Community Technology Advisory Commission
Dec. 8, 2020
OFFICIAL MINUTES

1. Call to order – roll call
   Meeting started 6:03 p.m. by videoconference
   Present: Bruce Browning, Kelly Heitz, Cindy Hoffman, Abe Levine, Rolf Peterson, Theo Pohlen, Mike Siegler
   Guests: Aaryn Anderson, Sandeep Sinha, Shawn Wood
   Staff: John McHugh, Clint Pires, Jacque Smith

2. Adoption of agenda - Agenda adopted as presented
   Browning moved, Siegler seconded, all voted in favor of adopting the agenda as presented.

3. Approval of minutes: Nov. 10, 2020
   Browning moved, Pohlen seconded. All voted in favor of approving the minutes as presented.

4. Smart cities subcommittee reports
   Pires had some comments about rewrites. On the connected community charter, Pires suggested on the last bullet point it should not be a blanket approach, but rather targeted. Pohlen said he checked out the Comcast report and noticed most responses said that community internet isn’t something people were very interested in. Levine added the suggested wording. Pires asked what happened to citizen awareness – first he heard it would be separate, then that it would be combined with connected community. Pohlen and Levine said it’s in the last paragraph before the bullet points. Pohlen said citizen awareness is likely something that will take place later in the process. Pires stated on the environment/sustainability statement, his suggestion was to specifically name the environment and sustainability commission as a group with which to work. Pires had no suggestions for the GIS committee statement. Levine said he’ll send out the newly revised committee charters.

5. Next steps
   Levine showed the work plan framework for committees. Levine said deliverables will be end of January 2021; definition of charter, goals and objectives were due today, which has been met. He said now we have to figure out how to get there from here, with milestones along the way.

   Smith said a council study session report is scheduled for Jan. 25, 2021, with a council study session presentation March 8, 2021. Levine asked if the group can continue its work in the meantime. Pires said the written report is a first-level check-in to see if the council is comfortable with the direction, and any modifications they might like CTAC to consider. With that, Pires said, CTAC can spend February building on that work. That doesn’t mean nothing happens between now and Jan. 25; additional work can continue which is where Insight comes in. At the March 8 meeting, that additional information will be presented, including any council recommendations/suggestions and requests from the Jan. 25 written report. Then CTAC can continue going deeper following the March meeting.
Levine said CTAC should continue working on project plans with a good definition of end date and deliverables, along with major milestones. It should be assumed we’ll get council comments that may enhance what’s being done. Pires said they may give priorities on the items listed. Pires said work on the plans should continue with the goal to have something prepared by end of February to present to council. That gives a couple months to flesh out the plan, taking into consideration holidays and other commitments people have. Levine said this also implies that there should be some milestones in mid to late February.

Levine asked what would be in the January 25 report. Pires said it would include background on the efforts of the CTAC, along with the committee reports. Pires and Smith will write the report and share it with Levine; there’s nothing else the commission/committees need to do with that report.

Levine suggested choosing a date for deliverables/major milestones by the committees. Pires said Insight can provide some guidance on this by discussing their template. Anderson said the essential structure and template they use is a use case justification. It has four core elements, one of which can be dismissed for this effort. It includes:

- Executive summary with high-level goals
- Financial impacts (not used for now)
- Project definition: this is the largest part of the document where scope is defined, high-level architecture, end result, goals of project, what’s needed to overcome the problem as defined, how does project support city initiatives, how does it impact for the better of the city.
- Team structure: includes project governance and decisionmaking process. This is where we’ll start to look at project timelines and milestones, along with progress reporting. It defines how actions taken are recorded, and how reporting back to an organization takes place to ensure checks/balances and realignments when needed.

Anderson said much of the work on the executive summary has already been done; usually it’s done last as understanding of the project grows. Anderson plans to meet with Levine in the next week to ensure the foundation is in place so that necessary detail can be plugged in. This will end with three solid project plans that are uniform and appear concise and cohesive to the city council. Levine said it’s important to remember these are the commission members, not the city staff doing the actual work.

Anderson said one thing he looks at in project organization is who needs to be involved and who is impacted, what assistance and expected requirements of input are needed. Levine asked if anyone had any input. Pires said it needs to be recognized the commission members are volunteers. Staff is respecting that and still needs your input, so Insight can take the input then do the detailed work. Pires said we won’t be able to do everything from all three committees. It could be a multiyear plan. There are also financial implications for everything. It’s important to narrow the focus so that it’s possible to go deep on those items. Anderson said the plans provide clarity and alignment. Pires said it will be important to identify outcomes and how we measure success. Anderson said they often create a “do nothing” plan to show the impact of doing nothing.
Pires said his understanding is that Anderson and Levine will meet on this plan, then work with the committee chairs. The committee chairs and Anderson can ask for whatever resources they need and Pires and Smith can point them in the right direction. He sees this as a point for Insight to engage with the commission.

Anderson said once he and Levine meet, they should have a playbook that can be distributed to the committee chairs. Levine asked if Anderson can send the document template to him to review. Pires suggested that Levine invite Anderson to meetings with committee chairs, which should be separate meetings to ensure no violation of open meeting laws.

Siegler said he appreciated the feedback on the process. He looks forward to seeing the Insight process and participating. Heitz agreed. Browning asked if Levine could send out the document with timeline to the commission; Levine said he would.

Levine asked if anyone had anything to talk about with respect to committees. Peterson said he wants to join a committee. Browning said he and Levine had discussed assignment to a committee. Given his talents, Levine suggested Peterson join the connected community committee. Peterson said he was leaning toward the environmental committee since it was thinly populated. After some discussion, it was decided that Peterson will join the environment committee with Levine. Pires said he will be seeking an additional person to join the environment committee. Connected community includes Browning, Siegler and Pohlen. GIS includes Heitz, Hoffman and Pires. Levine asked if everyone is happy with their committee assignments; everyone said they are.

Levine said that concludes the planning, pending his conversation with Anderson.

Levine said the next meeting should be in later in January. Smith said she’d modified the Doodle poll to add more possible dates, so asked that everyone go back to the link and fill in dates that would work.

6. **Selection of chair and vice-chair for 2021**
   Levine said according to the bylaws the chair serves only one year. He talked with Hoffman and she was okay with Levine taking on chair another year. There were no objections to that plan. Hoffman said she would like to step down as vice-chair. Levine asked if someone would like to be vice chair; Browning moved that Siegler take on the vice chair position. Siegler accepted. Browning moved that Levine continue as chair and Siegler become vice chair for 2021; Peterson seconded. All voted in favor. Motion carried.

   Levine wished everyone good holidays.

   Browning moved, Peterson seconded to adjourn, all voted in favor. Meeting adjourned at 7:02 p.m.