Structural Changes Needed to Regain
Information Communications Technology Edge in Portland

Introduction

Earlier this decade, many national observers considered the City of Portland an Information and Communications Technology (ICT) policy leader – especially in the areas of digital inclusion/equity and open data (see Glossary in Appendix 4). Two accomplishments – the ahead-of-its-time open data resolution[1] in 2009 and adoption of Connecting to Our Future: Portland's Broadband Strategic Plan (BSP)[2] in 2011 – highlight this point (see Appendix 1 for more details).

These steps likely contributed to Google Fiber naming Portland in 2014 as one of its second-round cities after its 2012 infrastructure construction entry into Kansas City. Portland's leadership continued in 2014 with the formation of the Digital Inclusion Network (DIN) and development of the Digital Equity Action Plan (DEAP)[3]. Portland and Multnomah County adopted the plan in 2016.

The BSP identifies 14 strategies to address five goals. The DIN and DEAP, though critical first steps, address only two of the 14 strategies. Since its adoption in 2011, many cities around the U.S. surpassed Portland in the ICT policy arena. This dynamic undermines recent community-driven accomplishments like the DEAP, and could contribute to 12 BSP strategies not being adequately addressed, though Google Fiber's withdrawal from Portland is why one strategy is not yet met.

Nevertheless, the Citizens' Utility Board of Oregon (CUB) believes that the City of Portland has the capacity, knowhow, and leadership experience to build-on previous ICT successes. The City's recent partnership with Bloomberg Philanthropies open data initiative, "What Works Cities", to embolden data collection to improve civic services[4], clearly demonstrates this point.

Yet CUB believes that the City can do much more, and in this spirit, offers this paper to recommend possible structural changes to improve the City of Portland's approach to comprehensive and visionary ICT policy development, implementation, and oversight.

Why CUB

In 1984, Oregonians voted to establish CUB with a mandate to represent the interests of residential electric, gas, and telephone utility customers. This gives CUB over 30 years of experience in public policy development and analysis. In 2014, Portland City Council invited CUB to advocate for residential customers of the City's two public utilities (Water and Environmental Services). This work deepened CUB's understanding of the City's governance structure and the all-important interplay between City Bureaus and the City Council.

CUB has a long history of working on ICT policy issues, including broadband access and digital inclusion/equity, which play out in legislative, administrative, and regulatory arenas at all levels of government (federal, state, and local).

More recently, CUB joined the DIN and supported an Office of Community Technology (OCT)-led effort to develop the DEAP. In 2016, CUB testified in support of both City of Portland and Multnomah County DEAP resolutions, as well as proposed open data provisions as a component of the City's updated Comprehensive Plan[5].

CUB prepared this paper with a firm belief that people deserve fair and affordable access to essential utility services that beyond electricity, heating, cooling, water, and wastewater management, now includes fair and affordable access to the Internet and civic engagement tools through publicly sponsored open data platforms.

Why Now

The world of ICT has experienced significant upheaval since 2011. ICT innovations in the past five years have changed the way(s) people communicate and connect with the outside world, access healthcare, discover and apply for jobs, manage household finances, and engage with their local government[6,7,8] (see Appendix 2 on Community Need).

After several failed attempts, in 2015, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) affirmed its authority to enforce an Open Internet Order[9] to, among other things, safeguard "Net Neutrality"[10]. The Order gives the FCC broader authority to regulate the Internet more like a utility. This policy shift not only signaled a new era in thought around regulating the Internet, but also paved the way for a modern overhaul of the Lifeline program[11] that helps low-income telephone customers by expanding the subsidy to include Broadband Information Access Systems (BIAS).

However, it is easy to undo many of these federal policy changes. The White House's political and ideological leanings heavily affect FCC policy. For instance, the current Obama Administration takes a very different view of ICT policy than that purported by President-Elect Trump[12]. Only time will tell how a Trump Administration acts on existing law around ICT topics like net neutrality, Internet transparency and privacy, and other federal initiatives targeting the digital divide.

Even before the Obama administration policy changes, many cities across the country took matters into their own hands by streamlining ICT bureaucracy to more efficiently administer existing services to foster innovation within and beyond city government through new and innovative policy. Post-election, proactive and visionary city-level action on ICT policy seems even more critical.

One purpose of this paper is to learn from other communities. First, however, we provide a status update on "Connecting to Our Future: Portland's Broadband Strategic Plan" to suggest that the City of Portland would benefit from considering new options for the location of ICT policy development, implementation, and oversight within its governance structure.

Connecting to Our Future: Portland's Broadband Strategic Plan - Status Update

The Portland City Council resolution launching the BSP wisely identified that "high speed, accessible and affordable broadband is now mission-critical infrastructure for job creation, education, health care, the enhancement of safe and connected communities, civic engagement, government transparency and responsiveness, reduced carbon emissions, and emergency preparedness"[13].

The BSP, adopted in 2011, laid out an ambitious set of five goals and 14 strategies toward achieving those goals as summarized below. However, now five years into the plan, the City has made the most obvious gains in only two of fourteen strategies linked to goals three and five. Italics denote those critical gains below. At the same time, the following summary indicates the extent to which other BSP goals and strategies have not yet garnered adequate attention.

Goal 1: Strategically invest in broadband infrastructure to attract innovative broadband-intensive business and institutions that create knowledge jobs in Portland
>   Strategies:
>   - Prioritize "Big Pipe" Capacity
>   - Attract R & D
>   - Standards and Best Practices

Goal 2: Eliminate broadband capacity, equity, access and affordability gaps so Portland achieves near universal adoption of broadband services for all residents, small businesses and community-based organizations
>   Strategies:
>   - Establish Neighborhood Broadband Hubs
>   - Expand City Capacity to Address Digital Equity: Improve Equity through dedicated funding and staff resources, and community partnerships
>   - *In October of 2016, the Office for Community Technology (OCT) hired a full time Digital Equity Program Coordinator*
>   - *Portland Community Media, with City support and via OCT, provides community access to technology and digital literacy training with an emphasis on equity*
>   - Facilitate Marketplace Competition
>   - *OCT's facilitation of Google Fiber's entree into the Portland market addressed this strategy and other elements of this goal as OCT also negotiated a "digital equity fee" agreement to support DEAP initiatives. Those dollars and Google Fiber's construction of high-speed broadband infrastructure are no longer coming to Portland. This, however, is due to Google Fiber's withdrawal and not any lack of effort on the part of OCT and/or the City Council*

Goal 3: Develop highly technology-literate and employable residents, students, small businesses and workforce
>   Strategies:

- Create Broadband Centers of Excellence
- Promote Technical Literacy and Skills
- Modernize and Adopt Telecommuting and Remote Work Strategies and Policies

Goal 4: Promote and plan for the use and widespread adoption of broadband technologies in government, energy conservation, transportation, health, education and public safety
   Strategies:
- Energize a Dynamic City Technology Culture
- Adopt Information Technology Standards
- Adopt Regional Public Safety Standards for Wireless Networks

Goal 5: Create future-oriented broadband policy, modernize government organizations and institutionalize digital inclusion values throughout the region
   Strategies:
- Establish a Regional Task Force on Digital Inclusion Policy
    - *The 2014 City of Portland and Multnomah County Library-sponsored Digital Inclusion Summit kicked-off the formation of the DIN and development of the DEAP*
    - *In April 2016, the City of Portland and Multnomah County passed separate DEAP resolutions, thereby endorsing DIN stakeholders to work strategically towards addressing regional concerns around digital inclusion/equity and open data*
- Advocate for legislation, regulation and adoption of open network platforms and open data standards

CUB acknowledges that other City Bureaus, such as the Bureau of Technical Services (BTS), may have projects addressing some BSP goals and strategies. To the extent that occurs, though, it illustrates inadequate coordination with OCT, the City office charged with BSP implementation, as well as inadequate attention, at a high level, to connections between internal technology improvements and broader ICT policy opportunities.

Governance Structures Matter
The BSP covers nine years, from 2011 to 2020. Therefore, it is understandable that not all the goals and strategies outlined above are complete in 2016. It is also appropriate that implementation of digital inclusion/equity strategies took priority.

Nevertheless, CUB believes that, in 2012, momentum behind BSP implementation slowed along with a general reduction in high-level attention to ICT policy. Up to that point, the Office of Cable Communications and Franchise Management (OCCFM) carried out early innovative work on open data and broadband adoption policy, though OCCFM changed its name to OCT in late 2011.

In 2012, however, then-Mayor Adams inserted OCT into Revenue Bureau within the Office of Management and Finance (OMF). Reportedly, the goal behind OCT's demotion was cost savings[14]. There was a significant non-monetary loss, however, since OCT no longer had Bureau level status and a direct report to a City Council member.

In 2015, decision makers buried OCT deeper within Portland's governance structure when the Revenue Bureau and Bureau of Financial Services merged to become the Bureau of Revenue and

Financial Services (BRFS) within OFM. The OCT soldiered on, but greater authority and autonomy would bolster its ability to provide a broad ICT policy vision (appendix 3 provides a past and present review of OCCFM and OCT).

In CUB's view, the loss of a direct connection between the City Council and OCT, and that group's inappropriately low organizational status are significant and contributing factors in Portland losing its edge as a national ICT policy development, implementation, and oversight leader.

CUB calls for a broader discussion than a return to the OCCFM model, but the status quo requires fresh evaluation. The following section explores other U.S. cities recognized at ICT policy leaders to inform Portland's discussion of strengthening the current OCT or reconfiguring a new ICT group, as well as determining the most effective placement within the City's governance structure to ensure visionary ICT policy development and consistent and comprehensive ICT policy implementation.

U.S. Cities and Information and Communications Technology Leadership

CUB's research identified a group of cities that receive consistent praise for their leadership around ICT policy from a diverse group of public, private, and nonprofit agencies.

Cities:
Austin, Texas; Boston, Massachusetts; Chattanooga, Tennessee; Chicago, Illinois; Louisville, Kentucky; Kansas City, Missouri; New York, New York; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; San Francisco, California; Seattle, Washington; and Washington D.C.

Agencies:
The National Digital Inclusion Alliance[15]; the Benton Foundation[16] the IBM Center for the Business of Government[17]; the Center for State and Local Leadership at the Manhattan Institute[18]; and the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology[19].

Several common threads exist among these cities. Yet perhaps the most important to acknowledge in the context of this paper is a streamlined bureaucracy among citywide ICT services and the extent to which core city leadership interacts with central ICT services.

City	Governance Structure	Chief Innovation or Information Officer	Chief Data Officer
Austin, TX	Manager & Council	Yes	Yes
Boston, MA	Mayor & Council	Yes	Yes
Chattanooga, TN	Mayor & Council	Yes	Yes
Chicago, IL	Mayor & Council	Yes	Yes
Louisville, KY	Mayor & Council	Yes	NA
Kansas City, MO	Manager & Council	Yes	NA
New York, NY	Mayor & Council	Yes	Yes
Philadelphia, PA	Mayor & Council	Yes	Yes
San Francisco, CA	Mayor & Council	Yes	Yes
Seattle, WA	Mayor & Council	Yes	NA
Washington, D.C.	Mayor & Council	Yes	Yes

Often, but not always, a Chief Information or Innovation Officer (CIO) oversees a broad platform of ICT services (open data/civic engagement, city IT, digital inclusion/equity, franchising, privacy, etc.) and enjoys a reporting relationship to high-level city officials, often directly to the Mayor or City Manager's office[20].

The CIO model (or a similar structure) utilized in the above cities is notably absent within the City of Portland. The Chief Technology Officer, who heads up the current BTS, is the closest comparison to a Chief Data Officer (CDO) in other cities.

Case Study: City of Seattle

CUB highlights Seattle because of its general proximity to Portland, cultural similarities, and relative population size (2016 estimate of 686,800 for Seattle[21] vs. July 2015 estimate of 632,309 for Portland[22]). Approximately 12 percent of Seattle homes do not access the Internet.[23]

Noteworthy Accomplishments:

- In 1995, the City established a Community Technology Advisory Board (CTAB) to offer recommendations to the Mayor and the City Council on issues of community-wide interest relating to ICT; research issues and collect public input; encourage and promote affordable access to and use of ICT; and promote and advise effective electronic civic engagement and e-government services[24].

- Since 2006, the City of Seattle's website and open data portal have received numerous awards, including the "Best of the Web" award from the Center for Digital Government[25].

- In 2015, to "facilitate delivery of [ICT] services, connect people to their government, enable an efficient, productive City workforce, and build a digitally equitable community", Seattle Mayor Ed Murray assembled a committee of the Deputy Mayor, the City's Chief Technology Officer, and six department heads to consolidate City ICT work under a new department called Seattle Information Technology (IT).

Seattle's Approach:
"On the date the consolidation takes effect in April 2016, IT leaders from across executive departments will change their reporting relationship, changing primarily from reporting to department finance or administrative leaders to the Office of the CTO in the new Seattle IT. Other staff will continue to work in their current roles, performing the same work, and reporting to their current supervisor.

Over the remainder of 2016, we will gradually and carefully bring together staff working on some infrastructure functions – such as service desks, networks, device support, security, and similar functions. How each service will be integrated will depend on the details of the functions and will be guided by knowledgeable staff from across City departments who can help bring best practices to each activity.

During 2017, we will functionally integrate city-wide and department applications development, geographic information systems support, and web services. By the end of 2018, with the integration of application operations and support, the consolidation will be complete"[26].

The city of Seattle's comprehensive approach to ICT stands out to CUB. The consolidation and centralization of ICT services coupled with a policy vision is demonstrated by the clarity and

usability of its website. Through a single and easily navigable portal, anyone can access resources about the City's broadband, digital equity, open data, privacy, data center, and emergency communication initiatives. The formal role of the CTAB in advising the Mayor and City Council on ICT policy is another important highlight.

Information and Communications Technology Organizational Options for Portland

CUB believes that OCT is gravely disadvantaged in its current position within BRFS within OMF, and that a significant structural change is essential to ensure visionary development, implementation, and oversight of ICT policies and a comprehensive and consistent attention to the goals and key strategies outlined in the BSP.

CUB does not have a specific recommendation regarding OCT's organizational placement or possible reconfiguration within the City's governance structure. Rather, CUB suggests the following options to jump-start an important discussion to improve City of Portland ICT policy.

- Establish an ICT office headed by a CIO with the current OCT management leading policy development. This could be an independent bureau akin to OCCFM that reports to a City Council member or could be a standalone Bureau within OMF with a direct report to the Chief Administrative Officer who leads OMF and reports to the Mayor.

- Establish a two-pronged ICT office headed by a CIO with the current OCT management leading policy development and the current BTS management leading technology implementation. This could be an independent Bureau that reports to a City Council member or a standalone Bureau within OMF with a direct report to the Chief Administrative Officer who leads OMF and reports to the Mayor. This approach is akin to Seattle's Information Technology department.

- Establish an ICT office that includes either current OCT functions or both OCT and BTS functions led by a CIO that reports directly to the Mayor's Office.

- Explore coordination and/or integration options with the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, acknowledging that the Comprehensive Plan highlights the importance of data accessibility and the interplay between ICT and all other City services.

Maintaining OCT's staffing of the Mt. Hood Cable Regulatory Commission (MHCRC) is an important element of any new ICT organizational structure.

In summary, CUB appreciates the opportunity to present this paper and welcomes involvement in future discussions regarding ICT policy within the City of Portland.

Appendix 1 – Early Innovations

- In 2009, the City of Portland adopted one of the first open data resolutions in the country[27], designed to "mobilize and expand the regional technology community…by promoting open and transparent government, open data, and partnership opportunities between the public, private and non-profit sectors, academia and labor."[28] The resolution led to the development of civic engagement tools such as "CivicApps" and "PDX CitySync".

- In 2011, OCCFM spearheaded the effort to develop the nation's first local, comprehensive Broadband Strategic Plan – Connecting to Our Future: Portland's Broadband Strategic Plan, with "a vision for Portland's future that recognizes the social, economic and political importance of Broadband in our livability, prosperity, sustainability, and equity goals". The BSP recommended a digital equity investigation, and that community stakeholders convene to address digital inclusion/equity challenges in the Portland-area.

Appendix 2 - Community Need

The August 2015 Digital Equity Needs and Opportunities Report[29] and 2016 DEAP describe the extent of the digital divide in Portland.

- 15 percent of Portland-area households do not currently have access to internet at home.

- People of color, recent immigrant communities, older adults, people with disabilities, and those with low-incomes disproportionately lack access, skills, and appropriate tools.

- 42 percent of non-internet users need support and training to access the Internet.

The 2016 Whitehouse Council of Economic Advisers Issue Brief on the Digital Divide and Economic Benefits of Broadband Access identifies five key outcome areas that see improvement from reducing the digital divide[30].

1. Economic Outcomes: There is a well-documented, positive relationship between broadband adoption and overall economic health. Closing the digital divide empowers people, who are willing and able, to realize socio-economic benefits from fast, reliable, and affordable access to the Internet.

2. Medical Outcomes: Fast, reliable, and affordable Internet access improves the efficiency and convenience of medical care.

3. Education Outcomes: Half all students between the ages of 14-18 report using a library computer to complete their homework. Broadband supports greater access to affordable higher education. Online courses are more affordable and lower tuition costs. Broadband access paired with an internet-enabled device is critical for homework completion.

4. Civic Outcomes: A strong and positive association exists between broadband adoption and civic participation. A Pew survey reports that, between 2000 and 2004, registered voters who cited the Internet as their primary information source increased from 11-18 percent. And in a 2013 study, 50 percent of public respondents cited the Internet as their primary source for national and international news.

5. <u>Labor Outcomes:</u> A strong correlation exists between broadband access and an improved labor market. Individuals with fast, reliable, and affordable broadband cannot only search more easily for jobs, using a variety of online tools, they can complete applications online and network with peers via social media.

Appendix 3 – Office for Community Technology Past & Present

OCT's mission is to "build community capacity and champion investments and public policy in a rapidly changing communications technology, utility, and broadband landscape to keep [the City of Portland-area community] economically and culturally healthy."

OCT covers a range of topics such as consumer advocacy and protections; utility franchising and licensing; wireless carrier agreements; cable television regulation (via the Mt. Hood Cable Regulatory Commission); broadband adoption; and communications technology policy.

OCT negotiates franchise fees with all communications providers. This negotiation process contributes many millions of dollars to the General Fund annually with utility license fees comprising 15% of General Fund revenue in the City's adopted budget for FY 2016-17[31].

All these efforts occurred under the auspices of the bureau level OCCFM with a direct line to the City Council through its Commissioner-in-charge. Through FY 2011-12, OCCFM's budget was a component of the Community Development Service Area. OCFFM updated its name to OCT in late 2011 as reflected in its FY 2012-13 budget request submitted in January 2012.[32]

While finalizing budgets in spring of 2012, then-Mayor, Sam Adams, tacked OCT onto the Revenue Bureau under OMF. Adams described the move as cost-saving. This organizational reconfiguration was in place from FY 2012-13 through FY 2014-15 with OCT's loss of bureau status and a report to a City Commissioner - access that CUB would argue is particularly valuable to achieving innovative ICT policy development and oversight.

OCT was buried even lower in the City's organizational structure beginning in FY 2015-16 when the Bureaus of Revenue and Financial Services merged to create BRFS within OMF.

These structural demotions also forced a commendable but awkward work-around accommodation – allowing previous OCT Management to directly contact two Council staff members – that should not be replicated but illustrates the importance of City Council involvement in ICT work.

Appendix 4 – Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations

BIAS – Broadband Information Access Systems
BRFS – Bureau of Revenue and Financial Services
BSP – Broadband Strategic Plan
CIO – Chief Information Officer/Chief Innovation Officer
CDO – Chief Data Officer
CTO – Chief Technology Officer
CUB – Citizens' Utility Board of Oregon
DEAP – Digital Equity Action Plan
DIN – Digital Inclusion Network

MHCRC – Mt. Hood Cable Regulatory Commission
OCCFM – Office of Cable Communication and Financial Management
OCT – Office for Community Technology
OMF – Office of Management and Finance

Digital Inclusion refers to the activities necessary to ensure that all individuals and communities, including the most disadvantaged, have access to and use of ICTs. This includes five elements:

1. Affordable, robust broadband internet service;
2. Internet-enabled devices that meet the needs of the user;
3. Access to digital literacy training;
4. Quality technical support; and
5. Applications and online content designed to enable and encourage self-sufficiency, participation and collaboration.

Digital Inclusion must evolve as technology advances. Digital Inclusion requires intentional strategies and investments to reduce and eliminate historical barriers to access and use technology.

Digital Equity ensures all individuals and communities have the information technology capacity needed for full participation in our society, democracy and economy. Digital Equity is necessary for civic and cultural participation, employment, lifelong learning, and access to essential services[33].

Data is Open if it can be freely accessed, used, modified and shared by anyone for any purpose – subject only, at most, to requirements to provide attribution and/or share-alike[34]. Specifically, open data is defined by the Open Definition[35] and requires that the data be:

A. Legally open: that is, available under an open (data) license that permits anyone freely to access, reuse and redistribute; and
B. Technically open: that is, that the data be available for no more than the cost of reproduction and in machine-readable[36] and bulk[37] form.

1 https://www.portlandoregon.gov/shared/cfm/image.cfm?id=275696

2 http://www.portlandoregon.gov/revenue/article/394185?

3 https://www.portlandoregon.gov/revenue/article/573122

4 http://www.oregonlive.com/silicon-forest/index.ssf/2016/10/portland_joins_bloombergs_publ.html#incart_river_index

5 https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/2035-comp-plan.pdf

6 http://www.npr.org/sections/alltechconsidered/2015/12/03/458225197/the-daredevils-without-landlines-and-why-health-experts-are-tracking-them

7 http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/15/technology/net-neutrality-fcc-appeals-court-ruling.html?_r=0

8 http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/10/29/technology-device-ownership-2015/

9 https://apps.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-15-24A1.pdf

10 https://www.fcc.gov/general/open-internet

11 https://www.fcc.gov/document/fcc-modernizes-lifeline-program-low-income-consumers

12 https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-switch/wp/2016/11/10/how-donald-trump-will-dismantle-obamas-internet-legacy/

13 https://www.portlandoregon.gov/revenue/article/394185

14 http://blog.oregonlive.com/portlandcityhall/2012/04/mayor_sam_adams_consolidates_t.html

15 http://www.digitalinclusionalliance.org/

16 https://www.benton.org/

17 http://www.businessofgovernment.org/report/using-innovation-and-technology-improve-city-services

18 http://datasmart.ash.harvard.edu/news/article/digital-transformations-wiring-the-responsive-city-488

19 https://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2016/02/23/pcast-releases-technology-and-future-cities-report-president

20 http://www.businessofgovernment.org/report/using-innovation-and-technology-improve-city-services

21 http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/cityplanning/populationdemographics/

22 http://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045215/4159000

23 http://www.governing.com/topics/transportation-infrastructure/gov-most-connected-cities-2013-internet-adoption-report.html

24 http://www.seattle.gov/community-technology-advisory-board/what-we-docommittees

25 http://www.seattle.gov/news/detail.asp?ID=12054

26 http://www.seattle.gov/tech/initiatives/it-consolidation

27 http://siliconflorist.com/2009/09/30/portland-oregon-open-city-officially-embracing-open-data-open-source/

28 https://www.portlandoregon.gov/shared/cfm/image.cfm?id=275696

29 https://www.portlandoregon.gov/revenue/article/545834

30 https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/page/files/20160308_broadband_cea_issue_brief.pdf

31 https://www.portlandoregon.gov/novick/article/463556

32 https://www.portlandoregon.gov/cbo/article/383729

33 http://www.digitalinclusionalliance.org/definitions/

34 http://opendatahandbook.org/glossary/en/terms/share-alike-license/

35 http://opendatahandbook.org/glossary/en/terms/open-definition/

36 http://opendatahandbook.org/glossary/en/terms/machine-readable/

37 http://opendatahandbook.org/glossary/en/terms/bulk/

From: Samuel Pastrick [mailto:samuel@oregoncub.org]
Sent: Friday, October 07, 2016 10:28 AM
To: Parsons, Susan <Susan.Parsons@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Re: Council Communications Time - 10/26

RESCHEDULED TO NOV 30 sp

Hi Susan,

Sorry for not responding sooner re: the description of CUB's Council Communications slot on the 26th.

I think keeping it simple is just fine.

Something along the lines of "Regarding City of Portland information and communications technology opportunities".

Thanks and let me know if you've questions.

Sam

On Mon, Sep 26, 2016 at 4:29 PM, Parsons, Susan <Susan.Parsons@portlandoregon.gov> wrote:
Hello Sam,
Just right to email me. Thank you for your email. I've scheduled you for a Communications spot on 10/26. Please send a sentence or two about the subject you'll be speaking on.
 Here is further information for you on the Communications portion of the agenda:

- You will have three minutes to address the Council and may also submit written material (please provide seven copies).
- We start the meeting at 9:30 and Communications are the first item on the agenda.
- Please note communications allow the Council to hear issues that interest our citizens, but do not allow an opportunity for dialogue.
- The Council meeting takes place at City Hall, 1221 SW 4th Ave., 2nd Floor, Council Chambers.

Kind regards,
Susan

From: Samuel Pastrick [mailto:samuel@oregoncub.org]
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 3:34 PM
To: Parsons, Susan <Susan.Parsons@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Council Communications Time - 10/26

Hi Susan,
Sam Pastrick here with Oregon Citizens' Utility Board.
I'm ignorant to the process of requesting a Council "Communications" slot, so I thought it best to email you directly. Is it possible to get on the agenda for October 26th?
Thanks, and please be in touch with related questions.

Cheers, **Samuel Pastrick**
Advocacy + Development Associate
Citizens' Utility Board of Oregon
CUB Policy Center

samuel@oregoncub.org 503-227-1984 x19
CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE :

1319

Request of Sam Pastrick to address Council regarding the City information
and communications technology opportunities (Communication)

NOV 30 2016

PLACED ON FILE

COMMISSIONERS VOTED AS FOLLOWS:	YEAS	NAYS
1. Fritz		
2. Fish		
3. Saltzman		
4. Novick		
Hales		