now to cover these meetings...

Additional general discussion:

- Participant: As the RFP moves forward, there should be clarification about what capital equipment and cablecasting infrastructure will be provided (by the City or via franchise agreement) and that an examination whether there is sufficient resources for SLI to be administered.
- There was a question whether the survey results from this discussion and notes will be online. Answer is yes. Ted Schmitt and Tony Perez encouraged people to take both the quick survey and the more extended online open ended questionnaire. CTTABs meetings are also podcasted and the notes will be posted. The CTTAB Public Access committee will compile the results of the survey into a report. www.seattle.gov/cable will have information posted as well.
- There was participant expression that it is important to contextualize how the polling was done—that people could only choose one response for each question and polling was only done prior to the topic discussion.
- John and Karen explained that this is the only public forum, but the survey is also gathering input for RFP. Also we have a CTTAB meeting on the second Tuesday of February to share what we have compiled.
- There was a reminder from a producer about the commitment they have for public access and how much pride people take in their programs and the work and care that goes into creating their shows. This was strongly affirmed by other participants.

Note: More info and link to survey: <http://www.seattle.gov/cable/publicaccesstv.htm>

**Next CTTAB meeting is Feb 8, 6-8 pm at the Seattle Municipal Tower 27th Floor
Board Room (Room 2750)
700 Fifth Avenue, Seattle, WA 98104**

Contact: David Keyes at 206-386-9759 or Communitytechnology@seattle.gov
The CTTAB committee will present the results of the meeting and survey there.

- Meeting adjourned 8:37.