

California Broadband Council (CBC) Meeting

April 23, 2024

9:30 a.m. – 11:19 a.m.

Meeting Recap and Transcript

In accordance with GC 11123.5, the CBC continued to conduct hybrid teleconference meetings and provide a physical meeting location for the public to view and participate in CBC meetings.

The California Broadband Council met on Tuesday, April 23, 2024 at 9:30am in CalEPA's Byron Sher Auditorium at 1001 I St. in Sacramento. Members of the public, presenters, and ex-officio members had the option to join in person or via virtual conference.

Agenda Item 1 – Welcome

Madam Chair Liana Bailey-Crimmins welcomed Council members and attendees.

Housekeeping & Roll Call

A quorum was established for the meeting.

Name	Organization	Member / Designee	Present	Absent
Chair Director Liana Bailey-Crimmins	California Department of Technology	Member	X	
Commissioner Darcie Houck	California Public Utilities Commission	Member	X	
Deputy Director Marvin Green	California Office of Emergency Services, Logistics Management	Designee	X	
Dr. Kristina Mattis	California Department of Education	Designee	X	

Chief Deputy Director Jason Kenney	Department of General Services	Designee	X	
Undersecretary Mark Tollefson	California State Transportation Agency	Interim Member	X	
President and CEO Sunne McPeak	California Emerging Technology Fund	Member	X	
Deputy Secretary Michael Flores	Department of Food and Agriculture	Designee	<i>Online,</i> X	
Program Manager Josh Chisom	California State Library, Broadband Opportunities	Designee	<i>Online,</i> X	
Secretary Christina Snider-Ashtari	Office of Tribal Affairs	Member		X
Senator Steven Bradford (Designee: Sarah Smith)	Senate Energy, Utilities, and Communications Committee	Member		X
Mr. Emmanuel Aguayo	Assemblymember Mike A. Gipson	Designee	<i>Online,</i> X	

Agenda

Madam Chair Liana Bailey-Crimmins briefly overviews the California Broadband Council agenda for the day.

Agenda Item 2 – Executive Report

Deputy Director Scott Adams provided a high-level recap of various Broadband for All programs and initiatives, including the Annual Broadband for All Action Plan Process, Affordable Connectivity Program, Partner & Stakeholder Engagement, State Digital Equity Plan, and SB 717 Report.

The following CBC member made additional comments:

- Ms. Sunne McPeak
- Undersecretary Mark Tollefson
- Director Liana Bailey-Crimmins

Agenda Item 3.1 – Broadband for All Updates

Deputy Director Scott Adams shared updates on the Broadband for All Action Plan. He reported that action items outlined in that Action Plan are either completed or ongoing, they are either absorbed or are included in other initiatives like the State Digital Equity Plan, the Middle Mile Broadband Initiative, Last Mile programs administered by the PUC and BEAD. OBDL will work with the Council and various members to create a new tracking system on how to track progress towards the goals of Broadband for All, and the measurable objectives that were outlined in the key activities in the State Digital Equity Plan.

Last

The following CBC member made additional comments:

- Ms. Sunne McPeak
- Undersecretary Mark Tollefson
- Director Liana Bailey-Crimmins

Agenda Item 3.2 – Middle-Mile Broadband Initiative Update

Deputy Director Mark Monroe shared how the current Middle-Mile Broadband Initiative (MMBI) network funding level of \$3.87 billion is being used. He presented the timeline for Round 2 of the Request for Innovative Ideas (RFI²) and data regarding advancing preconstruction progress by district and the delivery of miles throughout California. Deputy Director Mark Monroe also provided the findings from the MMBI Market Sounding and its Proposed Approach. Lastly, Mr. Monroe described the overview and goals of the MMBI customer sounding.

The following CBC members and presenter made additional comments:

- Ms. Sunne McPeak

Agenda Item 3.3 – Last-Mile Program Update

Commissioner Darcie Houck from the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) provided an overview of the Last-Mile Broadband Programs and Investments, including the Federal Funding Account Applications, Loan Loss Reserve Program, and California Advanced Services Fund.

The following CBC members and presenters made additional comments:

- Ms. Sunne McPeak
- Undersecretary Mark Tollefson

- Director Liana Bailey-Crimmins

Agenda Item 3.4 – Affordable Connectivity Program

Ms. Sunne McPeak from the California Emerging Technology Fund (CETF) provided an update on enrollment in the Affordable Connectivity Program (ACP). 2,945,281 households, or 50% of eligible households, were enrolled in the ACP program prior to the program freeze on February 7th. Ms. McPeak also highlighted key findings and smart practices in the analysis and comparison of the state ACP enrollment performance.

The following CBC members and presenters made additional comments:

- Director Liana Bailey-Crimmins
- Commissioner Darcie Houck

Agenda Item 4 – NTIA IJA Programs – State Digital Equity Planning and BEAD

Deputy Director Scott Adams from CDT and Director of Communications from CPUC Robert Osborn provided updates of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) Programs. Deputy Director Scott Adams shared updates on the State Digital Equity Plan (SDEP), highlighting the key activities, public comment overview, general themes from the plan, its approval, Notice of Funding Opportunity, and the allowable uses of Digital Equity Capacity Grant. He also discussed the SDEP engagement and collaboration efforts thus far. Lastly, Deputy Director Adams closed his portion outlining the State Digital Equity Capacity Grant timeline. Director Osborn provided updates on the Broadband Equity, Access, and Deployment (BEAD) program, challenge process and timeline.

The following CBC members made additional comments:

- Ms. Sunne McPeak
- Commissioner Darcie Houck
- Director Liana Bailey-Crimmins

Agenda Item 5 – Public Comment

Staff proceeded to address public comments, starting with in-person comments, then those with their hands raised on Zoom, and comments sent in via email.

The following members of the public made comments in person:

Patrick Messac
Georgia Savage

The following members of the public made comments via Zoom:

Natalie Gonzalez
Josh Butler

One public comment was received prior to the meeting in the California Broadband Council Email Inbox.

Email Comment: Brian Staff, Armsby Lane Road Association

"We live in a rural community of 30+ homes 4 miles from Morgan Hill. We had given up hope of ever getting truly fast internet service, when one day a couple of years ago, contractors working for Frontier turned up and installed fiber. This has transformed our community. I don't know who initiated this work, but thank you, thank you, thank you!!"

The following CBC members made additional comments:

Ms. Sunne McPeak
Commissioner Darcie Houck

Agenda Item 6 – Closing

Director Bailey-Crimmins thanked Council members, presenters, and attendees and noted the next meeting is Tuesday, July 23, 2024 at 9:30-11:30am at CalEPA and online. The meeting adjourned at 11:19 a.m.

(The recording and presentation slides from the meeting will be posted on the California Broadband Council's website.)

Transcript

Well, good morning and welcome everyone to the second California Broadband Council meeting of 2024. I'm Liana Bailey-Crimmins, State Chief Information Officer, Director of California Department Technology and the Chair of the Broadband Council. I'd like to acknowledge CalEPA for letting us be in their beautiful auditorium and having their staff support the CBC. Today. Ms. Nguyen, the first role, first order of business is to please do, roll call and do housekeeping items.

Thank you, Madam Chair. Good morning, Council members and members of the public. In accordance with Government Code 11123.5. The California

Broadband Council will continue to conduct hybrid teleconference meetings and provide a physical meeting location for the public to view and participate in California Broadband Council meetings. Please announce your presence, as your name is called.

State Chief Information Officer and Director Bailey-Crimmins.

Here.

Thank you. Commissioner Houck.

Here.

Thank you. Deputy Director Green.

Here.

Thank you, Dr. Kristina Mattis.

Here.

Thank you. Chief Deputy Director Kenney. Undersecretary Tollefson.

Here.

Thank you, Ms. McPeak?

Present.

Thank you. Deputy Secretary Flores.

Here.

Mr. Chisom.

Here.

Thank you. Secretary Snider-Ashtari.

Senator Bradford.

Mr. Aguayo.

Present.

Thank you.

Thank you, Madam Chair, we do have quorum. Next, housekeeping items for Council members and members of the public. This meeting is being recorded. We will be posting the recording of this meeting, slides and transcripts to the Broadband for All portal. Attendees please note that there is time allocated at

the end of the meeting for public comments, either in person, via Zoom, Phone and read through of public comments sent via email submitted prior to the meeting. Presenters, please cue Amanda to advance your slides. Committee members, please use the raise hand, feature on Zoom, or raise your hand in person to notify Madam Chair Bailey-Crimmins's to call on you to speak. For folks viewing online side by side, speaker view, when PowerPoints are shared and gallery view, when PowerPoint slides are not shared, will give you the best viewing experience. We have closed captioning. And please, when we get to public comment, please use the hand raise feature on zoom or Star 9 if called in by phone to raise your hand. Madam Chair, we may begin?

Thank you very much. We have a comprehensive agenda today. We are hearing a lot about what's going on across the State regarding the Broadband Action Plan. A lot of accomplishments have happened, so we are lucky enough to get a report out on that. We also have a summarized version of the middle mile of what's going on in order to achieve Broadband for All across the 10,000 miles. And we also have Commissioner Houck, who's gonna talk about last month programs. We have a lot of programs in place, both how they complement one another and how they just are very distinctive. We also have Ms. McPeak that's gonna talk about the Affordable Connectivity Program, ACP, and we also have Adam's talking about the Digital Equity Plan. There's a lot going on in relation to recent capacity grant dollars. And so we're gonna be hearing about what's happening on the equity front. And then we also have Director Osborn giving an update on the BEAD. So with that, I'll go ahead and turn it over to Mr. Oh, actually, first, is there any open remarks or comments from any members before we do an executive report out. I see none. So, Mr. Scott Adams, if you'd give an executive report brief that would be appreciated.

Thank you Chair Bailey-Crimmins, and Good morning Broadband Council members and members of the public. It's my pleasure to give you a brief report out on the Department of Technology and the Office of Broadband and Digital Literacy's efforts since our last meeting. Next slide, please. I'm going to update you on a brief update on 5 different items, the first of which is Chair Bailey-Crimmins mentioned the Broadband for All Action plan as reported at our last meeting. And, as you know, many of our last meetings, broadband council members and State agency partners have made significant progress on completing the action items in the Broadband Action Plan. Thus far 18 of the 24 action items have been completed. Many of those are updated and refreshed on an annual basis, and those that are not completed are really long-term efforts that are continuing to be tracked and tied by other efforts that have been framed since the development of the plan. We will note that we've

updated the action plan tracker to you know, with some details from the review process and that's something that's available for the public. I'd like to shift to the next item, which is the Affordable Connectivity Program. As you all know, the FCC's Affordable Connectivity Program, residential home Internet subsidy has been a critical tool for the Broadband for All program to both address affordable issues, affordability issues for residents and increase broadband adoption throughout the State. What I wanted to point out is that while this is a critical program, it is currently frozen, and we are hopeful that Congress will reauthorize funding to extend the program. But the window is rapidly closing on that. I think that Sunne McPeak and her presentation will go a little bit further on some really nice analysis, the program and some best learnings suffice to say that we, you know, amended, the State digital equity plan to kind of frame out what the State will do. You know, if, in fact, the program does not come back online. Given that partner and stakeholder engagement is absolutely the critical, just wanted to provide a high-level update that we'll go into further detail later that we continue to conduct extensive partner and stakeholder engagement. Since the last meeting on numerous broadband and Broadband for All related initiatives, including the digital equity plan, the Affordable Connectivity Program which we have regular monthly convenings with State agencies and Internet Service providers. And then some significant engagement related to Senate Bill 717. As moving on to the next item, please report, and we'll report out in further detail at the bottom of the agenda as Director Bailey-Crimmins noted, very good news since the last meeting that the public comment process on the digital Equity plan has been completed. The final plan was submitted to the NTIA and received approval of that plan on March 28th, which will now make the State eligible for a significant block of digital equity capacity grant funding and then, lastly, Senate Bill 717 wanted to provide the Council here with a brief update, while it's not necessarily under the domain of the Broadband Council Senate Bill 717, directed the Department of Technology and the Office of Broadband and Digital Literacy to develop a broadband access point investment acceleration study to seek to further understand the barriers of both wireline and wireless broadband access point deployment particularly in the context of the ongoing and significant investments and efforts that have already been made in this area, and make some additional recommendations on further potential interventions that the legislature might consider moving forward. So that is something that we're finally finalizing soon, and we'll submit to the legislature. But that is an effort that we've been working on. Chair Bailey-Crimmins that concludes my report. I'm happy to answer any questions.

Great report out, Mr. Adams a lot of accomplishments over the last quarter. I'm going to open it up to any of our members that might have any questions or comments before we go into the project updates. I see none. So Director Adams, we're going to hear about the broadband Action plan and all the great progress that we've been making. I'm going to go and turn it back over to you.

Thank you, Chair Bailey-Crimmins if we can move to the next slide, please. I think what's really important on this, is what the Chair said earlier Broadband for All is the State's program to close the digital divide and foster digital equity throughout the State, and underneath that umbrella are several initiatives to overcome the primary barriers of access or infrastructure, availability, affordability of service, and then the many different barriers and constraints that residents face in terms of adopting broadband at home, whether it's related to devices, training, etc. A lot of those efforts were framed out and sketched in the Broadband for All Action plan, as I noticed or noted at the top of the meeting here. This body in particular, has been very diligent and it's implementation and completion of specific action items in the Broadband for All Action plan to really set this stage for further initiative. So the 18 of 24 action items have been completed have really centered around identifying and bringing back additional funding to the state, creating a network of digital inclusion stakeholders, promoting low cost offers and subsidies, doing things like enhancing, permitting and a lot of use cases to support the Middle Mile Broadband Initiative. The Broadband for All Action Plan is still very important. But what we wanted to share here is that many of the action items outlined in that action plan are either complete or ongoing. And now absorbed or are included in other initiatives like the State Digital Equity Plan, the Middle Mile Broadband Initiative, Last Mile programs administered by the PUC and BEAD. And so the one thing that our office is going to work with the Council and various members is to create a new tracking system on how we can track progress towards the goals of Broadband for All, and the measurable objectives that were outlined in the key activities in the State Digital Equity Plan and that's something that we will come back and report to you on in the next meeting. And that concludes my update on the action plan. Oh, no, it doesn't. So I think what's really important is we wanted to show you quickly a little bit of a framework of what we're talking about. So the 3 goals of the Broadband for All Action Plan. Here's the first goal, all Californians have high performance broadband available at home schools, libraries and businesses. During the digital equity planning process, there were key activities established and then objectives to support achieving that goal. If we advance to the next slide, similarly, you have goal number 2, where all Californians have access to affordable broadband and necessary devices. There are 4 specific objectives that we will track against to achieve goal

number 2. And if you go to the next slide, goal number 3 of the action plan and the Digital Equity Plan is that all Californians can access training and support to enable digital inclusion. So after the planning process, the digital equity plan centered on 3 specific objectives, and these are those that we're going to be tracking on. So now I will restate that we will you know, staff will work with various partners in the ecosystem to develop a meaningful tracking system, so that on a quarterly basis we can come back to you all, and publicly on the Broadband for All portal track progress against those goals. And that does complete my presentation. Back to you Chair.

Thank you, Mr. Adams. We'll go back a slide. Any questions from any of our members? Ms. McPeak?

Well, I do want to just acknowledge huge amount of progress when I think back on the Governor's executive order, Broadband for All that that was prior to a pandemic, it was visionary we were directed to go out and do a lot of connecting of low-income households before there was IJJA or its predecessor that gave us those tools. So I just first want to commend the amount of progress that has been made. Secondly, I'm interested in if is there any guidance at this point from you, Mr. Adams, on the things that are remaining to be done, or those that we need to do more of what we who have these various assignments, even under the goals, the directives in the Executive order and the action plan that we need to be focusing on.

Yeah, thank you, Ms. McPeak, for the question. I think that, you know none of the activities that are listed in that action plan are ever complete. They're just complete to a state of doneness where they can move the ball forward. But given the dynamic is, or the ecosystem and the complexity of it are fluid. We have to be vigilant to update those on a regular basis. I think that the way that we can look at this is, if you recall about a year and a half ago, 2 years ago, we were reporting on the executive order and the actions that were taken there and then we did a presentation that council, and demonstrated how the items that were included in the executive order were rolled up into the action plan, and we said we were going to continue to track against the action plan. I think, similarly, the action items that were completed and those that remain completed have now been kind of rolled up into the infrastructure investments outlined by Senate Bill 156. So the Middle Mile Broadband Initiative and those programs administered by the PUC and others have been rolled up into the State Digital Equity Plan. So for instance, we are going to continue to build and expand the network of digital inclusion stakeholders. We will continue to promote low cost offers and subsidies to address affordability and adoption, etc. Continue to on a regular basis, refine ways to enhance permitting to further

deploy broadband infrastructure as it's so critical. So I think it's a fluid dynamic, and what our challenge is going to be and what we will come back to you, you know, at the next meeting is to create a tracking, a tracking structure that remains or maintains fidelity to those, you know, actions that were designated to different entities, and either the action plan or the executive order, but now frame it in context where we're able to really track the progress and these other initiatives that have been funded.

Thank you. I do want to commend the regular reporting here on the Broadband for All Action Plan. The cadence and discipline makes a huge amount of difference. And those monthly meetings that you convene with the State agencies and the Internet service providers also are essential to continue going forward.

Thank you.

Thank you. Do I have any other members that? Yes, under Secretary Tollefson?

Yeah. Thanks. Thanks. Scott, really appreciate the presentation and a lot of great progress, a lot of good information on just a couple of things. And I really like what you're talking about in terms of the tracking structure the goals and objectives that you walk through. Just curious in terms of that tracking have you established at this point any kind of metrics and timelines associated with those?

It's a great question, Mr. Tollefson, and I think, we have been for quite some time working with the Public Utilities Commission and the Middle Mile Broadband Initiative on what that would look like. And I know that you know you've been a key part of how helping how the Administration can track both broadband and transportation funding. And so we do have an idea on, on how we can do that, and what some of the metrics are. But there's some further conversations within the Administration that we'd like to have to make sure that we're not supplanting other similar efforts within the Administration to track and promote those so more to come and like I said, we are hopeful to have an update for the council at the next meeting.

Great thanks.

Yep.

Great. I also want to commend you, because I know when we go through action plan it feels like it's a one time set of actions. But as you're talking about now, it's tracking right? So we still have some on time efforts that we're trying to get off the over the finish line. But as these things go into more of an operations, we need to be holding ourselves accountable of the progress and the trajectory

that the administration has been on to deliver Broadband for All. So just I know, you know, Deputy Director Adams is not only you, but it is a workforce behind you that make this all happen. So I just want to commend you.

Well, thank you. That's much appreciated. And I, would also just like to say that as with all of these Broadband for All programs there's no one individual or entity that's responsible for its success, and that the I think the strength of Broadband for All is the coalition of partners. You know, multi level multi jurisdictional partners that we have working on these that are critical to actually achieving these goals.

Alright, I don't see any other questions or comments, so we'll go ahead and go to the next. Thank you again, Mr. Adams. We'll go to the next agenda item, which is a Deputy Director Mark Monroe, who's going to give a update on the broadband Middle Mile Initiative.

Yes, thank you. Good morning, Chair and members. Mark Monroe, Deputy Director for the Middle Mile Broadband Initiative here at CDT. I'm pleased to provide another update on CDT's progress with this important middle mile component of broadband connectivity in California. To begin with, as funding continues to be discussed, I wanted to start off reminding everyone how the current funding is being used. CDT has had a total of 3.87 billion dollars appropriated to date for the MMBI project. Here you see a layout of how current funding is being used. You can see that the approximately 6,500 miles in RFI squared cost an average of \$280,000 per mile due largely to shared construction costs, and we can also see that Caltrans estimates that absent those shared costs, the segments it is constructing on a standalone basis are expected to cost an average of \$641,000 per mile statewide. This also underscores the value of the second RFI squared solicitation that is currently being reviewed and then our next slide. I'll talk a little more about that. But as noted at the past few Broadband Council and MMAC meetings given the success of the first RFI squared partnership solicitation, CDT went out with another solicitation, last October. We are happy to announce that we received over 50 additional proposals for similar partnerships. So CDT is currently reviewing these and is working through negotiations with potential partners to identify the extent to which these alternatives can help the State complete the MMBI network as quickly and efficiently as possible. We hope to be able to finalize all contracts by July of this year, which would be several months ahead so from several months faster rather than what we were, we did last year with the first round. If we go to the next slide, you can see Caltrans continues to be a key partner in the development of the MMBI network CDT is currently planning on Caltrans constructing the last 4,000 miles of the MMBI network. This estimate is

prior to the RFI squared process that we're working on. But Caltrans is working to complete all permitting and design work on these miles by the end of this calendar year. Overall, Caltrans reported at the April MMAC meeting last week that it had completed 51% of this pre-construction work. This is the permitting and the design work that needs to be done on this 4,000 miles. And we can see here how Caltrans is progressing with this work by district. If we go to the next slide, we can see by quarter how many miles in each MMBI region. Caltrans anticipates having ready, reflecting Caltrans plan, to be ready for construction on all 4,000 miles by the end of this year. Then, if we jump to the next slide, the as noted previously as CDT moves from planning into construction of the MMBI network, we are beginning to look ahead to operations. To that end CDT conducted a market sounding in which we spoke with a number of public and nonprofit and industry participants to better identify a sustainable approach to operating the network. The outcomes of the market sounding included the need to share potential financial risks with an operator to leverage private sector expertise, use a competitive process and build in protections and governance to ensure that the policy priorities, such as affordability and open access, are protected through this governance. Jump to the next slide. In the coming week CDT plans to move forward with procurement to identify and experience and well qualified partner for a network stewardship agreement this procurement would be done in 2 parts, first, to identify partners with sufficient expertise and qualifications. And then a second part to part of the procurement will involve identifying a partner from this list with financial capacity to operate the network meet policy goals and provide for an ongoing operation and maintenance of the network. At the same time we can jump to the next slide, at the same time as the procurement is going, CDT will move forward with a customer sounding to identify potential MMBI users, such as local public sector leaders, and Last Mile ISPs with the goal of building trust in in the value of the network to Last Mile users identifying key network customers and getting input on operations, government governance for the network. And that ends my presentation, and I'm happy to answer any questions.

Thank you, Mr. Monroe. I will look at any of the members to see if they have any questions or comments.

Ms. McPeak, thank you.

And thank you. Thank you, Mark. I was struck by the graph of the 12 Caltrans districts having quite a bit of familiarity with each of those districts, and then the progress. And then there is the graph, that is the number of miles per region. So you have the 5, the 5 regions. The amount of vials to be connected in each of those is very different, and those really should be synced up with the 12 districts

in the sense of what progress are they really making against the number of miles. So it's not totally apples to apples with the one graph on district. So you've got a lot more in in your region one, that's district one, district 2, coming down to District 3, a lot more in region 5. Region 4 is all of Los Angeles. So you've got a huge amount in District 11, basically, that is, becomes region 5 and 8, I think. Now, that's 9, anyway, my point being just to have a better picture of actually the progress by region in comparison to the number of miles there to construct.

Yeah, I'm sorry. I'm not certain in terms of the question, what the question is? I will, I think, as you noted very well, there's a variation between the regions in terms of, you know, building along the coast that there's some real permitting challenges there, and we've had some great partnerships with the permitting agencies both at the State and Federal level. And so I think that's one of the reasons we are where we're at. When we figured that we finalized the map about 2 years ago. I think Caltrans estimated to the time. Normally, this would take at least 3 to 4 years to do the permitting. And so that was, that was 2 years ago. We're in a place now where they're going to be rolling forward with that you know, completing that pre-construction and involves that permitting throughout this calendar year. So there is some variation there. There's also variation relative to you know, when we look at the work at the district level, we have 6,500 miles more than 6,500 miles. The Caltrans is not building and so that also way, you know ways in where, you know, there might be districts where the vast majority of the work is not being done by Caltrans directly it's being done by other partners. So it's it really does. The workload both the challenges associated with pre construction varies significantly by district as well as the amount of miles that needs to be done in within a given district.

So thank you. So do I then understand that the graph that has the 12 districts arrayed includes work in those districts not being managed or construction not being done directly by Caltrans?

No.

No, that's I thought. This graph of the 12 bars is what they are constructing?

Correct that would reflect their work on the 4,000 miles that we currently have planned for them to construct.

Right. My point is, you must have a graph that actually shows the next level of detail which is progress by number of miles, not, this implies in this graph that there's an equal number of miles in each district.

Right something that's weighted by district. Yeah, that I mean, that's something we could provide. But I think the Caltrans is provided. But I don't have that here.

Right? Okay, I just wanna make sure. Caltrans is using that with their own districts.

Yes.

Okay, thank you.

Thank you. Are there any other questions or comments from any members? Yes, Undersecretary Tollefson?

Yeah, thanks, Mark. I really appreciate the presentation. And just going back to the preconstruction map that was on the table, or kind of in the presentation. Looking at the table. You know, broken down by region. It shows, you know, region 2 doesn't have any miles that have been completed in terms of you know, preconstruction. Is that more of a timing issue Or are there other challenges that you know we should be, you know, diving into a little deeper?

Yeah, in terms of the, I would say, it's all timing issue at this point. Some districts have, you know, have experienced other challenges. I can't speak to in in too much detail in terms of you know the challenges that happened at the district to have level other than to understand that some of them, some of them, require the require a plan to cut through granite, and that's different than you know, or run along a coast, or run through a number of bridges right? And some of them have more urban areas in them. So I think each of them presents its own challenges. But yeah, according to this the Caltrans still plans on completing everything by the end of this calendar year and this is what Caltrans reported. You know this is their latest estimate of kind of what will be ready by region.

Okay, great thanks.

Thank you. Mr. Monroe. Any other questions or comments from any members. All right. Thank you, Mr. Monroe. We'll go ahead and go to Commissioner Houck, who's going to give us Last Mile updates.

Thank you. And good morning. I'm going to as Director Bailey-Crimmins said, talk about our Last Mile programs at the Public Utilities Commission, and can we go to the next slide. So this slide provides an overview of the various programs that we're working on at the PUC, the Broadband Equity Access and Deployment program or BEAD is a hundred 1.86 billion dollars program and it funds the funds of are for planning infrastructure and adoption starting in 2024. NTAI recently approved our volume, one for our challenge process, and the Commission issued a proposed decision on April 5th, and NTAI's approval was April 4th, I'm

going to leave my comments there as Director Osborn's gonna provide a much more detailed overview of the program a little bit later this morning. So then I'm going to move on to our California Advance Services Fund. Oh, could you go back? Thank you. The second column on this slide we are pending a BCP approval to increase the amount to 150 million dollars a year. This program funds broadband infrastructure and adoption and low income housing tribal communities and unserved areas. It also funds technical assistance for tribes and it funds our consortia. We expanded the public housing and tribal technical assistance programs in March of this year, through a decision adopted by the Commission and applications accepted in 2024 for various accounts. I'm gonna discuss those on an upcoming slide. The third column on this slide, as our Loan Loss Reserve program was initially allocated, 750 million dollars, the current proposed budget is looking to reduce that to 500 million. This provides collateral to local government tribes and nonprofits to finance their own broadband infrastructure, and the first round of applications closed on April 9th. The last column is our Last Mile Federal Funding Account, which is roughly 2 billion dollars, and this funds Last Mile broadband infrastructure projects in every county in the State. and currently our staff are evaluating nearly 500 grant applications. Every county filed an application, and the first awards are expected to be announced in June, and I'll be talking a little bit more detail in the upcoming slide if you want to go to the next slide, please. And so this is our Federal Funding Account. The first Federal Funding Account or FFA cycle closed on September 29th, 2023, and the Commission received 484 grant applications. An application, again, was received for every county in the State with a total of more than 4.6 billion dollars in request to fund Last Mile broadband infrastructure projects to connect unserved Californians, which shows a tremendous need for and desire to expand broadband throughout the State. There were 397 Internet Provider or ISP applications, 79 applications from public entities, nonprofits and cooperatives, and 8 applications from tribal nations. We open the objection period for these 484 applications on October 23rd of last year, and close the objection period. On December 18th, 2023. Altogether, we received nearly 900 objections during this period, and nearly 900 applicant responses to each of the objections, and our staff, again, are currently reviewing the applications and the objections that were filed, next slide, please. So of the total funding available for the FFA allocations, it was split among county areas using a formula adopted by the Commission in Decision 2204005 and that stated that 5 million dollars is allocated to every county to start, and then each county is further allocated based funding based on each county share of unserved households based on the data that we had in 2020, when the legislation was passed, and then again, with the objection period closed, we continue to review the applications. The

interplay of the Last Mile funding account applications and middle mile broadband. This slide shows that the FFA uses a scoring system as one way to evaluate applications, whereby an application that proposes to connect to the State Middle Mile Broadband Initiative or MMBI receives additional points, however, an application that is not reasonably close to the middle mile, can also receive points. Further applications that do not propose to connect to the middle mile can be awarded grants. So you get additional points if you are connecting to the middle mile, but that doesn't mean you will be excluded from funding. And then we are working closely with our partners at CDT, at Caltrans and other agencies to coordinate on the last on the latest information on the FFA and the Middle Mile, and our staffs are working closely together and regularly meet to assess the needs. Can you go to the next slide, please? So this, based on the current data from the most recent update by the Last Mile Federal funding account applications proposing to connect to the middle mile include the number of applications and entities. There were 107 applications from 48 entities. The number of unserved locations proposed to be provided service in these applications is 500,000, and the total amount of funding requested in the applications is 4.6 billion dollars. Next slide, please. So this slide is an overview of our Loan Loss Reserve program and it provides the program provides collateral so local governments, tribes and nonprofits can receive more favorable borrowing rates and terms for bonds, loans, and letters of credit for the deployment of publicly owned broadband infrastructure. Updates on the applications during the Loan Loss Reserve first application window, the timeline, as shown here, is the first application window closed on April 9th, 2024. There's program information webinars and fact sheets all located on our website, and the next window is planned for July 2024. For this fiscal year 23-24 the funds allocated are 170 million dollars, and for 24-25, it'll be a 150 million dollars. The program rules and guidelines were adopted by the Commission in November of 2023. Applicants are eligible for funding through 3 tracks 50% of the funds through the general track, 40% of funds through the equity track and 10% of funds through the tribal track and the program prioritizes projects that benefit unserved areas. However, program funding is not restricted to unserved areas and can support adjacent underserved and served areas. Again, the first application window closed in April of this year, and we received nearly 40 applications requesting over 430 million dollars in Loan Loss Reserve funds with an available amount of 175. So again, there is a desire to have these programs and get broadband to areas that have been historically underinvested. So the CPUC also held outreach and education sessions in advance of the first financing window to ensure applicants can learn about how to take advantage of the program, and, as you can see we got a tremendous response, and

awards are planned for the second and third quarter of this year and the next application window again, is targeted for July approximately 3 months from now. Next slide, please. So our California Advance Services Fund, the programs under this fund are our adoption grant public housing, infrastructure, Tribal Technical Assistance. The adoption grants for digital literacy and broadband access projects, the January 2024 cycle applications. There's 61 projects for 7.4 million dollars, and the next application deadline is July 1st of 2024. Our infrastructure Grant, this grant subsidizes the cost of middle and Last Mile infrastructure to expand high quality communication services throughout California. We funded 3 projects that were approved for 7.2 million dollars. It's important to note that that we received a significant amount of grants, 72 applications, or 73 applications were received requesting over 527 million dollars. So again, as you can see from these numbers, there is tremendous desire for these programs to help fund getting broadband infrastructure out. So again, we've approved 3 projects for 7.2 million dollars. And these projects are going to provide services to over 980 households and the final deadline for approval of CASF projects for this application cycle was extended to June 13th, 2024. Our public housing grants program builds networks offering free service to low-income communities. The January 2024 cycle applications. There were 21 projects for 1.3 million dollars expand and then again in March we expanded eligibility to include both additional types of expansion, of infrastructure as well as who can apply for the grant, and that includes low-income communities, tribal communities, mobile homes, farm worker communities. And the next application deadline is July 1st of 2024. Our technical assistance grants, assist tribal nations and developing market studies, feasibility, studies, and other business plans, we expanded the program and increased support for market studies, feasibility, studies and business plans through our decision this last March. Our April 1st 2024 cycle, there were 3 applications totaling \$750,000, and the next application deadline is July 1st of 2024. Next slide. So that concludes my presentation this morning. If there's any questions I'm available, and also Director Osborn is here as well.

Thank you, Commissioner Houck. I'd like to open it up to any members that have any questions or comments. Ms. McPeak. Thank you.

Thank you, Commissioner Houck, for that comprehensive report, once again I should be able to do the math. But how much is left in the tribal technical assistance pot now?

I don't know, Rob, if you have the exact numbers.

I don't. But we can follow up with you, Sunne on that.

Because it opens up again this July right? Just trying to measure or gauge what's there? Thank you.

Yes, cause I think there was 2.3 million. Is that the total amount that we had? so we'll have to subtract, subtract the amounts that have been awarded, but the total amount allocated for this budget fiscal year was 2.3 million.

Is there anything left in the 50 million.

There is not actually. and Rob, correct me if I'm wrong, that the 2.3 million for the tribal technical assistance is coming out of CISF funding, not out of the 50 million from the local technical assistance that money has all been allocated for the local technical assistance both, and there was additional tribal funding set aside there. And that has all been allocated.

Thank you.

Thank you, Ms. McPeak. Any other questions. Comments. Yes, Undersecretary Tollefson.

Thanks, Commissioner, really appreciate the presentation. Just a quick question on the Last Mile program. So it looks like, you know, we're oversubscribed by, you know, more than 2 times tons of interest in the program, which is, which is great. Are there opportunities to draw down more Federal funds to support the program?

And I'll let Rob expand on this. We obviously have our bid program that we'll be working on that has 1.86 billion. We are still assessing the applications for the FFA program and Rob, I don't know if you're aware of any additional Federal funding that may be coming down the line. But if you could talk more about that, that would be great.

Yes, certainly, and thank you for your question. So we have a group of case workers that work directly with project applicants to look at all sorts of funding sources, including Federal, and particularly with tribes. There's additional Federal funding that has become available that they're helping tribes tried to secure.

Thank you. I did have a quick question, Commissioner. On the FFA slide. We you mentioned about a hundred applicants. Obviously, you're still going through that process, it will have at least indicated that they will connect to middle mile. You also had a important number, and I wanted to make sure that we pointed out, I think there was like 500,000 households that and each household we know typically is about 2 and a half people. And so I just always, I always know we focus on miles. But I think at the end of the day as we were talking, It's also the connectivity in the households that this is going to make an impact on, more is

probably the statement. But I just wanted to point that out that you had nicely put that on the slide and just thank you for you know, doing all that. And I know they're gonna be going through as we look at BEAD and the other programs, each of those that you are contributing ends up affecting people where they are. And so I just wanted to commend you for all your hard work on that.

Thank you. We've got great staff working on this and as Director Osborn mentioned our case workers are working directly with folks and really, putting in a lot of time and effort to ensure that that we're getting the information out there and trying to do our best to make sure these programs get as many people connected as possible.

Thank you, Commissioner. Are there any other questions before we go to the next agenda item? I see none, so we will go ahead and go to Ms. McPeak, who will give an update on something very near and dear to her heart the Affordable Connectivity Program.

Thank you, Madam Chair and actually the Governor Newsom directed the California Broadband Council to oversee getting all households connected. So, it is really the leadership of the California Broadband Council that is the through theme of what I'm gonna present today. So, the first next slide, you will see that 45% of all households in California actually were eligible for the Affordable Connectivity Program. It was 5,844,797 households. That number is emblazoned in my in my brain and it was actually the baseline established going back to March of 2022 when this council set a goal of getting to 90% of all of the households enrolled by the end of 2024. I will say, I think we would have made it had there not been a freeze that went into place in 20 in on February 7th, 2024, and at 7:59 PM Pacific time. we got 3 hours less than the east coast to do sign up, so, I have made that that complaint to the Federal Communications Commission before, but a huge lift that got us to 50% in fact, over 50% by the household number that was established literally by the University of Southern California. In California, we recognize as the law does that any member of a household who qualifies for ACP makes that household qualified. And I say that because actually when the FCC counts, and they only count, is the head of household eligible. So, they actually have undercounted in the past. So, this, this would be a drum roll getting to the 2,945,281 households that got enrolled by the freeze on February 7th. Going to the next slide. What I'm about to share with you is the story of how leadership here in California, under the umbrella of the California Broadband Council, had this remarkable performance for California. Keep in mind, California is the largest state. We had more than a million people eligible than any other State, so we had the most eligible households, and we had more than a million more eligible than any other State. When we finished,

we actually had more than a million more households enrolled than any other state. So just, it's a huge lift because of the size of our population. The Pew Charitable Trust approached CETF in 2021 to enter into a research partnership. We had just released the 2021 statewide survey, and we have been working with them very closely and of course they do research across the country. The most recent iteration was to look at all states and compare that performance over time. So, what you have in front of you is that California finished very, very strong, as we just said and that you see the charts from January of 2022, when the Affordable Connectivity Program went into effect. The Broadband Council met in March just 2 months later and adopted the goal. And then, we did the baseline analysis for Pew Charitable Trust in November of 2022, and we had already increased by 11 percentage points moving to 32%. And remember, again, a percentage point in California is 59,000 households, where, for example, in New York, it was 31,000 households, so always a big, big lift. And then in January when we last met, which is January 24th, we had 52% enrolled, and we went to 53% and these are numbers that are from the national numbers from Columbia University Poverty Center. Again, where they generally are looking at just the head of household being eligible. So, you'll see these numbers had to be normalized for all states. So, we are just have done a huge amount of work. In enrolling we had. And actually, I think I misspoke because there's 2 million more eligible households than any other high performing state high performing state, and that for every increase it was a lot more households in California. So, you can see that trend with the blue numbers going up the orange numbers are the reminder we still have about half of those households who were eligible for the Affordable Connectivity Program yet to be reached. So, we got to over 50% by our numbers to 53% by Columbia University numbers, and the rough numbers that we had 5.8 that were eligible. We enrolled 2.9, we still have 2.9. If we go to the next slide and keep in mind that 2.9 million are actually the hardest to reach, they are the lowest income, the most digitally disadvantaged and the most economically fragile. But, when we did the initial baseline for pew, we looked at 2 metrics for each state. One was the percentage enrolled of eligible households in each State, and then the other was between January of 2022 and November of 2022. What had been the rate of increase? So, on both metrics, we're looking to see what were the high performing States and at that point there were 10 that were very high performing. California was 10. There were 9 that were ahead of us. They're listed there. When we did the first Progress report for Pew in January and had just gotten the notice that there would be a freeze by the FCC on February 7th, there were only 4 States that outperform California due to the leadership here. This some, you know, tremendous focus by the California Broadband Council,

and I mentioned earlier those meetings on a monthly basis, with state agencies and ISPs just continuing to march forward. There were only 4 States. You can see them listed, and when we finished on February 7th, only 2 States who are ahead of California, and both of them are much smaller in population. When we met on January 24th, I made a bold prediction, and I'm glad I did. I said I thought we would finish at least at 50 percent, we California, and indeed we did because we knew what the trends were and what investment we had already made in outreach and in actually directly notifying households. So, this should this is an amazing accomplishment. I've had the opportunity to brief an advisory board made up of experts across the country that are advising Pew researchers and many institutions who are pretty impressed with this and also brief The Federal Communications Commission a couple of weeks ago, and NTIA will be next week. So, everyone's paying attention to what California has done. Going to the next slide, you will see so what are our lessons and what are the smart practices? What we have found gets the most immediate return, and we know what that is. Not only on weekly enrollment rates, but households who need assistance if they've been given direct notification by a state agency. The Department of Healthcare Services, the Department of Social Services twice have gone out to their database of actual eligible I mean enrolled households who are automatically eligible for ACP. Those who need assistance have a telephone number, and it comes right through our call center between October of 2022 and December of 2023, we got a hundred and almost a hundred-nine thousand calls. We can see a mail a mailing goes out according to the department, and the phone start ringing the next day. So, it's a very immediate measurement. And each communication channel has its own unique telephone number so we can also not just see overall trends, but identify with the If you will, the communication mechanism. So direct notification has been huge in San Diego County. What the Department observed with Scott's leadership is that on the online survey for the Digital Equity Plan, San Diego County went out with texting. Some counties won't text except in an emergency, so they don't allow it for some information. But San Diego has it set up, and they have shown just an amazing amount of efficacy by doing direct notification. So, once we get a call, there is an immediate connection to a live person, a community-based organization that's been trained in language, in culture and then they, if they need assistance, they get enrolled. So, we also can tell you exactly how many minutes it takes, depending on what documentation that the household has, and part of the benefit of direct notification is it's it they tell the household you need this document, this document, or this document, and if they have that document, it was less than 5 min. If the documents were there, and we and we will spend all the time that's necessary to walk someone through the enrollment

or to set up an in-person connection at this, you know, whenever we're doing an event so that we can help them, it takes a lot longer. The community and ethnic media channels actually have the best return on investment. So, a Spanish speaking television and in Asian language radio as a good examples of in markets where we're trying to reach that, we can get very high returns. Public advertising or public announcement actually is a reinforcement to direct notification. Nothing takes the place of telling someone from a credible source, you're eligible. And then the public private partnerships are actually the most important kind of collaboration, because the Internet service providers can be at a site to help enroll which is what we did. We ended up conducting a hundred and six ACP enrollment events between what was sponsored under the umbrella of the California Broadband Council get connected days, and then we were able to complete 41 of 50 ACP enrollment events. We were obligated to do with the FCC grant and we enrolled as many as physically or possible, but it's nothing compared to what can be done with this seamless system of direct notification. And CBOS that are connected by a telephone to that household. So those are the lessons learned and the smart practices. I will say, as I end our statewide survey last year that was done for the Digital Equity Plan, and the BEAD plan found that of low-income households who are eligible for ACP or an internet service provider, only 33% were aware. Only 33% were aware. We actually enrolled a lot more than who are than we're aware, for a variety of reasons. There were lots of transfers over, people were told, but they don't remember the name ACP. But the in the awareness level was very, very low compared to what we were able to achieve. In the survey, however, when asked, what is the primary reason that you're not online today? 36.5% said, it's affordability only 2.7% less than 3% said it is because of the lack of infrastructure. Now please know, we're in the column of ubiquitous deployment. We need absolute, you know High speed infrastructure everywhere, every corner of California. That's the great reports you just got that still leaves us with 2.9 people, 2.9 million households that didn't get onto ACP. 2.9 million that have to be transferred over, and we have to figure out what we're gonna do to meet the needs of all of those households as the Governor said in November of 2019. Thank you.

Thank you, Ms. McPeak. Are there any members that have comments or questions?

I will just make a comment that I'm hearing a feedback up there. Someone has a mic. Okay? Ms. McPeak, I just want to, you know again, I know you we commend everyone. It was a it was a It was a state, a community, public, private partnerships. But I just as you, as you know, your leadership through this

whole effort has always been you know, when someone is passionate and steadfast, and it is not going to take no for an answer, you can move mountains, and I would just say, you have continued to move mountains, and we just are very thankful to have you as a member and as an advocate on behalf of people that need these services. So thank you.

That is very nice. I'm just too dumb to give up.

Thank you, Ms. McPeak, any other? Oh, Ms. Commissioner Houck.

I just wanna second your comments that's is just a tremendous effort looking at those charts of where we went in 2022 to where we were a February this year and now the challenge is gonna be to get the Federal Government to continue to fund this to make sure people can have affordable broadband.

All right. I don't see any other questions or comments about this agenda item so we're going to go ahead and go to the next agenda. Item. I'm going to introduce a director, Adams and direct directory, Director Adams and Director Osborn, who's going to give an update on the Digital Equity Plan and then over to the beat program. So first up is Mr. Adams.

Thank you. Chair Bailey-Crimmins pleasure to provide an update on the State Digital Equity Plan. Could you advance the next slide, please? So wanted to remind folks since the last time we got here that the Digital Equity Plan the goal of the plan was to identify the common specific barriers, digital equity barriers for covered populations and develop strategies with the ecosystem to overcome those barriers that would be funded by Digital Equity Capacity grants that would augment existing efforts in the State, including the adoption programs administered by PUC so the key activities that the plan really focuses on are on the list here. It's complete Broadband for All infrastructure investments which are gonna be critical to addressing access and availability of infrastructure and can support affordability. Continuing to convene digital equity stakeholders Ms. McPeak, obviously, you know, carryover right from the action plan, refine digital equity data and maps. To get more specificity, you know, on local needs develop a Digital Equity Capacity sub grant program fund, state manage digital inclusion programs, develop digital inclusion tools and best practices, and then continue to promote low-cost service offers and subsidy programs. Regardless of what happens with ACP, just to continue to know that that work needs to be done to overcome affordability barriers and drive adoption. Next slide please. Now, what we wanted to also brief you on is, when we were here there were a couple of days left in the public comment process. So, you see the blue box at the bottom here. When public comment concluded, we received 442 comments, 301 from residents, and 141 from

organizations. And really, I think that's a testament that the plan itself, if you recall, was developed with input from over 50,000 individuals and stakeholders, partner entities. But you know, that's a significant number of comments received on the plan itself. If we could move to the next slide, please. So wanted to give you an update on some of the general themes of public comment that further informed and led to modifications of the Digital Equity Plan. You know there were a lot of public comments that we may not have may not have led to modifications to the plan, because they were outside our jurisdiction, or weren't consistent with the Federal guidelines from the NTIA. The first box represents some of those where there were a number of individuals and stakeholders within the ecosystem that wanted us to expand the covered populations that the plan focused on, and we noted that Broadband for All focuses on all Californians. And so, they're important. But the Digital Equity Plan must focus on the 8 covered populations as defined by the NTIA we do. Wanna note that on measurable objectives we took feedback from the public, and we further refined our baselines and against our measured objectives, we added more specific targets and timelines. I think a really important one is the next box at the top barriers for covered populations We received some feedback on 2 different covered populations. The first was members of racial and ethnic minority groups. The ecosystem reminded us that throughout the process, we were told of specific barriers for that population which were structural racism and discrimination and discriminatory practices so we put that into the plan as a top barrier for members of racial and ethnic minority groups and then advocates pointed out that for aging individuals we had lack of perceived need as a as a top barrier when they provided guidance to us there. It was really the lack of distinction between mobile phone and broadband connectivity that was a challenge that they experience. So, we amended, that particular section. I think timely when we look at broadband adoption ACP in a successor program. Really, it's dovetailing on what Sonny was saying, members of the public were concerned that the plan was to focus on ACP and so we did add some language specifying it's a statewide mobilization to support ACP was really established prior to ACP, and that the partnerships and the structure and the framework in place there provide us with a good footing, to continue to promote existing low cost offers other subsidies like state and federal lifeline programs and support any Last Mile programs that are developed by sub grantees of BEAD funds when you know PUC awards those. I'm gonna be brief here so, the last 5 buckets state managed efforts versus local digital literacy training, digital navigation and grant program framework implementation and timeline and ongoing collaboration, We tried to further demonstrate that there were parts of the plan that we left not as defined as some folks may have

wanted. That was for 2 reasons, the first of which we didn't know how much our Digital Equity Capacity grant allocation was gonna be, or the rules, requirements, and regulations associated with those and the second was that when we found those out, we wanted to go back to the public and further engage with our ecosystem on program design. So, there are areas within the plan where we've indicated that. You know, procuring digital literacy training platform. Further, defining a digital navigation and sub grant program are things that we fully intend to continue to do market research and have a formal public comment process on to seek input from the public. Next slide please. So, here's the good news is that after all, the work that you know the ecosystem and the many partners put together the final Digital Equity Plan, I'd say that the final draft for submission, this plan is gonna continue to evolve as the Broadband Action Plan has was approved by the NTIA on March 28th. Close on the heels on March 29th, the NTIA I released the no vote for The Digital Equity Capacity grants that states can apply for once their plans are approved, and in that Notice of Funding Opportunity California's allocation, initial allocation, was 70.2 million dollars, and so from a next steps the state must complete, It's more of an administrative process than an application. But submit an application to the NTIA outlining the plan for utilizing the funds you know, based on you know, the activities in the Digital Equity Plan. Oh, and I wanted to point out that there's a QR code here. If if folks would like to see the final version of the plan, they may go there the as with the draft plan, the final plan has been, you know, embedded in an all text HTML format that can be utilized by screen readers and read in over a hundred different languages. We've also supported you know, and translated the executive summary into the top 7 languages that residents responded to our online survey. Next slide. What we wanted to point out here is again as Broadband for All is, you know, a unified, you know, or over-arching umbrella to help close the states digital divide. We know that there's been a significant amount of resources allocated towards infrastructure. Could we please go back to the next slide or the previous slide towards infrastructure. For both the middle mile and the CPUC sees Last Mile programs, The allowable uses of the digital equity capacity grants are gonna be largely for non-infrastructure purposes. I wanna make sure that folks are clear about that that you know, the PUC has the California Band Service Fund adoption account which provides you know, great grant programs. These capacity grants will be to augment those efforts and support local and regional entities to further develop local Digital Equity Plans, conduct, broadband adoption campaigns, provide digital navigation service, digital literacy and skills training, targeted device distribution and workforce development training and apprenticeship programs. So that's really gonna be the primary focus. Next slide please. What we wanted to also

share with you is I mentioned at the top in the executive report that obviously stakeholder engagement and receiving, you know, feedback and input from the ecosystem is important, we've had a number of large group presentations since our last meeting. You know the Aspen Institute for Latinos and Society Forum, the CETF Forum, American Society on Aging, Chinese for Affirmative Action. I'm not gonna list them all. We've also begun doing market research and listening sessions related to the implementation of the Digital Equity Plan and that's included convenings with state agency partners, you know, including broadband council members, broadband consortia local governments, community-based organizations and private sector entities. Next slide please. So, for ongoing engagement and collaboration, we wanna make sure that we're 100% clear that we are not at the end on the Digital Equity Plan. We're kind of at the we're at the end of the beginning and that the plan was complete. Now we're on to the next phase, which is implementation. And there's still some program design that needs to be done. So, we will continue to host listening sessions and market research on program design, which will then inform you know, a draft framework that we will put out to public comment. We will, as noted in the Digital Equity Plan, transition the statewide planning group into a statewide implementation group to bring in the voices of those large state entities, or reinstate our outcome area working groups. We did include a community advisory committee that would consist of self-identified members of covered populations that would meet quarterly to make sure that the voice of the individual covered populations is heard throughout the implementation process and then we'll continue to communicate in a number of different ways through webinars and public meetings through the Broadband for All portal and through the monthly email updates. There is a QR code on the screen here. If you are not signed up for the Broadband for All email update, we encourage members of the public to do so and then we do have one last slide. Then we hope to you know in the future, be more specific with our timelines here, but there's a lot of moving pieces associated with the NTIA process wanted to Let people know where we are right now is in the process of developing an application for the capacity grant. That is due on May 28th. The NTIA review of applications is gonna occur between May 28th and August 28th. What we're told, and then capacity grant funds will be released to states sometime after August 28th. We will endeavor to get more specificity at our next meeting. Hopefully. I think we wanted to flag for the ecosystem is there will be another pool of NTIA Digital Equity competitive grants that will be made available that won't be managed by the state. It'll be for entities to apply directly to the NTIA that we expect sometime later this year and then are projecting that a capacity sub grant program that's funded by the NTIA Digital Equity Capacity grants will

be available in 2025. And so that completes my presentation. I'm happy to answer any questions.

Thank you, Mr. Adams. I'd like to open up to any members that have questions or comments. Commissioner Houck.

Yes. Can you talk a little bit about the outcome area working groups and the how they are they working with the community? Or is the community advisory committees providing input that goes back to the outcome area working groups or to the SDI implementation? Are they coordinated?

Well, they're yes, they're coordinated in that the statewide planning group is intended to be an expansion of the California Broadband Council members to allow us to bring in the department of Aging and the other statewide entities that have a connection to covered populations and providing services to those. The outcome area working groups were initially formed during the planning process to inform CDT on the how the plan could support the state's policy priority areas. So education, healthcare, etc., they reported directly back to the Department of Technology. We're looking at and we'll likely engage the public with some feedback on how to restructure those. We may focus those less around policy outcome areas and more around functional efforts like broadband adoption and digital literacy and digital navigation and then the Community Advisory Council will again, you know, report back to CDT, and we will share their findings with the implementation group.

Yeah, thank you. My question wasn't clear, but you answered it. I was asked, gonna ask, how they were if they're going to continue, and how they're going to be coordinated. So thank you. That's very helpful.

Thank you.

McPeak.

Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Scott for that report. Amazing progress. I'm glad we're here not still doing workshops last year. The question I have and again, I probably should know the answer, is of the 70 million that is to cover only a portion of ultimately what capacity grants might be allocated. Maybe my question should be, what did NTIA actually do, and how much of the full amount of kept capacity grants that are in IIJA, did they announce? And what period of time is that to cover?

Yeah, that's a good question. And so as you all recall, we had been reporting out that the digital like we act included 2.75 billion dollars of funding to support digital equity efforts And there were 3 sequential programs, the state planning

grant program, which was 60 million, the Digital Equity Capacity Grant program, which was 1.44 billion, and the competitive grant program, which was 1.25 billion. So Sunne, to answer your question, the NTIA released in their last for about 800 million of the 1.44 that was outlined in the Digital Equity Act. It's and then so the 70 million is our statutory allocation of that portion and so I think that answered your first question, that the next question is that we believe the NTIA is going to release 2 additional tranches in future years, 2025 and 2026, of about 300 million, and in 2026-27 of about 300 million, and we would surmise that we would get the same percentage of those. However, we wanna keep our eye on the ball and focus on what's immediately in front of us, and that we can count on and that's the 70 million allocation that was recently released.

And so that is to cover? Then you're gonna look at that over the full period of time then, and not front loaded or if you if you're gonna count on that and the implementation is 5 years, as I'm recalling from IIJA, is that true? Is that even?

Well, so I would say this, that the Digital Equity Capacity grant, no father just launched was for a lump sum of 70 million for 5 years. Okay? And so how the state develops the sub grant program we have an idea. But we'd like to hear more from stakeholder in the public on how to further design that program so that it meets the needs of folks. And so, some of the questions that you asked would be answered by that process.

Okay, I just want to sort of share publicly that you know, California is 13% of the nation's population and 15% of all low-income households in the country. When we were allocated our planning grant, it was 7.5%. Nowhere near what we are in terms of the contribution to the nation's economy, let alone the needs that we have here in California. And so if that percentage, just that small sum of 7.5% were applied to the 1.44 billion. That is in the law, I keep watching how much keeps getting taken off the top in DC, then California should be receiving no less than a hundred-eight million. So just I wanted to make sure everybody was aware of what should actually be coming to California, where we getting an appropriate share for the state's contribution to the nation and the need we have for our residents.

Thank you McPeak. Any other questions or comments from any members. Yes, Commissioner Houck.

No. I just wanted to thank Scott and his team for all their work with our folks at the PUC and just recognize the importance of this program and all of the outreach, and a great work that that's been done on it.

Thank you, Commissioner. I do have one question, Mr. Adams. I know you had the timeline on there, and just for the public that is watching as we're, you know obviously, there's the process of, you know, getting award at the 70.2 and then you had what exactly should people be expecting in the last part of this this calendar year, and then potentially awards through the grant our sub grant programs into 2025 cause I know there's gonna be more that you're gonna be sharing at the next meeting, but just making sure that when we're looking at this, I mean, cause it looks like NTIA has got competitive grants, and then you got the capacity but I don't know if the public understands exactly what all that means. And so, if you could put it in a lay person's terms, that would be appreciative.

Got it. Thank you for the question. So by May 28th we must complete the state's administrative application for the funds. So sometime before that it, you know at the beginning or middle of next month we will have a stakeholder convening to solicit input from the stakeholders on some questions we might wanna have answered for the application process, which is not. It's gonna be a tentative budget allocation. There will be a 4-month process between May 28th and August 28th where the NTIA will review our application for the capacity grant funds. That will be one track. We will reconvene the statewide implementation group and outcome area working groups inform the Community Advisory Council during that time period as well. So we will begin the process of engagement and collaboration and coordination during that timeframe and sometime between August 28th and the end of this year, we will also seek to get feedback from the public on the program design of the sub grant program and given the process and administrative work, folks can expect the capacity subgrant program to be available to receive applications in the early part of 2025. More than likely.

Thank you. I really appreciate that. I know there's a process. But when people are interested in the program, and how they apply and how they contribute from a transparency perspective, I really appreciate the additional clarity. Alright any other questions or comments? All right. I see our last agenda item before public comment is Mr. Osborn, Director Osborn, who's going to give an update on the BEAD program.

Good morning, committee members and members of the public. I'm Robert Osborn, Director of the Communications Division at the California Public Utilities Commission. In June of 2023, the NTIA allocated 1.86 billion in Federal funding for the broadband equity access and deployment program or BEAD from the infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act of 2021. To further the primary goal of BEAD, the which is the deployment of reliable Last Mile service to all unserved locations in California and the CPUC participated in statewide engagement

with the California Department of Technology last year, in preparation for completing some key milestones and those include submission of the 5 Year Action Plan last July. Submission of the initial proposal volumes one and two for the BEAD program, and that was submitted to the NTIA on December 27th last year and then on April 4th this year the NTIA approved initial proposal volume one which focuses on the challenge process. Volume 2 is still under consideration and Volume 2 covers the sub grantee selection process. Both volumes must be reviewed and approved by the NTIA before we can begin sub grantee selection. The Commission will take action through the open rule, making the BEAD rule making on a program design and roles once the NTIA approves a Volume 2, and I'll go into more detailed activities in the next slide please. So, as directed by the NTIA, the CPUC will conduct a challenge process to determine the locations which are served unserved and underserved, with all final decisions on challenges made by the NTIA. Unlike the CASF, The California Bank Services Fund infrastructure account, or the Federal Funding Account where challenges or objections are made to applications, the NTIA has set up a process where, prior to opening a solicitation for applications, stakeholders have an opportunity to challenge the map. The process allows governments, tribal nations non-profits and ISPs to challenge the status of a location, and it provides an opportunity for rebuttals. There will be no challenges to applications. Next slide please. So, on April 5th, the CPUC Issued a draft decision to adopt the approved initial proposal Volume 1. Once again, that's to cover the challenge process and comments are due on April 25th, which is this week and reply comments on April 30th. The CPUC may consider the draft decision at its next voting meeting on May 9th. The May 9th meeting and the CPUC plans outreach activities on the challenge process starting with a webinar from 10:00 to 11:30 this Thursday, April 24th with an introduction to the NTIA's model BEAD challenge process. Next slide please. So, there are upcoming milestones in this program to be aware of so adoption of Volume 1 proposed decision was released on April 8th. The challenge process outreach will begin this week. We'll be conducting the challenge process again. This is to challenge locations on the map, not for applications. The NTIA will review and approve Volume 2, which deals with sub-grantee selection. The CPUC will publish and vote on Volume 2 in a proposed decision subgrantee selection, negotiation and tentative awards will happen. After that, we'll have public comment on the final proposal, and then the final proposal, which includes all of the proposed subgrantee awards, has to be approved by the NTIA, and the final proposal is due within 365 days after approval of the initial proposal. And then, once the NTIA approves the final proposal, the CPUC will finalize awards. And that concludes my update. Thank you, Chair Bailey-Crimmins, and I'm happy to answer questions.

Thank you, Director Osborn. Do any members have any questions or comments?
Commissioner Houck.

I just wanted to commend Rob Director Osborn and his team. They have been really working diligently. There's been a lot of outreach and activity. A lot of coordination with NTIA, with CDT, a lot of questions. The process is, you know, directed by the federal rules, and there's been a lot of questions and inquiries. It's a new process, and just a tremendous amount of work went into getting these applications. The volumes done and the proposed decision out in the timeframes that we did, and we're hoping to get Volume 2 approved and out soon, so we can move forward with getting applications in and getting the funding into California so we can start getting projects built. But just really wanted to thank the team at the PUC for all of their work on this.

Thank you, and I will second that Director Osborn. You know I will just say the partnership that we've all had with CPUC to on the Broadband Council, and all that I think weekly daily sometimes activities. People don't always see it's just professionalism, the transparency and openness, and just willing to get things done on behalf of Californians. I just wanna commend you for your leadership. Great, great job. And I again, as we were talking to Mr. Adams, there is a whole organization behind you that makes this happen so very much. Thanks to yourself, all of your staff, President Reynolds, Commissioner Houck, and everyone that makes it happen so thank you. Ms. Sunne McPeak.

I don't, really. I did. I didn't know when to. I didn't want to cut you off trying to gauge when to press that button. Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Director Osborn, and Commissioner Houck for the leadership here. So I wanna just ask Volume 2 has been submitted to NTIA, and they, which I guess, is the April 5th date. Is that true? Or I don't know. It's here. I'm trying to understand the timeframe.

We submitted both Volumes 1 and 2 in December last year.

Last. They're both submitted. So, the April 5th it wasn't. It's approve. What is the April 5th date?

So, Volume 1 which deals with the challenge process was approved. And we've put that out for comment through the proceeding. Volume 2 is still pending approval by the NTIA.

Okay, thank you.

The April 5th date, the we have a rule making where we have to issue proposed decisions. So, the proposed decision for the PUC to adopt the approved volume was issued on April 5th. So, that's the April 5th date.

Okay, so here's where I'm going. It's my recollection of that Volume 2 and I think it's page 189 has an acknowledgement of the need on affordability that relates back to previous assessment by the CPUC at about the \$40 a month, and I think the discussion. But I'm again I should have looked it up before being here on about page 189 is around acknowledging that \$30 target that had come from the Affordable Connectivity Program. So, here's the question. If the NTIA approves it, then what is that next step by the PUC on Volume 2 and that target on affordability?

Commissioner Houck would you like me to? Okay so there's 2 components here. So, the ACP is required, a requirement for a BEAD applicants. The challenge we have is ACP is expiring. We haven't received any guidance yet from the NTIA on what that means in terms of a requirement. We do give points separately for what's called the middle-class affordability. That's not a requirement but there are points awarded for commitment to offer a plan. That is, I think it's \$55 is what we're proposing right now in the initial proposal for gigabit service would clarify that.

Ms. McPeak, does that answer your question?

Mostly. So then it with ACP expiring, I'm gonna repeat back what I'm understanding which was the target for or the vehicle for a lower income, affordability versus middle class or middle-income affordability. You're awaiting guidance, and if and we'll move on that, do you? So do you? And so that's accurate. Is that right? You just told me what if NTIA doesn't give you guidance? Then what?

I'll defer to the Commissioner.

So, they're gonna have to approve our Volume 2. So, whether it's direct guidance or through approving, what we propose we're gonna get something from NTIA, that we are trying to build in as much equity in in as we can to ensure affordability. But we are limited by the federal rules. So, whether it's direct guidance, or whether through what they are or aren't willing to approve in our Volume 2, we will get some feedback.

Thank you. Do I have any other comments or questions from members? Alright, we see none, so we'll go ahead and move to public comment, Ms. Nguyen, if you please, provide public comment guidelines and begin the public comment process.

Of course. Thank you to ensure everyone who wishes to make public comment has the opportunity to do so. We respectfully request one person per entity and 2 minutes per person. You'll see a speaker timer in at the podium. The order of public comment will be in person, comments, zoom and phone comments and emailed comments submitted prior to the meeting. For in person comments, please form a line by the podium. For Zoom, please use the raise hand feature on the lower toolbar. For phone, please press star 9 to raise your hand. Emailed comments received prior to the meeting will be read at the end. We will start with the first person in line by the podium.

Good morning, Chair, Council members and state partners. My name is Patrick Messac, and I'm here on behalf of California's disconnected, predominantly poor communities and communities of color. I'm here today to ask a simple question. What are you willing to do to make this once in a generation broadband infrastructure investment different? A year ago, I showed this Council evidence that the CPUC redesignated 8 times as many locations unserved in Alameda, Alameda County's highest income most connected communities, as they did in the poorest least connected predominantly black and brown communities. I showed you evidence that the 18 dense clustered clusters added by the CPUC in Livermore and Pleasanton are demonstrably served. To date, not a single improvement has been made to the map after MMBI optimization. I presented evidence that historically red line communities suffered massively disproportionate cuts. We called on the state to publish a clear criteria for how remaining encumbered funds and any future funding would achieve the legislative intent of prioritizing the lowest income, least connected communities. Not only has this criteria not been published, but CDT claimed that no segments were cut from Oakland, which is verifiably false. SR 185 was erased from the map. Now we face a record deficit and we're already hearing about additional cuts to planned investments, and I'm unsure of who stands with the people, specifically poor people and people of color in communities that have been deemed uneconomic by one of the state's most powerful and consolidated industries. This moment calls for courage. Fix the demonstrably inaccurate maps, prioritize broadband infrastructure investments in the communities that need it most, and implement terms of use and pricing that incentivizes MMBI utilization in low-income communities. Thank you.

Hi, everyone. Georgia Savage here on behalf of the California Alliance for Digital Equity or CADE. I just wanted to uplift. I heard today that community engagement will be a critical part of a lot of the timelines presented, and as such we urge you to accept the recommendations shared by CADE and community members in CADE which was sent to Monica Hernandez on April 4th.

I wanna ensure that you all have heard these recommendations. The first is switching virtual stakeholder meeting format to from a webinar to a regular meeting, so folks can better engage in those meetings. The second is to design future meeting agendas based on questions or comments received from stakeholders in advance to maximize time. The third is directly following up with stakeholders regarding outstanding questions that could not be answered during the meeting. The fourth is record all virtual meetings to increase access to presented information and discussions, and then, lastly, once again, we're urging you to share more information about how CDT is navigating this year's budget deficit and how that could impact completion of the MMBI. Thank you.

Alright thank you. Next, we will hear comments from Zoom via hands raised. For call in again, please press star 9.

Natalie Gonzalez, you're now unmuted.

Thank you. Can everyone hear me is okay? Hi, everyone. Thank you, members of the Council. My name is Natalie Gonzalez, the Deputy Director of the Digital Equity Initiative at California Community Foundation. I am speaking here on behalf of CCF and want to first appreciate the updates of the MMBI Interactive map and the additional non-governmental stakeholder meetings that have taken place so far. In an effort to continue increasing transparency and accountability, we encourage CDT to release additional information about the completion of the MMBI network considering the state's budget shortfall. Currently the Governor's proposed 1.5 billion investment in the MMBI faces an uncertain future. We understand that it doesn't materialize, it will have serious lasting consequences on the completion of the network. We strongly encourage CDT to share what specific segments of the MMBI are at risk of not being funded if the 1.5 billion investment is cut from the budget. CCF has put in numerous requests, and for this information, as well as our partners at CADE and significantly assist stakeholders as they make the case to the legislature on the importance of these funds, but we have received no concrete answers at this time. Secondly, I'd like to also briefly touch on BEAD just like with the MMBI, we believe transparency between the CPUC and community stakeholders is critical to ensure the program is a success. We hope to see similar increased stakeholder engagement efforts replicated as California's BEAD program is underway. This is especially important as we prepare for the challenge process that's taking place with the webinar this week as well. Thank you.

Josh Butler, you're now unmuted.

Thank you, Josh, Josh Butler, Senior Policy and Advocacy Manager for Human IT. We're a Digital Equity nonprofit in the State of California who works on all 4 legs

of the Digital Equity stool from helping people connect to low-cost Internet, distributing low-cost devices, helping people for digital literacy training and tech support. And we want to commend the California Department of Technology for putting together the plan and congratulate them on the approval of the plan alright, and we look forward to continued engagement with CDT on this once in a lifetime opportunity to close the Digital Equity gap in California. Though, as Commissioner McPeak pointed out, we did not get requisite funds for the work that the state does. We look forward to working with the partners throughout California to engage with everybody, to close the gap, complete the plan and keep California in front of the pack. And thank you very much to Director Adams for his willingness to engage directly with us at Human IT, and we look forward to continued conversations. Thank you very much.

We're not seeing anymore on Zoom. So I will now read the email public comments. We've received one prior to the meeting from Brian Staff from Armsby Lane Road Association. We live in a rural community of 30 plus homes, 4 miles from Morgan Hill. We had given up hope of ever getting truly fast Internet service, when one day, a couple of years ago, Contractors working for Frontier turned up and installed fiber. This has transformed our community. I don't know who initiated this work, but thank you, thank you. Thank you. That concludes emailed comments. I will circle back to see if there's any more in person or online or phone. Alright, Madam Chair, that ends our public comment session.

Thank you, Ms. Nguyen and thank you to the public. I would like to open it up to any Council members that would like to make a final statement before we do our closing remarks and adjourning. I see Ms. McPeak.

Thank you, Madam Chair, I did want to, at least adds a little bit more math to the conversation given the comment from Human IT and their work. They've been long time partners in this whole endeavor of getting people connected, and that is well not only release 56% of what's in IJA, we did get 9%. So, if we just run the numbers acknowledge that. So, we moved up one and a half percent from our capacity grant or our planning grant to the capacity grant so I did want to at least acknowledge that. But we have a lot more people we still have to reach with that amount of money.

Thank you, Ms. McPeak. Any members do.

I think Scott had some. Okay, I was just, I was just funny that the members yeah.

Two things. One, I know we've heard comments, and we've received comments at the Commission about doing more in person and public meetings in the communities. As we're moving through the BEAD process, we did do a listening

session in LA and one in Oakland. The turnout wasn't great, so I think we need help in coordinating with the right folks to make sure that we're getting the word out about those meetings and would be happy to come back to both Oakland and LA to meet with community members. So, we will again be reaching out and maybe we can ask Sunne to help us out as well. But so I just wanted to say that we definitely do want to conduct outreach and hear from the communities. The last thing I think I forgot to say during my presentation is, we are having our CASF workshop on April 29th. There's information on our website. It is a virtual and welcome folks to participate in that on April 29th.

Thank you, Commissioner. Any other comments from members? Alright, we'll go ahead. I want to again thanks the council members, presenters and attendees for the contributions today. Also express my gratitude for the diligent work that each of the departments, community-based organizations, the public we are all focusing on Broadband for All. And again, we cannot do this in silo. We have to do this as a community as California. Our next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, July 23rd, 2024, from 9:30 to 11:30 at this CalEPA building and also online. We look forward to seeing you then, and with that we'll go ahead and include, conclude April 23rd, 2024, California for California Broadband Council meeting is adjourned. Thank you.