From:	Solov, Nate
To:	lauren@cafwd.org; Milton, Katherine@CIO; Tom, Stephanie@CIO; Stein, Jules@CIO; CA Broadband Council
Cc:	Swanson, Rochelle
Subject:	revisions to Action Plan outline - Crown Castle
Date:	Wednesday, October 28, 2020 7:01:54 PM
Attachments:	BB-Action-Plan-Outline-v6-including-CBC-Notes-1130am-10-23-2020 - Crown Castle revisions 10-28-20.docx
	Crown Castle - recommendations to accelerate broadband deployment in CA - 10-14-20.pdf

Hi Broadband Council Action Plan team – hope you're well. Thanks for all the great work you've been doing. Here are specific revisions to the Action Plan Outline from Crown Castle. We think it's necessary that "Deployment" / "Barriers to Deployment" / "Solutions to Deployment Barriers" be added throughout the Action Plan since it is a critical issue for short term and long term solutions to improve broadband access and connectivity for Californians.

We believe that resolving issues around deployment are foundational for many of the other issues raised in the report: even if there's a ton of money for broadband infrastructure and it's affordable for consumers – we're not going to be able to quickly build out the projects at the local level if we're constantly delayed by each local jurisdiction's different permitting standards across the state. For the 6-month recommendation there needs to be a quick and streamlined statewide permitting standard that local governments use for broadband permits.

Thanks for your consideration	. – Nate
Nate Solov Policy Advisor NOSSAMAN LLP	_
NOSSAMAN uP	nossaman.com

PLEASE NOTE: The information in this e-mail message is confidential. It may also be attorney-client privileged and/or protected from disclosure as attorney work product. If you have received this e-mail message in error or are not the intended recipient, you may not use, copy, nor disclose to anyone this message or any information contained in it. Please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete the message. Thank you.

California Broadband for All Action Plan

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

[Placeholder - This section will provide a concise overview of the Action Plan, including the context, what problems we are solving, unknowns (e.g., RDOF, administration transition), the strategy we will pursue, including specific actions we will take in the next 6 and 18 months, and the impact we expect those actions to have. To be developed following the full draft's completion.]

INTRODUCTION

[Placeholder – This section will provide context behind the problem, vision and this action plan, including the importance of broadband for modern life. To be drafted following the rest of the plan.]

VISION

All Californians must have access, both in their places of business and residence, to affordable, reliable, high-speed internet, devices and skills training to ensure equity – the universal ability to engage in all aspects of social and economic opportunity.

Access to high speed internet service and digital literacy skills is foundational to economic opportunity, quality of life, and public safety. Ensuring all Californians have access to affordable, reliable, high-speed internet and current devices, paired with the experience and skills to use it is an essential is key to achieving racial, social, and economic equity in California.

We will build on the foundation set legislatively and programmatically across the state, and raise the commitment to reflect the urgency and needs of Californians overall.

<u>Notes</u>

- Other foundational impacts to consider weaving throughout: critical/essential services and outcomes (e.g., healthcare, education, environmental protection), and everything else in modern life
- Treat broadband access as a "right" to change frame towards actions as obligations (i.e., not just incentives alone, need holistic approach to serving entire communities); also organizing structure to better tap into pots of money – MGA, KR, LP
 - Ensure appropriate Federal frame to leverage appropriate resources
- Treat broadband deployment as a matter of statewide importance requiring a statewide framework for the quick approval <u>or denial of broadband permits at the local level.</u>

BROADBAND IN CALIFORNIA TODAY

Insufficient Standards

Existing broadband threshold speeds do not do justice to how households and businesses use the internet in daily life. For example, AB 1665 indicates that broadband access requires at least 6 mbps download and 1 mbps upload, and permits the CPUC to subsidize broadband infrastructure that provides at least 10 mbps download and 1 mbps upload. There is an urgent need for broadband

infrastructure that supports distance learning, telehealth with a dynamic threshold and performance standard for adequate speeds based on what residents need to participate in these essential functions.

- Federal standard is 25/3 and has latency standards
- Incorporate new EO standard, and address question of standard

To put this in context, a household that had more than one person on a video conference at the same time —e.g., a child attending class and a parent working from home—would exceed this standard and result in significant frustration with dropped calls or inability to participate for a struggling family.

• Consider adding more feedback / input from schools and health systems

When you consider network infrastructure impacts, it's clear that there may not be sufficient bandwidth to cover spiking demand in particular service territories. Moreover, existing definitions do not incorporate additional information that are critical for base level of service quality, such as latency.

Follow up: Bernie to share studies on actual usage data.

Limited Data

This data is in the public interest, and should be in the public hands, especially in the context of the "right" to broadband access. Much of the data exists today, but is classified as confidential data and need to explicitly indicate that this is critical data to enable appropriate public action.

A foundational issue is the lack of sufficient, detailed data to fully understand where we are today, and therefore inform our policy making and investment decisions.

California needs better data to inform its investment and policy decisions. We have anecdotes and incomplete survey data to begin to determine signal from noise, but we lack the robust data and evidence base to inform our policymaking.

California's Data Strategy's first strategic objective is to build "enduring longitudinal datasets" (i.e., data that helps us understand how things change over time) to better understand the relationship between critical services, policies, and subsequent outcomes. Throughout this Action Plan we will leverage the best available data. Where there are gaps, we will triangulate the best available information, and actively welcome suggestions. When it comes to broadband, we are missing several critical elements, including:

- Address-level broadband service data
- Small business broadband needs and existing
- Tribal and agricultural service data
- Actual download and upload usages
- Detailed data on adoption and usage of existing low-income broadband offers
- Comparable price transparency across services available at minimum census block level
- Quality of service
- Data and visualizations that are easily accessible and useful for the public
- Better mechanism(s) to enable feedback and ground-truthing on data

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

- Maps of existing, readily accessible middle-mile broadband infrastructure, indicating census blocks with no fiber middle mile interconnection built out
- Maps of infrastructure in the public right-of-way that could be used to expand broadband such as utility rights-of-way poles, telecom and transmission towers and conduit
- M&O costs for operating network infrastructure across providers and parts of the state

Access

- <u>Rural areas</u>: At most 2/3 of rural Californian households have broadband available, and this likely overstates availability. For example, <u>BroadbandNow recently</u> manually checked 11,000+ addresses where the FCC indicated that one or more ISP currently provide service in that census block and used that to revise estimates of actual service. In California, the estimate indicates a revision from 1.17 million Californians who are unserved to 2.35 million Californians.
 - How has available broadband changed over the last 5 years?
 - What percentage of rural / tribal census blocks have access to more than 2 providers at the 25 mbps down / 3 mbps up standard?
 - Add definition of Census blocks vs. tracts, and what they mean, either in appendix or as a sidebar in this section
 - Actual service availability (e.g., only available for new service if someone disconnects)

• <u>Urban areas</u>: While there is significant internet provision within urban areas, the quality and speed of the service varies dramatically by the income of the community.

- Neighborhoods in urban areas with maximum internet speeds sorted by average household income?
- Analysis of fiber deployment in urban areas overlaid with historical redlining? Where can we find this data?

Potential sources of insight

- CPUC to help in showing full picture on this
- Affordability as key driver of expected adoption; could potentially incorporate into Access or Adoption
- Deployment
 - Crown Castle point towards comment on enabling deployment of projects in pipeline

<mark>Deployment</mark>

Broadband is critical infrastructure of statewide importance yet every local jurisdiction has different permitting rules and timelines. While some jurisdictions approve applications for broadband well within the federally mandated timeframes, (30-90 days), others may delay a decision to approve or deny for years – for the same type of project. This is the biggest "barrier to deployment" and prevents broadband projects from being delivered to local communities.

There are currently thousands of broadband permits pending with local governments across the state that if approved could immediately benefit local residents with improved communications as well as spur investment throughout the state. A statewide permitting time requirement would speed up existing and future broadband permits throughout the state and allow more communities to be served by improved broadband coverage since finishing a project quicker in one city means starting a new project quicker in another city. This would have a huge ripple effect throughout the state not only with time but with money and resources – less money spent on bureaucratic hearings and legal fees in one city means more money for broadband infrastructure in another city.

Thirty other states already have laws in place to ensure the quick deployment of broadband (wireline and wireless internet). Some local governments in California utilize best practices to streamline permit <u>reviews</u> in 30-90 days for broadband deployment, however many local jurisdictions take years to approve permits. This results in many residents having to wait years for improved internet connectivity while residents in neighboring jurisdictions are able to quickly get online in a couple of months.

"Permitting Authorities" include cities, counties, state agencies and any other entity that may be required to issue a permit for a Broadband project like water districts, special districts and municipal utilities. Here are examples of "barriers to deployment" at the local level that cause delays:

- Expensive, multi-layered, unnecessary, permitting processes that include multiple reviews, hearings, and appeals and uncertain outcomes, stymying investment.
- Permits should be limited to reasonable cost recovery (a couple hundred dollars) but are often thousands or tens of thousands of dollars.
- Often times projects require multiple permits from multiple departments within a single permitting authority and these departments do not coordinate review nor fee collection.
- Inconsistent application of standards, technically infeasible design restrictions and aesthetic limitations cause significant delays.
- Requiring below ground trenching for fiber even though above-ground utility lines are available along the same route.
- Certain Permitting Authorities continue to perform a separate CEQA review for Broadband projects which is an unnecessary expense.

Adoption

Cable statutory adoption threshold (DIVCA) for low-income customers in the state, run at a community level. Lack an explicit obligation today. Providers have low income programs today, but need to be better – i.e., more affordable, meet performance standard (tbc), and need to address literacy and devices.

We have high-level adoption goals, but lack obligations and goals for specific demographic groups.

• <u>Under-adoption by certain demographic populations: Pew found</u> that the two most commonly cited reasons nationally for not subscribing to home broadband are: 1) that their smartphone can do everything they need (45%), and 2) that it's too expensive (50%). Delving deeper into specific populations in California using California Emerging Technology Fund (CETF) annual

For Internal Use Only

surveys, the following household types have broadband subscriptions (does not include smartphone only):

- No high school diploma: 2015 = 34%; 2019 = 53%
- Seniors: 2015 = 56%; 2019 = 71% (note 2019 data is 65-74 years old vs. 65+ for 2015)
- Disabled: 2015 = 51%; 2019 = 64%
- Spanish-speaking: 2015 = 42%; 2019 = 57%
- Less than \$20K p.a.: 2015 = 49%; 2019 = 52%
- Tribes: = TBD; Change from 2015 to 2019
- <u>Lack devices</u>: According to the 2019 CETF survey, 10% of Californian households only have access to broadband at home through smartphones. This percentage remains stable for households with school aged children. This appears to underestimate the extent of the issue. A study conducted by Common Sense Media and the Boston Consulting Group found that 25% of K-12 students lack adequate connection (25 down/3 up) and 17% lack adequate devices at home for distance learning.

Additional sources of insight

• Pew surveys of households with children during COVID. Consumer perspective changed in the context of pandemic, particularly around distance learning and word processing

Potentially indicate in the standards or goal section that smart phones are not a substitute for broadband access

Affordability

The cost of broadband subscriptions is one of the largest barriers to adoption, and a critical issue we must grapple with to ensure all Californians can participate in 21st century life. Affordability needs to account for other costs such as connection fees, contract obligations and the retail costs for devices and accessories. Unfortunately, there is limited information available currently on broadband pricing across the State of California. We can understand the issue through a few examples and stories, and look at some of the limited available data. We are open and would like to partner to have greater transparency statewide

- Provide anecdotal illustration of available subscription offer(s) in a low-income urban neighborhood, and put it in context of family economics
- Perhaps leverage data from <u>here</u> to illustrate access to affordable offer?

Reliability

Given the increasing centrality of broadband as a utility for modern life, it must be reliable and robust to ensure families, schools, businesses, and governments can expect it to be available in places of business and residence, on demand and 24/7.

- Lack redundancy for middle mile broadband infrastructure (i.e., the infrastructure that connects local or last mile networks to other network service providers and the greater internet). Criticality for business, essential functions and emergency response.
 - Potential action: fiber loop
- Highlight issues that have emerged in recent wildfires
- Highlight issues that have emerged during COVID, work/learn from home

During PSPS reliability of VOIP is troubling, need to encourage hardening of services for back-up power in the context of PSPS. Cellular carriers have made progress on this, and broadband has not. OES advised that VOIP systems using 911 have gone down – resilience and redundancy required.

Just because it's a different type of hardware doesn't mean not a telco service. Need to recognize it as a telco service to ensure it has the same type of obligations. Issue at the FCC level.

Digital Literacy and Skills: TBD

- An essential pillar of adoption, and important to be provided through schools. But need to also address non-school age children, including seniors, homeless populations, etc.

California's current investment approach and funding

- How much have we invested in broadband statewide? And in what (e.g., deployment w breakdown of speeds by funding \$\$, adoption etc.)
- What is ROI of investments in high speed Internet infrastructure?
- What is the performance of regional consortia?

Funding of public service program comes from voice, those that are voice only pay a greater percentage of their bill towards these programs. Regressive current structure, particularly those with the poorest existing infrastructure. Requires reform to surcharge.

California's current statewide broadband approach

- Highlight limitations to current state approach to broadband (e.g., council, CPUC, CDE & library grant programs)

Also needs to include broader non-private role of players in broadband provision and adoption – e.g., regional consortia, CETF, CENIC, and other partners.

How we compare to leading US States (e.g., Texas, Arizona, New York, top ten in terms of population)

- Benchmark on the indicators above
- Compare funding investments vs. return on investment (as possible)

How we compare to leading cities and countries abroad

- Benchmark on the indicators above
- Compare funding investments vs. return on investment (as possible)

HOW 2020 HAS EXPOSED THE CHALLENGES AND INEQUITIES

For Internal Use Only

We had been discussing the importance of broadband for regional economic development in 2019 and early 2020. COVID-19 laid bare the criticality of broadband for the remainder of modern life.

- Families with kids suddenly needed to be on video-conferences while kids are on Zoom doing distance learning
- Schools suddenly needed to ensure all of their kids had devices, access to internet, and the ability to use technology
- Doctors and therapists suddenly had to shift their visits to more online platforms
- Telework private and public employees
- Business now doing more online services which impacts business in rural communities who can't provide online services, and millions of employees used home broadband connections to continue to work and keep businesses operating
- Farms needing to sell direct to consumer online as distribution to restaurants disappeared
- Isolated seniors

The inadequacies of the status quo were immediately apparent.

- Home broadband networks were overloaded and inadequate for simultaneous video conferences
- The digital divide was for all to see with poorer families without devices and access to internet

We met the immediacy of this moment in partnership with companies and organizations from across the state.

- The State's surplus equipment program led by the Department of General Services (DGS) was immediately tapped to accelerate distribution of refurbished computer equipment to the underserved.
- The Recovery Task Force was created to establish a dedicated public and private network to help solve some of the biggest challenges regarding broadband access.
- The Department of Education created a Digital Divide Task Force in collaboration with legislators to partner with providers in creating solutions to bridge the digital divide for K-12 students.
- The Department of Technology partnered with the Department of Aging to specifically address the broadband needs of California's aging population
- Several public-private partnerships catapulted broadband adoption efforts including Google's device donation to K-12 students and the aging population, and Verizon's extended efforts to provide affordable Internet access and devices to 125,000 students in the Los Angeles Unified School District.
- The Public Utilities Commission, in cooperation with the Department of Education, made \$30M available to subsidize over 100,000 mobile hotspots for more than 400 school districts and, over 16,000 computing devices for 14 school districts.

Although many ad-hoc broadband initiatives came to fruition in response to the COVID pandemic, the need for better broadband access, increased broadband adoption and improved computer skills became a matter of survival.

AS A RESULT, WE WANT TO RECONSIDER BROADBAND STANDARDS

We want to reconsider broadband standards according to guiding principles:

- 1. At a minimum, technology should be sufficient to meet emergency shelter-in-place orders in response to pandemics and emergencies to ensure protection of public health and safety.
 - a. Include the major elements of broadband performance, including speed, latency, outage time, etc.
- 2. New builds should also be future proof to expected demand shifts based on the total cost of ownership TCO over infrastructure lifetime
- Deployment and approval of broadband projects at the local level shall be approved or denied within 90 days.

Informed by a few data points (that require fleshing out):

- 1. Current network usage and performance data for key residential use cases (e.g., telework, telemedicine, distance learning) [e.g., include a table that ties speed and latency requirements to specific residential use cases]
- 2. User feedback on specific network experiences based on technology
- 3. Historical trajectory of usage changes over the last 15 years
- 4. Forecasts of usage changes
- 5. International corollaries to triangulate requirements
- 6. Operational and network upgrade costs of different technologies (e.g., comparative analysis of total cost of ownership of future-proof deployment (fiber) versus shorter-term alternatives)

As a result, we are proposing the following standards to ensure sufficient performance supporting distance learning, telework, telehealth and public safety:

- Middle mile = TBD
- Last mile with density < X = TBD
- Last mile with density > X = TBD

HOW WE CAN ACHIEVE OUR VISION

We have a long way to go to achieve our vision. Specifically:

- Insert a "from" / "to" table with baselines and where we want to be in 5 years
 - 5 years may be necessary for the deployment actions, but can measure other elements in shorter time frames
- Synthesize high-level strategy to frame actions below, potentially including high level roles and responsibilities

WHAT IT WILL COST TO GET THERE

- Explain assumptions used to build out the network according to proposed standard(s)
- Show outputs of cost model from CPUC under different scenarios, using a range to illustrate potential higher costs possible given non-optimal conditions
 - $\circ \quad {\it California\ Broadband\ Cost\ Model\ based\ on\ Connect\ America\ Cost\ Model}$

- Scenarios to address unserved and underserved at different speed scenarios (e.g., all unserved to 100 symmetrical, all underserved to 100 symmetrical)
- Geographical map & % of population in CA that live in areas where fiber won't pencil out economically (i.e., the hockey-stick graph, which ideally we'd extract from the model ASAP as already exists)
- Assumptions around how we will serve the ~2% (i.e., technology types)
- Ranged cost estimates given technologies to provide order of magnitude sense of cost for this 2%
- Assumptions around what kind of performance can be expected both in the majority of the state and what's associated with the tech chosen for the 2% (i.e., bandwidth, speeds, latency)
- Model will include opex and capex costs

ACTIONS WE WILL TAKE OVER THE NEXT 6 AND 18 MONTHS

[This section will include actions such as: governance changes, funding opportunities, data collection, etc. that have been noted as problems above. We have shared a separate list of proposed or requested actions that have been surfaced to date to help inform this section. The below includes a high-level set of categories and bullets to generate discussion.]

Obligate wholesale leasing of fiber access to other providers to enable last mile service provision

Cross-cutting themes

- Gather better detailed data to inform policymaking and investment decisions
- Restructure Statewide governance of broadband, including revisiting funding programs
- Collaborate with local governments to facilitate cross-jurisdictional learning
- Make the case for incremental broadband investment (e.g., model socio-economic impacts)
- Remove barriers to deploying broadband at the local level through the creation of a statewide time limit for approving or denying permits by local jurisdictions.

How we can deliver more access to high-speed internet

Within 6 months

- Coordinate/support application for federal funding opportunities
- Share list of funding opportunities in simple, easy to use format
- Accelerate the availability of public data to facilitate broadband deployment [Q what specific public data must be available?]
- Require that all pending broadband permits be approved <u>or denied</u> within 90 days by local jurisdictions – and that all future broadband permits also be approved <u>or denied</u> within 90 days.
- Create programs to provide technical assistance for public entities (local governments, Tribes, school districts, etc.) at the appropriate political level to assist public and private entities to productively deploy broadband infrastructure. [Q What type of technical assistance is required? Can we illustrate this by adding specificity] local governments are creating the problem by making the permitting process take years instead of months with unnecessary hearings,

inconsistent application of standards, technically infeasible design restrictions and aesthetic limitations causing significant delays.

• Leverage state contract vehicles to support accelerate broadband deployments

RECOMMENDATIONS TO ACCELERATE BROADBAND DEPLOYMENT

1. Local governments and agencies shall identify any pending broadband permits and outstanding lease amendments and utilize a 90-day or less review period so local residents can benefit from improved connectivity quickly. Some of our broadband permits have been pending with city staff for years, preventing local residents from accessing high-speed internet.

2. 90-day maximum permit review period for new broadband projects – otherwise projects are deemed approved so installation can begin. This prevents projects from being delayed months and years which happens regularly today.

3. Broadband projects are defined as wireline and wireless – this ensures that connectivity improvements will happen in a significantly shorter time window and extends capital further to reach more people because it allows maximum flexibility to deploy broadband projects.

4. Allow for above ground or below ground installation of fiber – where there are existing utilities, fiber should be deployed in the same fashion. Example: if above ground utility lines exist along the same route as the proposed fiber line, then the fiber line can be installed along the above ground utility line which is quicker and cheaper than trenching underground. Where and when feasible, local jurisdictions shall utilize microtrenching (*https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-rloGDUxWYw*) to install fiber underground since it is quicker (80% faster than traditional trenching), cheaper (50-70% cheaper than traditional trenching) and less disruptive (doesn't close streets) to local communities.

 The City of LA recently adopted a microtrenching ordinance which is leading to accelerated broadband deployment and serves as a model for a statewide requirement.

5. Application fees by Permitting Authorities should be limited to reasonable cost recovery – often times application fees are thousands of dollars and prevent limited dollars from going to as many broadband projects as possible. Often, increased fees are used to increase the permitting process to include multiple reviews and hearings.

• In Long Beach, they are working towards a Master Permit where design and locations for a full multiple node project is agreed upon upfront, fees are paid, and inspections to confirm compliance occur post construction. This allows for expedited construction schedules and the city has access to the fees immediately.

6. Objective and clear design standards by local jurisdictions based upon Federal Law – objective, technology-neutral (purpose-neutral) and physically feasible. Inconsistent application of standards and technically infeasible design restrictions cause significant delays of months to years, as well as creates inconsistent levels of connectivity for residents between different neighborhoods and different communities.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

Within 18 months

- Adjust existing funding instruments to enable incremental broadband deployment in specific areas (e.g., schools, transportation, water infrastructure)
- Review and propose revisions to existing California broadband funding programs, including exploring potential bond issuance in order to more quickly and effective deploy more
- Maximize deployment in state, local, and tribal government agency rights of way to close the middle-mile gap
- Implement a policy for state, local, and tribal government agency and service provider coordination to facilitate deployment [Q – what type of policy? What lever(s) do we want to consider / what's the problem we are trying to solve?] Here are the problems we're trying to solve – we provided several changes to state law to solve these problems.

 Expensive, multi-layered, unnecessary, permitting processes that include multiple reviews, hearings and appeals.

 Permits should be limited to reasonable cost recovery (a couple hundred dollars) but are often thousands or tens of thousands of dollars.

 Often times projects require multiple permits from multiple departments within a single permitting authority and these departments do not coordinate review nor fee collection.

 Inconsistent application of standards, technically infeasible design restrictions and aesthetic limitations cause significant delays.

 Requiring below ground trenching for fiber even though above-ground utility lines are available along the same route.

 Certain Permitting Authorities continue to perform a separate CEQA review for Broadband projects which is an unnecessary expense.

- •
- Develop and implement a State of California Dig Smart policy by incorporating broadband into the planning, design, engineering, and construction of all major infrastructure development projects by default, and adjusting based on appropriateness, feasibility, and cost considerations
 - Need to define major infrastructure projects, and set useful standards to ensure reasonable ROI on the investments

How we can drive adoption

Within 6 months

- Motivate and involve philanthropy
- Leverage key low-income programs (e.g., CalEITC, CalFresh, CalWorks) to promote affordable internet offers
- Updates to Lifeline program to support underserved

Within 18 months

- Fund detailed user research to understand why people aren't using low-income or free programs, estimate utilization in CA, and run randomized control trial to drive adoption
 - This should include reviewing adoption data from free COVID-19 programs
- Create anonymous data sharing hub for data on low income programs to be shared w state
- Develop consumer-oriented search tool for broadband availability, low-cost programs, devices, etc. Engage ODI and alpha team to build something similar to <u>the food banks</u>.
- Create sustained funding mechanism to drive adoption (e.g., devices, training, support for immigrant communities)
- Other ideas for local govs? Libraries? etc.
- Implement low-income and affordable offer requirements, metrics, accountability, and standards.

How we can drive affordability

Within 6 months

• Publish pricing data on a per MB basis, including low-income programs

Within 18 months

For Internal Use Only

• Analyze and publish essential service broadband affordability data. TBD

How we can boost reliability

Within 6 months

• Set reliability and resilience standards based on detailed review of failure during recent disasters

Within 18 months

• TBD

How we can improve digital literacy and skills

Within 6 months

- Support sustained, regular meetings of local governments leading on digital inclusion (and interested parties), publish findings and actively share with other communities
- Codify best practices and highlight evidence-based programs at a State level

Within 18 months

- Support local digital skills training programs (either through funding or other support), as part of broader economic recovery efforts
- Date for local broadband infrastructure deployment and digital equity plans.

IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH

This section will include information on:

- How we will monitor implementation
- How frequently we will revisit these recommendations

Build on our strength.

Invested in your community



¹Estimated using 700MHz contours ²United States Census Bureau Data represents quarterly approximations and is subject to change.

Crown Castle at a glance

Our nationwide portfolio of communications infrastructure connects cities and communities to essential data, technology and wireless service—bringing information, ideas and innovations to the people and businesses that need them.

- > 40,000+ towers
- Approximately 65,000 small cell nodes on air or under contract
- Approximately 75,000 route miles of fiber
- > 25 years of experience owning and operating network assets
- > Nearly 100 offices
- > ~5,000 employees
- > S&P 500 company listed on the NYSE



Crown Castle Overview

Crown Castle is the nation's largest provider of communications infrastructure–connecting people, government, schools, and businesses to essential data, technology & Broadband services (including wireless and wireline).

Crown Castle is also the nation's largest independent owner and operator of shared wireless infrastructure, with more than 40,000 towers, 70,000 small cell installations, and over 80,000 route miles of fiber nationwide.

We install, operate and maintain Broadband for a variety of customers including K-12 school districts, local governments, universities, internet service providers, and cell phone carriers.

In California we serve more than 200 government, school and public safety customers in addition to other business enterprises.



What's The Problem?

Broadband is critical infrastructure of statewide importance yet every local jurisdiction has different permitting rules and timelines.

Some take 30-90 days, some take years – for the same project.

"Permitting Authorities" include cities, counties, state agencies and any other entity that may be required to issue a permit for a Broadband project like water districts, special districts and municipal utilities.

- Expensive, multi-layered, unnecessary, permitting processes that include multiple reviews, hearings and appeals.
- Permits should be a couple hundred dollars but are often thousands or tens of thousands of dollars.
- Often times projects require multiple permits from multiple departments within a single permitting authority and these departments do not coordinate review nor fee collection.
- Inconsistent application of standards, technically infeasible design restrictions and aesthetic limitations cause significant delays.
- Requiring below ground trenching for fiber even though above-ground utility lines are available along the same route.
- Certain Permitting Authorities continue to perform a separate CEQA review for Broadband projects which is an unnecessary expense



Solution

The state needs to step in and mandate that pending and future permits for Broadband must be approved by any "Permitting Authority" within 90 days with a deemed approved remedy at its conclusion.

This would be the single most important, cost-effective, and quickest action the state could take to accelerate Broadband deployment in California.

30 other states already do this.



State Needs to Streamline Broadband Deployment – Prevent Delay by Locals

- 1. Update Assembly Bill 57 from 2015 clarify that permits for all broadband related projects need to be approved within the federal time limits of 90 days. Don't allow locals to delay.
- 2. Pass Senate Bill 1206 from 2020 which requires that all local jurisdictions must permit the use of microtrenching for broadband installation: quicker, cheaper, less disruption to communities.
- 3. Governor can issue an executive order on permit streamlining and accelerating broadband deployment and include broadband reforms as part of the January Budget.
- 4. Include these reforms in the Broadband Council's Action Plan due in December.



Crown Castle: Over 9,500 fiber miles in urban and rural areas of California (big city examples below)





Enabling the services that make life more convenient, enjoyable—and safe.





New technologies are driving greater data demand and usage.

More devices, faster speeds, and more data-heavy traffic.



Expected growth in broadband speed from 2017 to 2022.

Expected growth in connected devices from 2017 to 2022.

10B+

82%

Expected amount of all consumer internet traffic that will be video by 2022.

Cisco Visual Networking Index Forecast. Cisco Visual Networking Index: Global Mobile Data Traffic Forecast Update, 2017–2022 White Paper, February 2019.



A different approach to installing fiber is needed to keep up with the coming growth.

Traditional trenching

- Large excavations
- Extended construction times more noise, debris, and disruption
- Traffic lane closures





So we've innovated and improved how we install fiber with microtrenching.

Faster, smaller, and less disruptive from installation to restoration.



Pre-installation



Installation



Cable Placement



Restoration



Microtrenching is a less invasive way to install fiber.

1-2"





A smaller cut



OCTOBER 2020 | PAGE PROPRIETARY & CONFIDENTIAL

With a restoration that is almost unnoticeable.

And minimal impact on the environment.

- Fewer new materials needed to reinstate roadway
- Minimal truck movement requires less gas
- Less water waste for trenching and clean up





And we're using it successfully in communities around the country.

- Austin, TX
- Boston, MA
- Charlotte, NC
- Chicago, IL
- Dallas, TX
- El Paso, TX
- Lexington, KY
- Long Beach
- Los Angeles, CA
- Louisville, KY

- Miami-Dade County, FL
- Mt. Vernon, NY
- New York City, NY
- San Diego, CA



With significant benefits for your community.



Minimal disruption to traffic

Less noise

Fewer resident complaints





Microtrenching Cost Savings

Major Urban Open Trench ~\$400 per foot Microtrench ~\$125 per foot <u>31% of the cost of open trenching</u>

Small - medium size community Open Trench ~\$300 per foot Microtrench ~\$125 per foot <u>42% of the cost of open trenching</u>

