

CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON TECHNOLOGY

----- X

DECEMBER 5, 2018
Start: 1:41 P.M.
Recess: 2:36 P.M.

HELD AT: 250 BROADWAY - COMMITTEE RM, 14TH FL

B E F O R E: PETER A. KOO, CHAIR

COUNCIL MEMBERS: ROBERT F. HOLDEN
BRAD S. LANDER
ERIC A. ULRICH
KALMAN YEGER
FRANCISCO MOYA

A P P E A R A N C E S (CONTINUED)

GAIL BREWER, Former Council Member,
current Manhattan Borough President

GREG SUTTON, managing Director of Access
Services of the Manhattan Neighborhood
Network (MNN)

ANTHONY RIDDLE, Vice-President for
Community Media at Brick

AUDREY DUNCAN, Director of Training and
Special Projects at Bronx Net

2 CHAIR PETER KOO: Good afternoon. We are
3 going to start the meeting. I am Councilman Peter
4 Koo and I am the Chair of the Committee on
5 Technology. At today's hearing the Committee will
6 vote on Resolution Number 620, sponsored by Council
7 Member Moya and myself at the request of the
8 Manhattan Borough President, Gail Brewer. Resolution
9 Number 620 calls on the Federal Communications
10 Commission to reject the proposed rules put forth in
11 the Second Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making 18-
12 131 and to create provisions that would strengthen
13 public, educational and governmental access
14 television. Public, educational and governmental
15 access television is an important resource for our
16 local communities and City as a whole. I
17 specifically want to highlight my local community
18 television center Queens Public Television. Queens
19 Public Television also known as QPTV is a vital
20 resource for Queens residents and cable causes the
21 most diverse programming to the most diverse
22 community in the world. They run a bulletin board to
23 highlight events when over 140 organizations in our
24 borough, provide training, production tools and
25 resources for Queens Residents and nonprofits and

2 allow our residents to exercise their First Amendment
3 rights. Our, other public stations like Bronx Net
4 and Manhattan's MNN are also fairly established
5 stations with local news and talk shows that have
6 become the go-to outlets for hyperlocal boroughs
7 specific NYC news. The FCCs proposed rules remove
8 these dedicated streams of funding for QPTV and
9 others and it will severely hinder their ability to
10 cable cast the day's events, news and important
11 community information. All of our local public
12 education and governmental access channels will be
13 impacted by this proposed change. We will, we should
14 be protecting these channels as the conduits for the
15 principals of free speech as they are the last true
16 public television stations. They are not relying on
17 advertising or politics. The public should have the
18 access to broadcast channels without these stations,
19 without these stations needing to compete for
20 funding. I ask my colleagues to help protect these
21 channels. At this point, I would like to invite our
22 first panel, Council Member, oh no, Council Member,
23 Former Council Member Gail Brewer, now is borough
24 president of Manhattan to speak about Resolution
25 Number 620 and I would like to commend the members of

2 this Committee to vote in favor of the Resolution.

3 Thank you. And before uhm Borough President starts

4 we want to acknowledge the presence of our Committee

5 Members, Council Member Ulrich, Council Member Holden

6 and Council Member Yeger. Gail, uhm Borough

7 President you can state your name and start now.

8 GAIL BREWER: Thank you very much. I am

9 Gail Brewer. I am the Manhattan Borough President.

10 I am the former Council Member and I am honored to be

11 here today and I want to thank you Chairman Koo and

12 Council Member Moya and all the members who are here

13 today. I want to thank Council Member Moya and Koo

14 particularly for uhm sponsoring Resolution 620 and as

15 the Chair indicated the Federal Communications

16 Commission uhm you know were urging. This Resolution

17 urges them to reject the rules put forth by the

18 Second Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making 18-131.

19 And what that means is something that you probably

20 know, something new from the Trump Administration is

21 that the new restrictions proposed by the FCC which

22 is the Federal Communications Commission would count

23 services this is the crux of the whole issue. It

24 would count the services that New York City

25 negotiated for cable franchising agreements and I

2 think some of us have been through those agreements,
3 whether it is Time Warner or Verizon or other cable
4 franchises. We negotiated these cable franchising
5 agreements and fees which fund our public, our
6 educational and our governmental access channels know
7 as PEGs toward the existing 5% cap on cable
8 franchising fees. That's the crux of it. And so, by
9 uhm proposing these restrictions to me it is an
10 attack on local government by the FCC headed out by
11 Chair Pi and the Trump Administration as they look to
12 align the pockets of cable companies as the expense
13 of these important services that the PEGs provide and
14 the PEGs are really important through our community.
15 You will hear from them. But these organizations
16 train nearly 10,000 people a year in video production
17 and editing, graphic, sound, and lighting. They all
18 provide facilities, technical support, equipment and
19 free channel time and they give people presenting
20 diverse communities an audience and a voice. I know
21 Manhattan Neighborhood Network well, MNN but I know
22 the others are also terrific in the five boroughs.
23 But MNN is the largest media educator in our City
24 serving more than 1200 media students every year. It
25 is also the single largest cable caster of original

2 content in the United States. It airs 15,000 hours
3 from 1,000 producers. In general, the majority of
4 the PEGs funding comes from the rates negotiated in
5 the cable franchising agreements that I mentioned
6 earlier. These revised rules would have a
7 significant impact on PEGs budget and ability to
8 provide this very needed service in our community.
9 The new restrictions would also prevent local
10 franchising authorities from negotiating for a
11 percentage of revenue generated by the internet
12 services that cable corporations provide which
13 further endangers the future of PEGs as cord cutting
14 becomes more and more common. Between July and
15 September of this year, 2018, nearly 1.1 million
16 people cancelled their subscriptions with cable and
17 satellite TV providers according to Moffit Nathanson
18 a Media and Telecommunications Research Firm here in
19 Manhattan and I think anybody, any millennial, you
20 are all cutting your cables, don't to that. That's
21 my opinion. The Lifeman Research Group has reported
22 that 12% of American households have cut the cord
23 since 2013 and again I'm not surprised. So, we know
24 that cable revenues will suffer in the future as
25 internet streaming becomes more popular. In order to

2 ensure the future of PEGs we must be able to tap into
3 the growing revenues cable corporations generate from
4 internet service which relies on the same hardware
5 and public property as their paid TV packages.
6 That's what the FCC should be focusing on.
7 Restricting on local governments ability to regulate
8 noncable services is not only a direct threat to the
9 future of PEGs, it also impacts the City's ability to
10 protect New Yorkers. The City must be able to pass
11 laws that provide constituents with privacy and
12 consumer protections that apply to internet service
13 providers. Large corporations have mishandled and
14 misused consumer data. We all read recently about
15 the data breaches at Marriott, Dunkin' Donuts and
16 Dell 500 million consumers impacted very recently.
17 Despite the FCCs claim that these rules would reduce
18 barriers to entry and promote competition in my
19 opinion they intentionally and significantly reduce
20 cost for incumbent cable tv operators. I firmly
21 believe that these proposed rules will more firmly
22 entrench existing companies and dissuade competition.
23 Finally, from my perspective, there is nothing in
24 these proposed rules which provides any measurable
25 benefit to New Yorkers and I think you will hear the

2 same from the PEGs. I just want to mention that the
3 City of New York benefits tremendously from the work
4 that the PEGs have done and also from their own
5 support as a result of the franchise negotiations.
6 So, there is nothing in these proposed rules which
7 provides any benefit to New Yorkers and the rules
8 threaten to destroy one of the most important Eco
9 systems that we have of small, local, original
10 programming and information services to underserved
11 communities. So, I think you very much for your
12 sponsorship and I appreciate that this Resolution has
13 been introduced. It is not the front page of every
14 newspaper but it is something that I think is
15 important to our communities. Thank you very much.

16 CHAIR PETER KOO: Thank you Borough
17 President.

18 GAIL BREWER: Thank you.

19 CHAIR PETER KOO: Now we will call the
20 second panel, Mr. Greg Sutton, Anthony Riddle and
21 Audrey Duncan. Okay you may start after stating your
22 name. Anyone can start first.

23 GREG SUTTON: My name is Greg Sutton.
24 The managing director of Access Services of the
25 Manhattan Neighborhood Network and I thank the

2 members of the City Council for the opportunity to
3 voice MNNs support for Resolution Number 0620-2018.
4 MNN agrees wholeheartedly that the actions proposed
5 by the Federal Communications Commission if adopted
6 would significantly harm the public access
7 programming serving the people of the City of New
8 York with no offsetting public benefits. Last month,
9 MNN filed comments with the FCC in strong opposition
10 and we thank the City of New York for also filing
11 comments opposing the FCCs misguided proposals. As
12 this Council may be aware, MNN operates the public
13 access channels in Manhattan and is currently one of
14 the largest cable casters of original video
15 programming in the United States. MNN vision is to
16 empower local voices and diverse views of New Yorkers
17 from all political, socio-economic and cultural
18 perspectives. Its programming is in multiple
19 languages and serves the gorgeous mosaic that is in
20 New York City. It does so by offering media
21 distribution services, video production facilities
22 and media education to Manhattan residents and
23 community-based organizations who deliver high
24 quality and hyperlocal programming to Manhattan's
25 Cable subscribers. MNN collaborates with many other

2 video content providers. Our next NYC cable and
3 digital channel highlights local community groups
4 that are changing lives and making a difference.
5 They include the Avanelle American Dance Theatre, Big
6 Brothers, Big Sisters of New York City, the
7 Children's Museum of the Arts, Girls who Code, the
8 Harlem Arts Festival, the National Alliance on Mental
9 Illness and the New York Anti-Traffic Network but for
10 the MNN public access channels many cable subscribers
11 especially who are physically challenged or lack the
12 financial means would have no access to this vital
13 city programming. There is no other outlet that can
14 accommodate the broad range of ethnic, religious and
15 cultural programming that is presented on the public
16 access channels at no cost to the producers. MNN
17 also invests in training residents in local community
18 organizations in all aspects of video production and
19 provides low cost access to production equipment and
20 facilities. MNN educates more than 1200 media
21 students annually in courses ranging from digital
22 editing, field camera and studio production. Many of
23 the MNN video producers are from communities that
24 have no access to high quality media equipment and
25 services. MNN public access programming gives voice

2 to diverse perspectives that simply cannot be found
3 anywhere else on today's commercial cable TV
4 channels. The FCCs proposals threaten to gut funding
5 for public access in this city and in cities and
6 communities across the country. The effects of its
7 proposed ruling would be a devastating blow to
8 diversity, inclusion and freedom of expression and
9 the FCC proposes to do so by illegally stripping the
10 city of the statutory authority given to it by
11 Congress in section 621 of the Communications Act.
12 In 1984, Congress deliberately chose to provide local
13 franchising authorities, not the FCC with the
14 authority to require cable TV operators to support
15 public, educational and governmental access
16 programming as a condition of granting the valuable
17 privilege of holding a city cable franchise. Decades
18 after Congress enacted the law; however, the FCC
19 seeks to rip that authority away from the City. I
20 will not repeat here the many legal arguments raised
21 by MNN, the City and associations and individuals
22 across the country as to why the FCCs proposed
23 actions would violate the Federal Communications Act.
24 I will note; however, that the FCC essentially
25 misinterprets the plain meaning and phrase franchise

2 fee to sweep in for the first time all costs of PEG
3 access within the 5% statutory cap but as the FCC
4 itself has conceded, not all franchise obligations
5 are franchise fees. Like a franchise build out
6 obligation, the PEG obligations give back to the
7 subscribers directly with valuable local programming,
8 they add value to the cable network itself and they
9 enhance the market demand for the cable operators
10 channel line-up. The FCC turns a blind eye to these
11 critical facts. Why do the FCC do this? How did the
12 FCC do this? How did it get so wrong? It's not
13 really clear. What is very clear from over 2,000
14 comments already filed with the FCC is how completely
15 wrong it got the law and the policy with no
16 offsetting benefit other than to increase the cash
17 profits of cable franchises. MNN urges this Council
18 to send a strong message of support for diversity and
19 inclusion in New York City but adopting Resolution
20 0620-2018. Thank you very much.

21 CHAIR PETER KOO: Thank you. Next
22 speaker.

23 AUDREY DUNCAN: Hello I'm Audrey Duncan,
24 I'm director of training and special projects at
25 Bronx Net. We want to thank the City Council for

2 allowing us to voice our support for Resolution
3 number 0620-2018. Bronx Net provides public services
4 with current studios and network operations located
5 at Neiman College and our constellation site located
6 in the East Bronx at Mercy College. Bronx Net's
7 multimedia production studios in the South Bronx are
8 currently being constructed as part of (INAUDIBLE) in
9 the hub. Through Bronx Net's public access
10 facilities, we trained the public in media production
11 by providing television, studio and field production
12 workshops. We provide access to technology and help
13 students acquire valuable workforce development
14 skills. Graduates of our workshops utilize media
15 production equipment at no cost to produce programs
16 and share diverse ultra local content that
17 contributes to community development through media.
18 Bronx Net strongly opposes the tentative conclusion
19 in the FMPRM that cable related in-kind contributions
20 such as those that allow our programming to be viewed
21 on the cable system are franchise fees. Using fair
22 market value to determine the amount to be considered
23 a franchise fee will lead to arbitrary deductions and
24 would have adverse effects on our budget and
25 ultimately our ability to serve the people of the

2 Bronx. The programming that you find on Bronx Net
3 you will not find anywhere else on your cable channel
4 lineup. So far Bronx Net has achieved the following
5 results: Over 350,000 broadcasts of independent
6 programs have been produced by Bronx residents and in
7 most cases the programs were produced with equipment
8 and facilities provided by Bronx Net. Over 5,000
9 Bronx residents have been trained to produce studio
10 and field-based programs through our intensive eight-
11 week certification workshops. Over 3,000 high school
12 and college students have gained experience through
13 hands-on internships in production, management,
14 engineering and more. As a result, many have
15 acquired competitive positions at scores of national
16 and local media outlets. Hundreds of Bronx
17 organizations and hundreds more across New York City
18 have utilized Bronx Net signature public affairs
19 programs as platforms to share important information
20 about services, activities and issues that are
21 important to Bronx families and communities. Bronx
22 Net provides coverage of arts and culture along with
23 innovate local arts programming. Bronx Net also
24 helps local artists and organizations build support
25 in audiences while fueling economic engines and

2 contributing to the creative economy. As times and
3 technology change, Bronx Net works to state cutting
4 edge as we enhance our public services in the Bronx.
5 We are building on our strong record of providing
6 workforce opportunities to high school and college
7 students. Also, high school students interning at
8 Bronx Net have demonstrated improved academic
9 achievement and we recently started working with
10 junior high school students, middle high school
11 students to help them prepare for a world of
12 possibilities since they may not have imagined. We
13 reject the implication in the FNPRM that PEG
14 programming is for the benefit of the local
15 franchising authority or a third-party PEG provider
16 rather than for the public or the cable consumer. As
17 indicated above, Bronx Net provides valuable local
18 programming that is not otherwise available on the
19 cable system or in other modes of video delivery such
20 as satellite, including programs that allow residents
21 to remotely participate in live discussions on
22 important community topics. Yet the Commission
23 tentatively concludes that non-capital PEG
24 requirements should be considered franchise fees
25 because they are in essence taxes imposed for the

2 benefit of local franchising authorities or the
3 designated PEG providers. By contrast, the FNPRM
4 tentatively concludes that Bill Dot requirements are
5 not franchise fees because they are not contributions
6 to the franchising authority. PEG programming fits
7 squarely into the category of benefits that do not
8 accrue to the local franchising authority or its
9 designated access provider. Yet, the Commission
10 concludes without any discussion of the public
11 benefits of local programming that non-capital PEG
12 related provisions benefit the local franchising
13 authority of its designee rather than the public at
14 large. It is important to consider how media
15 literacy access to broad band and technology and
16 related skills are increasingly more essential for
17 participation in contemporary civic and economic life
18 and how community access organizations like Bronx Net
19 are anchor institutions serving a critical role in
20 the technological future of the Bronx and our great
21 city. Thank you again for this opportunity to
22 address the Council.

23 CHAIR PETER KOO: Thank you Ms. Duncan.
24 Now we have Mr. Anthony Riddle.

2 ANTHONY RIDDLE: Yes, thank you uhm Mr.
3 Chair. I'm Anthony Riddle, I'm the Vice-President
4 for Community Media at Brick. Brick is a downtown
5 arts organization in Brooklyn. The largest presenter
6 of free or almost free programming and incubator of
7 artists including media artists here in New York.
8 Uhm we are strongly in favor of the resolution before
9 you today and we strongly opposed the tentative
10 conclusion in the FNPRM that cable related, in-kind
11 contributions such as those that allow community
12 programming to be viewed in the cable system are
13 franchise fees. This is in direct contradiction to
14 the original language and congressional intent of the
15 law and contrary to decades of practice. Uhm I would
16 like to paint a little picture with some numbers for
17 you of what we do. We reach over 600,000 homes in
18 Brooklyn alone and we have four cable providers, all
19 of them that are in the City. We uhm we have rating
20 that show us that we have more than 5 million views
21 of our programs per year. The programs are produced
22 by 550 local series produces per quarter. We operate
23 five studios. We have seven locations throughout the
24 borough outside of our main location at the Brooklyn
25 Public Libraries. We have dozens of camera packages

2 which we provide to the public for free. We train
3 over 5,000 students per year including young people
4 at 42 public schools in Brooklyn. I had to ask about
5 this, I couldn't quite remember but it seems like we
6 have 10 Emmy awards uhm here in New York. I wasn't
7 quite sure what the number was, because you start
8 forgetting after a while. But that is after dozens
9 of nominations in the most competitive market in the
10 country which casts a line to the idea that, that
11 public access is not a quality programming source.
12 Uhm our Brick TV has been included in at least a
13 dozen major film festivals including both Sundance
14 and Tribeca. Our meaningful important work for the
15 community is almost entirely dependent upon our
16 financial agreements with the cable companies.
17 Without them our services to the public would cease
18 to exist. It is not fair to allow these massively
19 profitable companies to determine an arbitrary free
20 market, fair market value for in-kind services when
21 the people who own this valuable public right of way
22 are arbitrarily prevented from charging fair market
23 value for the use of the right of way. I would like
24 to talk about a couple of programs that we have. We
25 have a program we are very proud of call Project

2 Redirect with the Brooklyn Das off where we work with
3 the Das office with young offenders to give them the
4 opportunity not only to eliminate the felony that
5 they have on their record but to discover who they
6 are through the use of video courses and video
7 equipment. We also have a program with Made in New
8 York and SBS for the Made in New York Production
9 Training Program wherein people are taught up to a
10 level where they can enter the robust film making
11 market here in New York. It is a very intense
12 program that requires a lot of work and there is job
13 placement afterwards. But what is interesting is we
14 have both of these programs, Project Redirect and
15 Made in New York in our facility that allowed us to
16 introduce the parties in both programs so now some of
17 the students who are in the Das program are given the
18 opportunity to get job related skills through the
19 Made in New York Program so we have sort of a, we
20 have a pipeline to work that comes out of the work
21 that we do. We reject the implication and PRM that
22 PEG programming is for the benefit of local
23 franchising authority or a third-party PEG provider
24 rather than for the public or the cable consumer. In
25 fact, we provide a source for programming that is a

2 significant factor in the consumer choice to
3 subscribe to cable rather than competitive systems.
4 We are a primary source of local news and loyalty and
5 good will for the cable companies. The Commission
6 concludes as my colleague said, without any
7 discussion of the public benefits of local
8 programming that non-capital PEG related provisions
9 benefit the LFA or its designee rather than the
10 public at large or the cable company. Tell that to
11 the guests of adopting Teens and Tweens, a program
12 which interviews older young people in need of a
13 family and home and which has on several occasions
14 related in the adoption of those who appeared on the
15 program. We stand with the City of New York in
16 opposition to this poorly drawn and dangerous rewrite
17 of decades of Law and Practice. Thank you for
18 allowing us the chance to talk to you.

19 CHAIR PETER KOO: Thank you. Uhm. Any
20 questions? No. So, you may step down.

21 AUDREY DUNCAN: Thank you.

22 CHAIR PETER KOO: Before we go to the
23 vote, we have uhm Council Member Moya and Council
24 Member Moya will give a statement before the vote.

2 FRANCISCO MOYA: Thank you uhm Mr.
3 Chairman and thank you to my colleagues uhm for
4 giving me this opportunity. Uhm in late September,
5 the Federal Communications uhm Commission released
6 the second notice of a Proposed Rule Making 18-131.
7 If enacted uhm this proposal would introduce new
8 restrictions on local franchising authorities with
9 regards to cable franchising agreements and
10 regulation of noncable services. Ultimately the
11 proposal amounts to a little more than a meaningless
12 handout to cable companies while kneecapping our
13 public, educational and governmental programming. It
14 is no surprise that this FCC proposal is nothing more
15 than just a naked handout to corporate giants. This
16 is the Trump Administrations FCC after all and an
17 administration that has allowed Net Neutrality to
18 die. Effectively selling our internet services to
19 the highest bidder. This rule change that would
20 severely limit New York City's ability to negotiate
21 cable franchise agreements to benefit our local
22 public uhm specifically with regards to local public
23 uhm access networks like the Manhattan Neighborhood
24 Network being one of the which provides uhm public
25 education and governmental programs also known as

2 PEGs. Currently franchise fees for cable providers
3 are capped at no more than 5% of the cable TVs
4 operator's annual gross revenue. As part of the
5 agreement, New York City negotiated cable companies
6 count PEGs as in-kind contributions to the City. If
7 the FCC adopts this proposal, cable companies would
8 count the dollar value of those in-kind services
9 against a 5% cap on the franchise fee. This would
10 reduce the revenue that would be directed to PEG
11 channels under our current franchise agreement and it
12 would also preclude local governments from charging
13 uhm cable providers a percentage for revenue for non-
14 cable services. This would devastate the public
15 access television organizations like the Manhattan
16 Neighborhood Network and others. Uhm in addition to
17 being the City's largest nonprofit media educator,
18 uhm, the Manhattan Neighborhood Network also serves
19 more than 1,200 students every year and airs 15,000
20 hours of original content for more than 1,000
21 contributors. This potential kneecapping of
22 independent media comes at a time when our City is
23 already increasingly starved for new sources with the
24 disbanding of DNA info and the continual lay-offs of
25 outlets like the New York Daily News. The FCCs

2 proposal is a flagrant overreach by the Federal
3 Government and paralyzes the authority of the
4 municipalities to negotiate their own franchise
5 agreements. This from the Administration of a
6 President whose own party starts and ends the
7 sentence with (INAUDIBLE). Not only that, these
8 rules change are also are absurd. The cable giants,
9 the potential profits that they turn would be nominal
10 at best but to PEGs the money is vital. If enacted
11 these rules would cripple public programming. These
12 rules benefit no one, save only those who benefit
13 from a less informed and engaged public and this
14 proposal is yet another example of this
15 Administrations embrace of corporate interest and its
16 compulsive betrayal of the public good. This is why
17 I have introduced a resolution along with the great
18 Borough President of Manhattan Gail Brewer who is
19 here today uhm to condemn the Trump Administration's
20 move to gut cable access channels and nullify the
21 ability of local governments in negotiating their own
22 franchise agreements. And with that, I encourage my
23 colleagues to join in condemning this proposal and I
24 thank you one again Chair for allowing me to come and

2 read my statement and thank you to my colleagues as
3 well.

4 CHAIR PETER KOO: Thank you Council
5 Member Moya. Are there any more public members who
6 want to participate in this? Seeing none. Did you
7 sign up?

8 FEMALE: Mr. Jacobs.

9 MR. JACOBS: I don't want to actually
10 speak but I want to support these comments that my
11 colleagues from the Bronx made. I thank you for your
12 comments and acknowledging the public television and
13 I have submitted comments.

14 CHAIR PETER KOO: Oh, I see. Okay, thank
15 you very much. So, seeing none we are going to
16 proceed to vote. Will the Clerk please make the roll
17 call to vote?

18 CLERK LEE MARTIN: Lee Martin, Committee
19 Clerk, Roll Call Vote Committee on Technology
20 Resolution 620, Chair Koo?

21 CHAIR PETER KOO: I vote aye.

22 CLERK LEE MARTIN: Holden?

23 ROBERT HOLDEN: Aye.

24 CLERK LEE MARTIN: Yeger?

25 KALMAN YEGER: Aye.

2 CLERK LEE MARTIN: Ulrich?

3 ERIC ULRICH: I vote aye and I ask my
4 name be added as a co-sponsor to the Resolution.

5 CLERK LEE MARTIN: By a vote of four in
6 the affirmative, zero in the negative and no
7 abstentions, Resolution has been adopted by the
8 Committee.

9 CHAIR PETER KOO: So, thank you very much
10 for the public and also the members of this
11 Committee, thank you. The meeting is adjourned. We
12 are going to hold the meeting open for 15 more
13 minutes for a Member to come to vote. Thank you.

14 CLERK LEE MARTIN: Continuation Roll Call
15 Committee on Technology Resolution 620, Council
16 Member Lander?

17 BRAD LANDER: I vote aye.

18 CLERK LEE MARTIN: Final, final vote is
19 now five in the affirmative, zero in the negative and
20 no abstentions, Council Member Lander.

21 CHAIR PETER KOO: This meeting is
22 adjourned. Alright thank you.

23 BRAD LANDER: I thank you very much for
24 holding it open.

C E R T I F I C A T E

World Wide Dictation certifies that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. We further certify that there is no relation to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that there is interest in the outcome of this matter.



Date DECEMBER 31, 2018