California Broadband Council (CBC) Meeting

July 23, 2024

9:30 a.m. – 11:33 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, July 23, 2024 at 9:30am in California Environmental Protection Agency'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

Chief Deputy Director Jared Johnson welcomed Council members and attendees as the acting chair for Director Bailey-Crimmins.

Housekeeping & Roll Call

A quorum was established for the meeting.

Name	Organization	Member / Designee	Present	Absent
Acting Chair Chief Deputy Director Jared Johnson	**California Department of Technology**	Designee	X	
Commissioner Darcie Houck	**California Public Utilities Commission**	Designee	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**	Designee	X	
President and CEO Sunne McPeak	**California Emerging Technology Fund**	Member	X	
Deputy Secretary Michael Flores	**Department of Food and Agriculture**	Designee	*X*	
Program Manager Josh Chisom	**California State Library, Broadband Opportunities**	Designee	*Online, X*	
Deputy Secretary Loretta Miranda	**Office of Tribal Affairs**	Designee	*Online, X*	
Senator Steven Bradford	**Senate Energy, Utilities, and Communications Committee**	Member	*Online, X*	
Mr. Emmanuel Aguayo	**Assemblymember Mike A. Gipson**	Designee	*Online, X*	

Agenda

Chief Deputy Director Jared Johnson briefly overviews the California Broadband Council agenda.

Agenda Item 2 – Executive Report

Deputy Director Scott Adams provided a high-level recap of various Broadband for All programs and initiatives, including the completion of the Broadband Access Point Investment Acceleration Study as tasked by Senate Bill 717. He reported that the study, conducted by CDT, further examined barriers related to the deployment of wirelines and wireless access points by hosting 44 listening

sessions and engaged in over 280 stakeholder groups. The report was delivered to the Senate Assembly Committee in June.

The closeout of the Affordable Connectivity Program (ACP) & Outreach Grant, progress of the State Digital Equity Plan Implementation and Digital Equity Capacity Grant Program Design, and introduced Office of Broadband and Digital Literacy's new members.

No CBC members made additional comments following the Deputy Director Adams' Executive Report.

Agenda Item 3.1 – Broadband Action Items

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 (MMBI), Last Mile programs administered by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)and Broadband Equity, Access, and Deployment program. Specific action items that he shared updates on were Action Item 6: Permitting, Action Item 16: Promote & Track Low-Cost Offers, and Action Item 21: Broadband for All Portal.

No CBC members made additional comments following the Deputy Director Adams' update on Broadband Action Items.

Agenda Item 3.2 – Middle-Mile Broadband Initiative

Deputy Director Mark Monroe shared how the current MMBI network funding level of $3.87 billion is being used. He presented the budgetary outcomes for MMBI and criteria update. Deputy Director Mark Monroe also shared the revised MMBI network map and how the MMBI network will support Last Mile projects in their respective regions. Lastly, Mr. Monroe described the current market research efforts in progress.

The following CBC members and presenters made additional comments:
- Senator Steven Bradford
- Ms. Sunne McPeak
- Commissioner Darcie Houck

Agenda Item 3.3 – Last-Mile Programs

Commissioner Darcie Houck from the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) provided an overview of the Last-Mile Broadband Programs and

Investments, including the Multi-Year Broadband Investments, Federal Funding Account, Application Update, Awards & Recommendations, Loan Loss Reserve Program, and California Advanced Services Fund.

The following CBC members and presenters made additional comments:
- Ms. Sunne McPeak
- Deputy Director Maria Ellis

Agenda Item 3.4 – Broadband Adoption & Affordable Connectivity Program

Ms. Sunne McPeak from the California Emerging Technology Fund (CETF) provided a recap of the Impact that the Affordable Connectivity Program had on California. She reported that 2,945,282 Californian households, over 50% of eligible households and 1 in 5 total California households, were enrolled in the ACP program prior to the program freeze on February 7th, which included a total of $1,668,542,768 in total ACP support. Ms. McPeak also provided information regarding the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) customer complaint process post ACP, the importance and impact of direct notifications, and lessons learned to accelerate broadband adoption and digital inclusion.

The following CBC members made additional comments:
- Commissioner Darcie Houck

Agenda Item 4 – NTIA IIJA Programs Update

Deputy Director Scott Adams from CDT and Deputy Director for Broadband from CPUC Maria Ellis provided updates of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) Programs.

Deputy Director Scott Adams shared a recap on the State Digital Equity Plan (SDEP) Implementation and Capacity Grant Program Design. He then reported out on the Digital Equity Capacity Grant Program Structure which includes the NTIA as federal grant administrator, CDT as state grant recipient, and the three buckets under the CDT: Centralized Services, State Agency Digital Inclusion Efforts, and Digital Equity Capacity Sub-Grants.

He shared the Allowable Uses of Funds as written in the NOFO including the state's total allocation of Digital Equity Capacity Grant of 70.2 million dollars. He also presented a brief overview of the SDEP Implementation and Digital Equity Capacity Grant questionnaire. Deputy Director Adams encouraged the public to attend the July 30 stakeholder briefing to hear more analysis of the questionnaire and provide additional feedback. Next, Deputy Director Adams

reported on various partner and stakeholder engagement that took place since the last CBC meetings and plans for continued engagement and collaboration throughout the next few months.

Finally, he shared upcoming milestones and a tentative timeline that includes the NTIA Competitive Grant NOFO release date, Native and Tribal Entities grant release date and due date. As CDT continues to engage the public and gather feedback on the State Digital Equity Plan Implementation and Capacity Grant Program Design, the team is aware that some of these dates are subject to change but what to provide approximate dates for public awareness. These dates include a public comment process on the program design, Sub-grant RFA release and finalization date and plans for 2025.

Deputy Director Ellis 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

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.

There were no members of the public that made comments in person

The following members of the public made comments via Zoom:
Natalie Gonzalez
Kevin Sievert
Georgia Savage
Lindsay Skolnik
Patrick Messac

No public comments were received prior to the meeting in the California Broadband Council Email Inbox.

The following CBC members made additional comments:
- Commissioner Darcie Houck
- Senator Steven Bradford

Agenda Item 6 – Closing

Chief Deputy Director Johnson thanked Council members, presenters, and attendees and noted the next meeting is Tuesday, October 22, 2024 at 9:30-11:30am at CalEPA and online. The meeting adjourned at 11:33 a.m.

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

Transcript

Good morning and welcome to the third California Broadband Council meeting of 2024. I am Jared Johnson, Chief Deputy Director of the Department of Technology and Acting Chair of the California Broadband Council on behalf of Director Bailey-Crimmins. We're here today to hear important updates related to the State's Broadband for All initiatives, and the progress being made on the Broadband for All Action plan. Thank you to the California Environmental Protection Agency and their staff for supporting today's meeting. Ms. Nguyen, please start with roll call and review the meeting housekeeping items.

Of course. Thank you. 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. Council members, please announce your presence as your name is called.

Chief Deputy Director Johnson

present.

Thank you. Commissioner Houck.

Here.

Thank you. Deputy Director Green.

Present.

Thank you. Dr. Kristina Mattis.

Here.

Thank you. Chief Deputy Director Kenney.

Present.

Thank you. Undersecretary Tollefson

Present.

Thank you. Deputy Secretary Flores.

Here.

Thank you, Mr. Chisom.

Present.

Thank you. Deputy Secretary Miranda.

Present.

Thank you. Senator Bradford.

We'll come back. Mr. Aguayo

Present, good morning.

Thank you.

We're aware that Senator Bradford is in the waiting room.

Chief Deputy Director Johnson, we do have quorum. Now, 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 your hand feature on Zoom, or raise your hand in person to notify Chief Deputy Director Johnson, to call on you to speak. I will also keep an eye out as well. Please note that there is side-by-side speaker mode view for the best viewing experience when slides are shared as it is right now on the screen. Closed captioning is available. Please choose Closed Caption on your toolbar to select show subtitle when you're on zoom and to raise your hand, please use the hand, raise feature, or if you're calling in, that would be star 9. Chief Deputy Director Johnson, we can begin.

Thank you, Miss Nguyen.

We have a full agenda today, beginning with an executive report by Deputy Director Scott Adams. Next, we will hear a Broadband for All update where we will hear progress on the implementation of the Broadband Action Plan and the Middle-Mile Broadband Initiative from CDT. Last-Mile program updates will be provided by the California Public Utilities Commission and an update on broadband adoption efforts, including the closeout of the Affordable Connectivity Program and its impact to California from the Council. We will then

hear about the Federal Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act broadband program update as it relates to the State Digital Equity Plan and Capacity Grant Program and Broadband Equity Access and Deployment plan. Finally, as Miss Nguyen alluded to earlier, there will be an opportunity for public comment before closing. Would any of the Council members like to make brief opening comments?

I hear none, and there are no hands online. So, we will start with the first order of business. Let's begin with the executive report. Deputy Director of the Office of Broadband and Digital Literacy, Scott Adams.

Thank you, Chair Johnson. Good morning, Council members and members of the public. It's my pleasure to give you a high-level update on our office's progress, you know, on a number of different Broadband for All initiatives since our last meeting. Can we go to the next slide, please. I really wanted to focus on providing an update on five significant accomplishments and progress we've made over the last three months, the first of which is the Broadband Access Point Investment Acceleration Study. The Department of Technology and our office was tasked by Senate Bill 717 to develop a study to further examine the barriers related to the deployment of wireline and wireless broadband access points. Over the last year, we hosted 44 listening sessions engaged with over 280 stakeholder groups to really examine the barriers that were reported by the legislation and to provide recommendations to the Legislature on potential opportunities to improve and remove those barriers. That report was delivered to the respective Senate and Assembly Committees in June. The next item I wanted to touch on is the Affordable Connectivity Program. Obviously, we're well aware of how the ACP, as it's known, was a valuable tool for Broadband for All here in California. Unfortunately, that program is closed. CDT was the recipient of a $750,000 ACP outreach grant. We are closing out that grant and have done so in the last week. What we've done proactively is work with CETF and other Broadband Council members to leverage and transition the Get Connected! California mobilization to focus on really what it was initially established to do, which is to continue to promote low cost offers and support, you know, to address affordability and support increased adoption rates in the State. We will continue to be vigilant for any other developments and new subsidies or benefits that come up that can support local residents. Part of that ongoing effort is to continue the State Agency, Internet Service Provider collaboration meetings that have been taking place on a monthly basis for the last year and a half or so and it's just something that continues to be a priority for us. I don't want to get too far ahead of ourselves on affordability or ACP, Miss McPeak is going to go into that later on in the agenda, on a much more expansive conversation around that topic. Another item that I

wanted to brief you on is just at a high level that we continue to move forward with the implementation of the Digital Equity Plan, which is really you know, setting forward the framework to implement what we've planned and put together with the ecosystem over the last year. That also includes having submitted our application for the State's 70-million-dollar allocation of state, digital equity capacity grants which was done after the last meeting and we're currently in the current and review process. Part of that is really engaging with significant partners and stakeholders, both on overall program design of the capacity grant, but seeking market research to inform any potential procurements, etc. associated with that, and you'll hear a lot more about the Digital Equity Plan later on in the meeting. And then, lastly, what I wanted to touch on, we continue to expand our office capacity to support all the work that we're doing. I wanted to highlight some new faces that are helping lead our growing and expanding team, and the first is Aracely Hernandez. She is our new Digital Inclusion Manager, she's to my left here. Maria Kelly, who is our new Broadband Access and Deployment Advisor, and then James Spencer, who is our Broadband Administrative Manager, and he and his team are really working with our entire staff to develop the overall structure of the Digital Equity Capacity Grant, but also developed the Capacity Sub-Grant Program. So, its good news, wanted to make sure that people were familiar with who they are, because you're going to be seeing a lot about them. But Chair Johnson, that concludes my report, and I'm happy to send it back to you.

Thank you, Mr. Adams, and thank you for sharing the new team members, their names and faces so that we can welcome them to this important state endeavor. Do any of the Council members have any questions about Mr. Adams' update? I'm seeing none in the room. Are there any online? Okay. We will move. we will move to the next topic. Then we will hear some Broadband for All updates, beginning with Deputy Director Adams on the Broadband Action Plan, he will share progress made on some of the items that have been assigned to the Department of Technology and the Office of Broadband and Digital Literacy.

Thank you, Chair Johnson. Glad to be back. Council members and members of the public, I think, as folks have known, just want to take a step back over the last two years or so we've been following a pretty standard agenda, that's a repeatable format to really reinforce that, you know, Broadband For All has been an evolving, you know, program or set of initiatives here in the State for some time, that really kicked off with the Governor's Executive Order was further framed and envisioned and outlined in the Broadband for All Action Plan, which assigned 24 action items to various State agencies and partners, and then really further fleshed out with Senate Bill156 and the Middle-Mile Broadband Initiative, the Last-

Mile programs that CPUC administers. And then, you know, to really stress the importance of, you know, continuing to promote affordability, you know low cost offers subsidies to increase broadband adoption. So, we can go to the next slide. What's important about the Broadband Action Plan is that it continued to set forth a number of you know, efforts to support broadband deployment, broadband affordability, broadband adoption. And these aren't necessarily things that were funded but they're things that were assigned to folks. And, as we reported out in previous meetings, you know, at the end of last year, 18 of the 24 Action Items were completed. But still, even though an Action Item is complete, doesn't mean it's not, doesn't need to be tended to and refresh on an annual basis, because very fluid dynamics. So, we want to report on 3 Action Items that were assigned to CDT. Each one related to either deployment adoption or helping to inform the ecosystem and collaboration. So, the first, Action Item 6, which directed CDT to explore enhancing, permitting at all levels of government. Maria is now heading up that effort on behalf of CDT. We have continued to provide resource updates on the Broadband for All portal which included new guidance from on NEPA, the NTIA provided some critical mapping tools that are going to be helpful to our ecosystem, and we have posted the second version of the local jurisdiction broadband permitting playbook which is super important to augment the work that's already been done at the Federal and State level to support the Middle-Mile on permitting. They've further gone out and have been working in concert with other Broadband Council members. Maria participated in 2 large group presentations of local jurisdictions at the end of April and in May with CETF and then they're planning an upcoming Local Jurisdiction Permitting Webinar with Go-Biz in early September. And this is going to be important, because, as you hear about the great progress CPUC is making putting these last miles infrastructure grants out it's really important for all of us to stress the importance of local jurisdictions being prepared to support the rapid deployment of that infrastructure next slide, please. So, the next Action Item is the promoting and tracking low cost offers and subsidies. We've kind of abridged the nature there, and the intent here was to lead a multi-layer network of digital inclusion activists to promote and track low cost offers. Obviously, we're an adjustment period with the close of ACP. But since our last meeting we've gone back and updated the low-cost offer that we post on the California Broadband for All portal to support organizations and residents to find existing low cost offers that can make home Internet more affordable. We've also worked to create additional enhancements to that tool, to increase user experience, which is, you know, that tool is translatable into over a hundred different languages because it's on the portal itself. And then, as I mentioned, we have been continuing the collaboration with many of the Broadband Council members, the Department of Education, the State Libraries,

CPUC on a monthly basis, which is bringing together State Agencies and Internet service providers. CETF's very critical in that effort to make sure we're aligning and leveraging, you know, communications, channels and distribution networks to make sure that you know individual residents are aware of opportunities to get affordable broadband next slide, please. And I think, lastly, wanted to share highlight over the last couple months, Action Item 21 directed the Department of Technology to develop a Broadband for All portal that would serve as a central repository of information and tools for the ecosystem to support the achievement of Broadband for All. We have done, a number of content updates, including updating the language on the homepage updating the Digital Equity Plan pages, including providing some of the data from the online survey and the digital equity ecosystem mapping tool that was gathered during the planning process over the last year, as I mentioned, the low-cost offer finder and permitting. But we've also had up on that portal is a broadband grant funding finder that works to put together all the State and Federal funding opportunities that there are for folks who would be interested in getting that. And Maria and Aracely are really heading up that effort on a regular basis, working with Go-Biz on that. Some planned content updates of note, and this comes from a lot of our stakeholder engagement is we'll be building an archive page for the Broadband for All monthly email updates on the portal itself. That'll be all text HTML, so it can be viewed in in over a hundred different languages. And then we're working to establish a digital equity ecosystem resource finder. We've done a lot of user testing with stakeholders, etc. but that's going to be an important tool to support folks in achieving Broadband for All. So that is my update, and I'm passing it back to you, Chair.

Thank you, Mr. Adams. At this time, if I may, I'd like to acknowledge that Senator Bradford has joined us. Mr. Bradford, it's nice to see you this morning and thank you for joining the Council meeting, and also Ms. Sunne McPeak from the California Emerging Technology Fund has joined us. Thank you, Sunne. Do any Council members have questions for Mr. Adams' updates?

None in the room. I don't see any hands online. So, we will move along to the next update. The next update will be on the Middle-Mile Broadband Initiative from Deputy Director Mark Monroe. His team and the broadband partners have made great strides over the last three months to move this historic project forward. Mr. Monroe.

Yes, good morning, Chair and members. Mark Monroe, Deputy Director for the Middle-Mile Broadband Initiative here at CDT. We appreciate the opportunity to provide a brief but important Update on the MMBI project this morning. First, as most of us have likely been tracking in addition to the current base funding of 3.87

billion dollars, the Administration had been hoping to be able to provide an additional 1.5 billion dollars for CDT to build out more than, 10,000 miles of the MMBI network. However, due to a significant budget shortfall, the Administration and the Legislature had to reduce budgetary funding across a broad range of state programs. But while the 2024 Budget Act ultimately did not include the additional 1.5-billion-dollar augmentation that many of us had been hoping for. It did importantly preserve the full 3.87 billion dollars in current base funding previously allocated for the program. We expect this preservation of funding to help the State achieve most of the State's original Middle-Mile broadband connectivity goals. The budget package also included legislation, SB 164, which requires CDT to prioritize construction of MMBI segments that connect to locations with last mile grant funding from the CPUC's FFA BEAD and CASF programs consistent with CDT's overall strategy to date as we'll discuss in a few minutes. CDT believes that this can be achieved within the MMBI's current funding level. Also, we note that the budget includes additional reporting requirements and permits the Department of Finance to augment the MMBI budget by up to 250 million, should additional funding become available. I want to jump to the next slide. Given this new budgetary reality. CDT, I'm sorry. I think we're jumped ahead. Can we jump back? Yep, okay. Maybe it looks like a slide missing. I apologize for it. We'll stick with this one. Given the new budgetary reality, CDT still believes that existing resources are anticipated to be sufficient to develop the MMBI network to reach the FFA grant locations that plan to use the MMBI network. CDT continues to work closely with CPUC and to align the MMBI network with these FFA grant locations to support these last miles connectivity, this Last-Mile connectivity and CDT in partnership with Caltrans and Golden State Net continues to make progress in moving to installation along MMBI network segments. As we look for every efficiency in providing Middle-Mile connectivity to the FFA Grant locations as well as the many other communities in between along the MMBI network route. So now we can jump to the next slide. So as noted at previous Council meetings in developing the MMBI network CDT. Has broadly used several key factors as decision criteria. From the beginning CDT has targeted the unserved and underserved locations throughout the State as identified by CPUC per SB 156, consistent with these locations, CDT was able to identify segments that could be developed faster and a lower cost than stand-alone construction through RFI squared partnerships. These contracts were signed for lease, joint build, and purchase contracts for more than 6500 miles of the network most of them signed this last year. Similarly, CDT. Applied for additional federal funding from the National Telecommunications and Information Administration or NTIA for specific segments of this network. And last year CDT was awarded 73 million dollars in NTIA grant funding to build these segments. So, the MMBI network includes all of these

segments as well and most recently as noted. SB 164, was passed as part of the 2024 budget, restating the broad goals of SB 156 by specifying that CDT prioritize the segments necessary for connecting to Last-Mile projects with grant awards from CPUC, including the FFA Program based on these decision criteria, CDT believes it will be, will, in fact, be able to achieve most of the State's Middle-Mile connectivity goals by using existing funding to build out, to reach, to reach all FFA grant locations that plan to connect to the MMBI network estimated to be approximately 8000 miles. In a moment, I'll show the map that was released at last Friday's quarterly MMAC meeting. But before I do that, I also want to review how CDT has validated the MMBI decision criteria outcomes by considering other important criteria. This includes the geographic split between urban rural and tribal areas with 27% of the network serving communities in urban areas and 73% serving unserved communities in rural areas. Both the 10,000-mile map and the 8,000-mile map maintain this geographic distribution. CDT also reviewed the MMBI segments to verify that even at the 8,000-mile level the network still connects to almost all of the disadvantaged communities identified through SB 535 Cal-Enviro Screen. And with that we can move to the revised map. All right. The revised map here reflects the segments necessary to connect to all of the 105 FFA grant locations that plan to use the network, or approximately 8000 miles. Regarding CPUC's Last-Mile grant program most of us will be tracking that 484 FFA grant applications for last mile project funding were submitted to CPUC this past year. Of these 105 applications indicated the intent to connect to the MMBI network. As discussed, the 2024 budget requires CDT to prioritize construction of network segments necessary to connect necessary for connection to Last-Mile projects with grant awards from FFA BEAD and CASF programs. Of these programs, the FFA grant program is the one is the one grant program for which CPUC currently has open rounds. FFA grant applications are currently being evaluated by CPUC. One or more rounds of approval recommendations have already gone to the Commission for votes, and the CPUC will be providing updates on this program. I believe the map here reflects how CDT expects to be able to reach these FFA grant locations within its existing 3.87 billion dollars in funding as noted. And here you can see the resulting routes and how it connects to the FFA Grant locations which are identified in blue. These blue locations here should reflect the 105 that would connect to MMBI. If we can jump to the next map for reference. The map here is the same one we just saw. CDT's approach will utilize both Caltrans construction and the RFI squared partnerships the State is negotiated. This resulting MMBI network is expected to be approximately 8000 miles as noted, it will reach all of the FFA grant locations planning to connect to MMBI per SB164 and will provide connectivity to other communities along the route, as well as most of the unserved, underserved communities originally identified by the CPUC.

And we understand that a lot of people will want to be able to zoom into their respective regions to get a better view of how this revised map reaches the FFA grant locations, as well as reaching the other last mile locations that will benefit from the network. And to that end CDT updated its online interactive map yesterday, a week earlier than normally scheduled, so that the public and stakeholders can get a clearer view of how the MMBI network will support Last-Mile projects in their respective of regions. And if we jump to the next slide, regarding how the State will develop the MMBI network to reach, excuse me, FFA grant locations under existing funding. We can see the component types being used here on the first line, we can see how CDT had originally hoped to develop the larger network. And we can also see how more than 700 miles of additional leases and joint build partnership opportunities are expected to be identified this year. We can see how these partnerships will be vital for CDT to construct the approximately 8000 miles MMBI network needed to reach the FFA grant locations that will depend on the network. And while most of these new RFI squared partnerships are still being finalized, we anticipate signing final contracts over the next couple of weeks. And then, lastly, if we jump to the last slide as a reminder, in addition to the market sounding CDT did earlier this year, which led to the so the solicitation for an operations TPA that is currently underway. CDT is also continuing its market sounding effort to talk to potential Last-Mile entities which anticipate using the MMBI network. CDT is conducting the customer outreach to understand how stakeholders want to use the MMBI network to confirm and solicit feedback on the range of services that would be of interest and would best meet the needs of communities and to establish a communications channel to ensure feedback loops are in place as we move forward. Central to this effort has been a customer survey that has gone out to potential last mile users, such as local governments, ISPs and anchor institutions. While initial survey results were pulled on July 10th and are currently being reviewed the survey remains open and we encourage any potential users of MMBI network to scan the QR code here and provide input. All of this engagement will be memorialized in a public customer sounding report that we plan to present at the October MMAC meeting. and that ends my project update for the MMBI this morning.

Thank you, Mr. Monroe. Excellent progress being made on the nation's largest open access Middle-Mile network. And it's exciting to see everything that has happened since the last update in April. Do any Council members have questions for Mr. Monroe?

I see a hand up from Senator Bradford.

Thank you. I appreciate it and good morning. And while I'm glad to see that progress is being made on deployment of middle mile facilities and making last

mile grants, I note there has been a distinct lack of investment in the Los Angeles Basin and the lack of investment comes, even as the CPUC maps show that the urban core of Los Angeles is home of the largest portion of the most disadvantaged households that remain unconnected and though we, the Legislature, passed Sb 156 almost three years ago, my district has seen, hasn't seen, I should say, any major investments stemming from that legislation. So, I just need to know, as we move forward, what steps is the CPUC And CDT taking to ensure that funding opportunities and state investments equally address the connectivity needs of communities that are historically neglected portions of Los Angeles area? And let me note, many of these areas are not low-income areas, but they are black and brown areas. And it's surprising that that service is not there where those communities are black and brown. And I give an example, on the map you can look at Crenshaw Boulevard, which runs from Hancock Park, one of the wealthiest neighborhoods on the west side of Los Angeles or north northwest, I should say, and it runs all the way to Palace Verdi's Peninsula. But when you go along Crenshaw Boulevard, and you enter what is predominantly African American and Latino communities that service drops off. So, I just don't understand how that happens. So, for those last mile projects in Los Angeles, I'm counting on the deployment of minimal in LA. So how do CDT is working, I should say, how is CDT working to ensure that its deployment plans align with the last mile provider needs?

Yes, thank you. And so, CDT works with the Public Utilities Commission first of all meets certainly weekly, if not daily, to coordinate on what the FFA grant locations look like, and so given the locations that intend to connect to and MMBI the network that's being presented here would connect to all of those. And I want to note that we've got an important partnership that we're working on with LA City Bureau of Lights to do a joint build down the 110 corridor which will, I think, go through, or is close by, a lot of those the communities that you referenced.

Thank you, Mr. Monroe.

I'll just be clear. The one channel is nowhere near Crenshaw Boulevard. You're talking about almost a 5-and-a-half-mile difference from the 110 freeway to Crenshaw Boulevard. More than 5 miles. Matter of fact, that's 6 miles, the 110 freeways east of there. Crenshaw Boulevards on the west side of Los Angeles.

Yes, no, I'm sorry. Yes, I understand what you're saying. I was just noting that we do have that 110 corridor has been part of the network. But yes, that's the in developing 8000, mile network. It does get to and it does get to the FFA grant locations that are going to connect to the MMBI.

Okay, thank you, Mr. Monroe. Are there any other comments, Miss McPeak?

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to follow on Senator Bradford's question a little bit. I actually am pleased to see Sb 164 and the focus on prioritizing to last mile. That's been an approach, as I know. You're aware, Mr. Monroe, that we have advanced. But I actually want to 1st ask a technical question. When I look at 164 I can't, I can't actually tell what code was being amended, because I think I'm looking at the right bill, which is the budget bill? Right? Is that true?

So, SB 164 is actually Budget Trailer Bill. Yes, so I think the if I remember, served me correctly. I think AB 107 was the 1st Budget Bill, and I want to say, SB 108 was the budget, one of the budget bill Juniors. But those are the budget bills. And then with those, as I think you're very familiar with is that the there's budget trailer bills, and SB 164 was one of those I don't have the actual code section here, but I'm happy to perform.

Just because I seem to be so slow and trying to catch up and understand. I'll follow up Mark to get it, but then the larger question is, so, what is the additional lens that went into the new map when you applied the concept of prioritizing Middle-Mile segments for high priority Last-Mile deployment. And, as you've heard me say many times, there's two kinds of priority Last-Mile areas that are hardest to reach. They are the rural remote, including all the tribal land and the high poverty urban areas. Senator Bradford is talking about other communities that also are underserved, although not necessarily high poverty. But how just could you elaborate on then the process you went through to apply this new lens?

Yeah, absolutely. And I should probably just want to clarify in terms of, I don't know that I characterize is a new lens. It's a new requirement. It's a lens that that CDT has already been using right. And so, we have been tracking, working with the Public Utilities Commission, and we've been, you know, very closely since last year to identify and re-identify which FFA grant locations would connect to the MMBI. And so, we had already, we already knew where those locations were. We were already working towards how to get to those. The real change here with the budget is that without any additional funding, the funding we have is just, I would argue barely sufficient to reach those FFA grant locations. So, there's not, there's not any extra funding to kind of go anywhere else. It just is sufficient to get to those FFA grant locations.

All right. Maybe I want to do one, if I might, Mr. Chair, one follow-up question, and perhaps even Commissioner Houck could want to comment on it.

So let me just for a moment drill down where I start and forgive me, I'm a simple-minded farm girl here. So I look at as an example in Los Angeles, where we've got high poverty, urban areas. And there's also Crenshaw Boulevard as a major

thoroughfare that probably already has a lot of fiber running in it alongside it, etc. But I would go to the communities that are most in need, and then figure out sort of back into the Middle-Mile based on last mile needs. I'm wondering how that is actually playing out.

I'm sorry. I'm not certain I understand the question. I think we all understand that in urban areas, such as Los Angeles, there is a lot of existing infrastructure, but it's not open access, or is otherwise not affordable. And so that's the reason for the need for the MMBI is to develop an open access network that is going to be affordable, and that will provide the support. The current infrastructure is, I'm just going to say, not providing.

So, I think you actually took my question that might have been convoluted did a great response to it. The point I'm about to make is that as opposed to as opposed to looking at only the middle mile solution, it is working from the last mile solution for the high priority areas. And I would consider what you would need to do along Crenshaw, perhaps part of a last mile project, and not necessarily what you're going to get to with all of the middle, with the limited middle dollars that you have. So I'm trying to understand how that might work and asking anybody who can enlighten me. I'm not. I'm just asking a question here. And I want to comment. I'm sure that Senator Bradford could help us on getting, you know, cooperation on open access from those providers who have facilities.

Yes, yes, I will before...

You don't have to comment, Mr. Monroe. I made the comment. Yes, okay, cause I have all confidence in Senator Bradford, as I'm looking at a smiling face to negotiate the best deal for our residents.

Thank you for that confidence, Miss McPeak.

I have total confidence in you, Senator.

Likewise.

And I think those are all good points, and one of the reasons the FFA grant for last mile. If you're using FFA money to fund portions of middle mile, it has to be open access, and so we are trying to get as much open access as possible. We are constrained, I think, at this point, with the rules and the laws that we have to force private carriers to open their Middle-Mile. But if we could have more open middle mile for existing infrastructure that would definitely go a long way in stretching the funds we currently have. I know our staff are working very closely with CDT on these issues. We're also working very closely with the applicants and the counties where the biggest needs are. And I think that the staffs have been working very

hard to pivot with changing circumstances, both in regard to funding the budget issues and trying to work as quickly as we can. But we definitely are prioritizing, trying to get money to underserved at risk communities as in urban areas as well as rural and tribal areas, and then I'll give an update on where we are with the last mile funding. But to the extent we can continue to collaborate and look at how to stretch these dollars as far as we can get as much middle mile that's opened as possible and get these communities served as soon as possible. I think that's critical. This is one of the most important investments the state is going to make in in this generation, and it is critical that we get all of these communities connected. If they're going to be able the individuals living in these communities need access to Internet, as we see to access health care, education job applications. Everything is done online. And we need to make sure everybody's connected.

If I may, I understand this is an important point for the Middle-Mile Broadband Initiative, and the discussion is welcome. We do have the Middle Mile Advisory Committee, which also occurs quarterly, and that is really a deep dive into everything that is happening on that front. I know Mr. Monroe, in our last meeting, was able to speak to many governments, to Government partnerships and other opportunities for cost, sharing, and things of that nature that are coming through our RFI squared procurement. And we're going to be excited to show progress on that as we move forward. But if I may, I would like to see if we can move along to the next agenda item. Do we have any other comments from other members. Thank you all for that important discussion. Next, we'll move on to the California Public Utilities Commission on the Last-Mile programs. CPUC has many last mile grant programs that work in concert to the MMBI and support last mile connectivity to homes and customers. They have been very busy lately and have exciting news to share. Commissioner Houck.

Thank you. Please go to the next slide, and I also want to note that we've got Maria Ellis, our Deputy Director for Broadband, who's joining us virtually, and she may have more specific answers when we get to questions. But I just wanted to recognize that she's online and the excellent work her team's been doing to move these programs along. So, this first slide provides an overview of our last mile programs at the PUC, our Broadband Equity Access and Deployment program is 1.86 billion dollars awarded by NTIA from the 42.5 billion dollars that the Federal Government allocated nationally. These funds are for planning infrastructure and adoption, starting in 2024. And we're currently in the challenge process where NTIA and we're looking at having NTIA has approved our volume one and we're currently in the process of getting our Volume Two approved. Maria's going to talk about this in much more depth. So, I'm not going to go into a lot of detail on that

program for purposes of my presentation today. Our California Advanced Services Fund program or CASF 136 million dollars for fiscal year 2024 to 2025. This program funds, broadband infrastructure and adoption and low-income, low-income housing, tribal communities and unserved areas of the State. And it has the adoption program, the public housing line program line extension, tribal technical assistance funding and our infrastructure program. I'm also going to talk about our Loan Loss Reserve Fund. We have 50 million dollars allocated for this year which we're really pleased to see. I know, with the budget issues, here was discussions about zeroing that out. But there is 50 million dollars that's going to help stretch our dollars farther. This program provides collateral to local government tribes and nonprofits to finance their own broadband infrastructure. And I'm going to talk about program updates, awards and upcoming activities and a future slide. And then I'm going to talk about our last mile Federal funding account, which I'm sure all of you are interested in, which is the 2-billion-dollar program that funds last mile, broadband infrastructure projects. And it's has funding for that's been allocated for every county, and I'll discuss where we are with the recommendations and awards for that program. So, if we can move to the next slide. So I'm going to start out talking about our FFA program. This is part of a multi-strategy project for expanding broadband investment in California that includes the Middle Mile Broadband initiative that we just heard about, our technical assistance to enable new entities and providers to develop proposed projects, Last-Mile Federal Funding Account is intended to equitably make funds available for every county. And then we've also got our loan loss reserve program that I'll talk about a little later that enables innovative public financing that multiplies broadband investment. So, the first Federal Funding Account or FFA application cycle closed on September 29th, 2023, and the PUC received 484 grant applications from 63 distinct entities. An application was received for every county in the State with a total of more than 4.60 billion dollars in requests to fund Last-Mile broadband infrastructure projects to connect unserved Californians. So, an objection period ran from October 23rd to December 18th, 2023. Altogether. We received roughly 900 objections during this period, and nearly 900 applicant responses to those objections. So, I'm going to talk about the awards under the FFA program, which are, in addition to the 106 local agency technical assistance or LADA grants, which totaled 50 million dollars that were issued to nine tribes and 97 local agencies. These grants were awarded to cities, counties, joint powers, authorities, and utility districts, and they enabled NTIA applicants ranging from countywide, expedited, permitting to formation of joint powers, authorities to engineering and project design. All but 2 counties across California received LATA grants and almost all recipients of these grants either submitted applications or partnered with an applicant for through the FFA Program. Let's see if you could

go to the next slide. Okay? So, this slide shows grant awards and recommendations. These NTIA awards represent comprehensive on-time investments implementing the vision of the Broadband for All initiative and multi-year broadband investments. In addition, the program combines Federal and State dollars and recommended reward. Awards are rolled out by county approximately every 2 weeks. You'll see from here that the Grant awards and recommendations provide end user service to unserved locations. The program goals are to ensure equity, affordability, open access, middle mile allocation of projects by county, and please continue to watch for proposed awards for public comment on a rolling basis. We're issuing these out roughly every 2 weeks and there's recommendations by counties. The Federal funding account awards, in addition to technical assistance, they include Alameda County, Imperial, Lassen, Plumas, San Francisco, and Sierra Counties were recently awarded funding from the Last-Mile program, and they're going to benefit 193,200 Californians to date the FFA program again, as indicated on this slide has awarded 105.3 million dollars for 14 projects in approximately 6 counties. Those counties are shown in green on the map. Here all 14 projects connect to publicly funded open access, middle mile 9 of the projects specifically connected to the MMBI and the MMBI has been again, as we talked about earlier, a crucial component for these projects to buy down and make possible these projects serving disadvantaged low income and high cost communities, and, as I stated earlier to and to the extent any portion of middle mile is funded through the FFA, it would need to be open access. so go to the next slide. Thank you. So, in regard to recent and pending awards, we have 95 million dollars for ten projects to eight providers in five counties that benefit 247,000 Californians. These awards have been issued for public comments and are represented by the orange County. The Orange County counties are in orange on here, not Orange County in the graphic on the Slide. The earliest the Commission may adopt these awards is the August 1st voting meeting. The upcoming awards, build on the approved grants that benefit nearly 200,000 Californians, and overall, the approved and proposed grants. There are 24 grants in 11 counties that collectively benefit close to half a million Californians and represent a diversity of approaches and communities. These awards range from grants to Fort Bidwell, Indian Community in Modoc County. That includes approximately eight million dollars of middle mile to connect the remote tribe to the State's Middle-Mile, and to grants to Golden State Connect Authority in Imperial County that will likely leverage additional funds with the Lone Lost Reserve program. In addition, we've recently approved at our last voting meeting grants to urban area projects in the Bay Area, building off local government investments that will connect MDUs in disadvantaged areas of Oakland and San Francisco. So, we were really pleased to see those awards get approved at our

last meeting. And one additional thing to note is that the Middle-Mile MMBI has been transformational and enabled many of the FFA applications and awards that would not have been possible otherwise. And they've been able to provide the providers that have submitted grants connecting to the Middle-Mile have been able to provide service that again, otherwise wouldn't have been able to be provided such as tribal and public providers, and Alameda, Imperial Modoc and San Francisco Counties. It's really made a difference, and we anticipate that the MMBI will benefit other programs such as the NTIA Tribal Connectivity program, our CASF infrastructure and BEAD programs and make other programs more effective and efficient.

So again, I encourage you to continue to watch for awards as they come out every 2 weeks. We recently issued an award that will be pending for a vote at our late August meeting that is recommending approval of 12 applications for grants, for up to $143,305,978 million from the Last- Mile Middle Federal Funding Account for projects in Mono, Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Mateo, and Riverside Counties, and would provide service to an additional 15,435 unserved locations. So we are issuing these as quickly as we can, and again are working with local applicants to make sure that that the programs are going to meet the needs of the customers that need to be served. So please go to the next slide. Our Loan Loss Reserve Program, again, this provides collateral to local governments, tribes, and nonprofits, so they can receive a more favorable borrowing rates in terms of bonds, loans, and letters of credit for the deployment of publicly owned broadband infrastructure. As I mentioned earlier, we have a 50-million-dollar allocation for the program and the budget, and we are going to be looking at and evaluating the applications that have come in. And we received the application period closed on April 9th and we received 40 applications for over 430 million dollars. So, in advance of the 1st financing window, the PUC held outreach education sessions to ensure applicants could learn about how the program would work again. We've got 50 million dollars of funding this year, and while this is a smaller pool of funding than we anticipated, we are committed to maximizing the impact of this 50 million dollars and look forward to the program enabling the multiplier effect of bond-funded network buildouts and demonstrating the impact and value a larger pool of funds could provide in the future, and we anticipate that these funds will be awarded before the end of this year. Next slide, please. So, our California Advanced Services Fund continues to serve as an important tool to support digital equity and the goals of Broadband for All in California. Again, the programs under this fund include our adoption program, our public housing program infrastructure and our tribal technical assistance. And on this slide, again, grants for digital literacy and broadband access projects are part of our adoption program. Our January 2024

cycle has been awarded in our next application deadline is January 2024. The adoption account provides grants again to public entities and community-based organizations for digital literacy and broadband access. We received 61 applications requesting approximately 7.4 million dollars, and for the July 1st application cycle, we received 68 applications requesting over 12.7 million dollars. Our public housing account provides grants to build networks, offering free service to low-income residents in communities such as tribal farm worker and public housing developments, and we received 21 projects requesting approximately 1.3 million dollars for the January cycle for July 2024 cycle. The PUC received 36 applications requesting over 2.7 million dollars, and in March we issued a Decision 2403041, which expanded eligibility for public housing developments to other specified housing entities, including mobile parks. The decision also expanded the scope of cost eligible for reimbursement in low-income communities and provided tenant protections. To make sure low-income community residents continued to benefit from these subsidized investments. Our infrastructure account provides grants to subsidize the cost of Last-Mile and Middle-Mile infrastructure to expand high quality communications throughout California, and on June 1st, 2023, we received 73 applications requesting 527 million dollars. So, there is a lot of interest in these programs. The PUC has awarded 3 projects in June of this year under the infrastructure grant totaling 40 million dollars. We also have our tribal technical assistance program which provides grants to assist California tribes in developing market studies, feasibility, studies and or business plans which support tribes to improve the communications on tribal lands and in the vicinity of tribal lands. Decision 2403041 previously mentioned in regards to the public housing account expanded the tribal technical assistance program to increase the award threshold for each applicant from 150,000 to 250,000 and the decision clarified support for infrastructure with minimum speeds of 25 megabits per second download and 3 megabits per second upload and for the April 1st cycle we received 3 applications requesting 750,000 and our next application cycle for the program is October 1st, 2024 , please go to the next slide. So again, we continue to review and approve applications for the programs under the CASF account. Since 2008, the CASF has helped close the digital divide in California by providing grants to build and expand broadband facilities. And we've awarded over 1200 projects for over 448 million dollars. Our infrastructure loan in line extension accounts we've awarded 105 infrastructure loan in line extension account projects since 2008 of which 93 last mile hybrid projects provide broadband access to 66,390 estimated potential households, and the overall total number of potential households served when including the Middle-Mile projects, is 322, 682. Our tribal technical assistance program has awarded 72 Tribal Technical Assistance projects for 38 tribes to

provide technical assistance again, for the areas I discussed earlier market studies, feasibility studies, business plans to help tribes to improve communications. Our rural and regional urban consortia account. There are 15 active consortia groups that are facilitating CASF infrastructure applications or assisting in broadband deployment projects related to programs created under SB 156 and AB 164. And these consortia have proved invaluable and helping promote and work with communities to ensure these projects are implemented, and we have our broadband adoption account. Where we have awarded 454 digital inclusion and broadband access projects serving 399,900 participants in 48 counties since 2008 and our public housing account, we've awarded 508 projects connecting over 24,300 affordable housing units across 31 counties since 2008 and have provided digital literacy training to 122 project locations with approximately 28,400 residents in total. Next slide. So, this is our allocation for the different programs under the CASF fund that was just recently adopted by the Commission. So, this is our 136 million dollars, and we have roughly 36 million for adoption, 3 million for consortia 1.2 million for line extension, 60 million for infrastructure, 30 million for public housing and 1.5 million for tribal technical assistance which totals our 136 million dollars for this fiscal year. So, with that, we'll take any questions. And just really excited about all of the work that that we're doing.

And thank you, Commissioner Houck, for those exciting and important updates on your last mile programs. Do any members have questions about Commissioner Houck's update.

You wouldn't.

Ms. McPeak.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, Commissioner Houck, I do want to congratulate the Public Utilities Commission, for now, a year ago, April one, having put in place the new collection methodology for the California Advanced Services Fund. So, thank you. Cause you were now getting the full collection and with this budget we have the full authority. You have the full authority to expend. So, it makes a huge amount of difference. It's doubling the money this year, which is what I really wanted to acknowledge and commend. So, thank you. I also wanted to ask a question for a quick question on clarification. So, on FFA impact, the impact is expressed in terms of Californians. I want to make sure I'm understanding that's a projection of actual people. It's not the households or locations reached. Is that true? Or is it not?

It's the, I believe it's the locations is what we are looking at. And so I maybe mixing and matching because and Maria can also clarify as well. But I think we are

talking in some terms regarding the households, and in some we're estimating the number of individuals, but it does make a difference. So that is a very good point. And I see Maria just came on board, and may want to clarify or correct if I misrepresented.

Yes, so according the funding is really allocated by location. That is how we have to report also to the Federal Government, because those are, that we are also using for the deployment of the Federal Funding Account. And so we base it off locations. But we do understand that those locations are actually people. There are people living there and working and so we do have a rough estimate of what we think the population in those broadband serviceable locations are that we are funding those BSLs and in addition to that, there are, there's a greater number of population that is also benefits from the overall project as it's passing through. So we have a number, we really look at different measures is one-the number of locations specifically, because that's tied to the funding number, two-the population in those unserved locations and three the general population that will benefit from that overall project in that.

Well, this is a I'm really glad I asked this question because I was, I actually was inferring that it wasn't locations when you, you know, have the combined. For example, green and orange, 440,000 Californians that's really based on your response, Commissioner and Maria's 440,000 locations, most of which are household generally, that is going to be at least two and a half times the number. You know, the people impacted that are directly in the area, notwithstanding that there will be others outside the area that benefit from having that infrastructure. So I appreciate getting that clarification, because I will be reporting to others. So I want to know. Thank you very much, and I also want to acknowledge that I think when I was looking at the map, I knew you would announce the but the commitment to of almost 39 million here in Sacramento. But it wasn't Sacramento County wasn't colored in so. But you but you announced it. So I think you're actually making decisions faster than the map is being updated, which is a good thing.

That is true, I believe, and Maria can verify that this map does not include the counties that are on the most recent resolution that was just issued yesterday.

We submitted these slides a little bit earlier last week to have them tight it up for this week. And the resolution dropped yesterday, I think, in the afternoon. So we haven't had a chance to update this. But on our website everything is up to date, and you can track all of this on the Federal funding account recommendations and award website.

Well, congratulations to the Connected Capital area, broadband consortium and the PUC and Valley Vision for all their work to get the money secured. or you have to vote on it. But it was announced.

Yes, it's out for public comment.

Thank you, Senator Bradford. I saw you come off mute. I want to make sure we have time for your comment or question.

Yeah, I just want to circle back on the public housing situation. It said it was 508 projects as an author of a bill 11 years ago, when I was still in the Assembly that provided 30 million dollars for public housing Internet and broadband connection, I'm not aware of a single project. So how are you defining public housing? Because it's not the Pueblos or Nickerson Gardens or Jordan Downs that are in the city of LA or in LA County. So how are you describing public housing? Because none of those facilities have been connected.

And, Maria, do you have specifics on the exact projects? I have a list of the total dollar amounts and the awards. But do you have A more detailed response than maybe I'd be able to provide to Senator Bradford.

Certainly, we do. So public housing, of course, includes multiple dwelling units that has the recent changes that folks are aware of expanded that definition to also include unserved communities and areas, including farm work or housing. I can definitely, I don't have that exact of all the projects on top of my mind but I'm happy to follow up with a list of the projects specifically in the Los Angeles County area so that you could see which have benefited from the CASF program.

I would really like that, because again, I authored a bill in 2013 that set aside 30 million dollars specifically for public housing projects, those governmental entities that have been built since the fifties, and as you drive by any of them, at least in LA County, all you see, is satellite dishes on the side of those buildings because they're not wired. So that's what I consider public housing, and that's what that money was for, you know 11years ago, and we haven't seen any implemented, any of those projects being implemented. So, I'm just curious on of these who's included in that. Thank you.

Do we have any other questions or comments? I'm hearing none, so we will move to our next topic.

The next update will be on the Broadband Adoption and Affordable Connectivity Program from the California Emerging Technology Fund, who will also report on the successful collective efforts of California Broadband Council members and others through Get Connected! California mobilization to connect California

residents to the Affordable Connectivity Program. While the program has closed and has had a huge impact on California. Miss McPeak will share about lessons learned and how our collaboration can support the implementation of the State Digital Equity Plan. Miss McPeak.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and if we go to the next slide, you'll see the big headlines in those beautiful boxes prepared by the department. I just want to say the farther we are away from the freeze that went into effect in February, I think the more appreciation we have for the collective work and collaboration that happened in California and in terms of how others around the country are looking at the experience of all the 50 states and territories, certainly the performance in California stands out with over 2.9 million households being connected. that is over 50% of the households that were eligible. We had 45% of all households that were eligible. And, as you see here, 1 in 5 of the California households of all California households actually enrolled in the Affordable Connectivity Program. What that did in locations throughout the country is, in addition to getting people who were otherwise unable to get online because they couldn't afford it, it circulated a lot of stimulus in the community. Economically, almost 1.7 billion dollars came into California in 2 years because of the collective work. So it is a huge economic factor that can drive a stimulus in a local economy simply by being able to get folks online. So now, going to the next slide, there is a process in place that the FCC has their consumer complaint hotline, if you will and you also can email, but you have to be online to do that. So being able to actually make the phone call is important. And I will say that they're actually very responsive. We're using that a lot. And our network of digital navigators, community-based organizations who are assisting households that did sign up for ACP who want to, now, if you will, transfer over to an existing more affordable offer from an Internet service provider. They are calling to say, "How do we do that?" and then there are those who are now finding out there was something called the Affordable Connectivity Program, and they are particularly irritated to agitated over, "How come I can't sign up now?" So the FCC is actually very good in in walking folks through, even though we also explain that to them when we get those calls. The QR code is there if you want to look, you know, take that and be able to connect to the complaint center at the FCC. Going to the next slide, what we have learned, which is really important is what we're calling collectively the direct notification process, which means a credible source. A credible source being generally a public agency, a state agency, a county, a school district, the industrial utilities actually are credible to the customer who gets a letter because nobody wants their lights shut off. If they get a direct notification that they were eligible for a particular program, it actually stimulates the most activity. So we should not, you know, even though we're viewing this in the rearview mirror, we

should not miss this whole point about that power of direct notification. We were able to get to the 2.9 million in California. It was the Department of Health Care services and the California Department of Social services that did repeated direct notifications to their Medi-Cal and CalFresh CalWORKs recipients, to our knowledge, and we've reached out to all the other States that have that were high performing. No other State did direct notification, as was done by our state agencies. At least when we ask the broadband leaders that we've interviewed in those other States was direct notification done to a person, they come back and say no, they did other things. They had to high performance, but not this. So once again, California was on that cutting edge. And this becomes very important, because that 4th bullet is that we are in very productive discussions at this point with the Federal Communications Commission to share data from those large public assistance programs that qualified people for ACP as to who signed up, and it would only be a sharing of a household for which, for example, the California Department of Health care services has all the confidential data on everybody who's enrolled in Medi-Cal - the 8.9 million households enrolled in Medi-Cal. The only issue is can then the FCC say, these are the medial folks who signed up, or these are the folks under food stamps or CalFresh, who signed up, what does that do for us? It allows us as a state to target those who did sign up with the message of here's how you do the migration over to an affordable offer, and those who didn't sign up which were 2.9 million that we never reached who are the most disadvantaged, the most economically fragile that we still need to get to close the digital divide in California. We can really focus on that part of the Caseload. So going to the last slide, what we have come to learn is that there have to be several arrows in the quiver. There's no silver bullet, as Carol Whiteside, the late Carol Whiteside, who's the founder of CETF, used to say, "there's not a silver bullet, but there's silver but shot." Which means you can, you know, you have to have sort of a constellation of effort in Deputy Director Adam's presentation on the Broadband for All action plan action 21, you said, we're making huge progress and we're going to post on the Broadband for All website, the digital equity ecosystem resources. And that's essentially what is listed here are the steps we need to do, we, the California Broadband Council you drove and led this whole progress. So the direct notification, when you notify folks, they have to be able to know if they can't enroll themselves, although about % can. Where do they go? So they need to actually have a phone number because they're not online, they can't just go to a website. They have to be connected at that point when they need help through a call center to a digital navigator, someone who can assist them because they know where they live, here are the affordable offers and once getting them connected to the Internet, they actually then can help them get to digital literacy, either synchronous with a CBO real time or asynchronous,

which is a choice they can have, help them find an affordable computing device and then, if they, the CBOs, who are their expertise, is in their community being able to do outreach in language and culture. But those CBOs, actually should not be expected to duplicate what we can do at the state level or statewide at a larger level; flyers, the information about affordable offers that is, on the location finder that Mister Adams talked about. And then, lastly, we know we've got to do more in terms of public awareness. That public awareness, advertising reinforces the message of direct notification. That's to start with direct notification. If you can only start with one thing, but then reinforcing that message is what we want to do. So I think those are the lessons learned that we have culled through all of our experience and again recognize how California led the nation, and that we want to continue to do that to achieve digital equity.

Thank you, Miss McPeak. Do any Council members have questions about Ms. McPeak's update? Commissioner Houck.

I just wanted to thank CETF for all of the work that they're doing here. This is a really important issue that we're going to have to continue to watch. A lot of folks are relying on these programs as we're seeing their increased cost or need for access. And so just really appreciate all the work that you're doing and plan to continue to watch this issue and help out where we can. Thank you.

Any other members? I see none and none online. So with that, we will transition to our next topic. Next item on our agenda will be an update on the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act broadband programs. Deputy Director Adams from CDT will give an update on the State Digital Equity Plan and Capacity Grant Program. His team has been busy with the implementation of the Digital Equity Plan and seeking further inputs from the ecosystem partners and stakeholders on how to design the Capacity Grant Program. Then Maria Ellis, Deputy Director for Broadband of the California Public Utilities Commission will provide an update on the Broadband Equity Access and Deployment program. Deputy Director Adams.

Thank you, Chair Johnson, and to the Council members and some members of the public. It's good to be back. Next slide, please. So wanted to give you a recap Council member on what has occurred at a high level since the last meeting. So on May 23rd we implemented which was the 1st in a series of summer engagements. So it was the state, digital equity, plan and capacity grant notice of funding opportunities, stakeholder briefing, that was on the 23rd. On the 28th we submitted the State's application for the 70-million-dollar state capacity grant to help implement the plan. Now, that's going to be in essence a block grant that comes into the State to implement our plan, and the expectation is that a large

chunk of that money will be used to fund a subgrant program to support capacity of a host of organizations at the state and local and regional level. The next thing we did obviously, engagement and input and bi-directional feedback is an important part of the focus of digital equity. We launched implementation and capacity grant design questionnaire that was out in the field from June 18th to July 2nd. Right now, we're in the carrying and merit review process, where the NTIA, who's administering the grant has gone through a couple rounds with us, and we feel that we're getting close to the finish line of being able to have an award come to California. Next slide, please. So thank you, Miss McPeak, for setting up this slide in your presentation, but one of the things we wanted to stress is, of course, like this Council here is to coordinate all of the efforts that are intended to support Broadband for All , and you have the sort of the policy and the organizing frameworks, the identification of funding, working to improve mapping that is part of the Broadband Action Plan. You have the financial investments and infrastructure at the middle-mile and the last-mile level that were funded, you know, by 156 and a lot of the historic, you know, programs through CASF and now the BEAD program which you'll hear about. It's important that the Digital Equity Plan is going to get a significant amount of funding to augment the existing non-infrastructure related funds that CPUC has mostly been administering through the Casa adoption account. And so what we wanted to let you know is, this is kind of how CDT is thinking about structuring the Capacity Grant Program, and you know, simple diagram NTIA, at the top is the administrator of the program. CDT is the recipient of the program and the administering entity, so, you know, grant administration, digital equity implementation updates to the plan and evaluation. But really thinking of allocating the funds in 3 different buckets, one is centralized services. Those things that Miss McPeak talked about that we heard during the planning process from our ecosystem partners that the State could potentially develop tools and resources to support the entire ecosystem-wide work like procuring a digital literacy training and assessment platform. Developing, you know, statewide campaign materials for broadband adoption campaigns, etc. The second bucket that we're looking at is potentially funding state agency digital inclusion efforts, those that already exist, or those that are starting up or can evolve and the focus there is to really try to leverage the ability of state entities to drive impact for covered populations that we're focusing on at a large scale. Then obviously, the third bucket is digital equity capacity subgrant program, and that would be providing sub grants much like CPUC does with their adoption account, to entities and coalitions to implement the State Digital Equity Plan, and that really focusing on the regional and local engagement around. Providing that digital navigation that Miss McPeak talked about - digital literacy training ongoing tech support things like that. Next slide, please. So I mentioned

the total size of the grant is 70 million dollars. There is the potential for additional tranches to come in the subsequent years. But there's a lot of movement at the federal level. So we only want to focus on the what's at hand, which is the 70 million. And what this slide is intended to do is just to kind of break out the allowable uses of fund is determined by federal guidelines. These are up to numbers, so these are sort of the ceiling on how much can be spent up to 20% to up to and maintain the Digital Equity Plan up to 5% evaluation up to 3% for administrative costs and up to 10% for subsidies. The rest is really intended to go towards programmatic, to fund state and local digital equity initiatives. And so really, what we want to say is, we are endeavoring to structure a program that will reduce the amount of expenses and those smaller, you know, pieces of the pie in the upper right hand quadrant so that we can increase the amount of the pie in the green on the left hand side, and really get it out to as much money that can be done to drive Broadband. For all that, I really appreciate Miss Alice's comments and the conversation that you know we have infrastructure that's about pipes and conduit and fiber, and you know, last mile deployments are about locations. But we're really, we're talking about human beings and individuals that are, you know, seeing they're connected at home, that they're connected to affordable devices, and that they have the skills and training that they need to improve outcomes. Next slide, please. So I mentioned the questionnaire that we put out there. Obviously, we don't want to develop the subgrant program or implement the Digital Equity Plan in a vacuum given that so many folks contributed to its making. So we issued the questionnaire to ask ecosystem partners and subject matter experts specifically about centralized services, specifically about certain issues related to the capacity subgrant program like an allocation formula; should we use the NTIA's formula or go beyond that criteria evaluation. Even some administrative preferences given that it's our intention to try to make this an accessible program for folks to use. And then, lastly, really wanted to ask this stakeholder community and our partner community how we could do a better job of on stakeholder engagement, but also in collaboration. That was one of the central themes that came back throughout the entire Digital Equity Planning process that in order to do this, there's so many moving parts, so many critical partners that are here, that collaboration is key. So that was really the focus of our questionnaire. Can we go to the next slide, please? This year, it is a bit of a seeing eye chart, but we got about 94 responses from 29 different counties that completed the question. There were also eight respondents from California, native tribal communities, and four from out of State that represented large nonprofits that work in the space in the State. And so really, we're endeavoring to try to get a perspective across the State and all geographies. Next slide, please. This here is a breakdown of the kind and type of

organizations we've heard from to presence folks to the, you know, 70 million is a very significant amount of money. Based on the eligible entities described in the NTIA NOFO, or Notice of Funding Opportunity. There's potentially 9,000 eligible entities in California. We're trying to design and structure the program so that can be equitable but also not dilute the funding to continue to maximize its impact. But in order to do that, we wanted to get input from a variety of different types of organizations and this slide is just intended to show that you know, in addition to advocacy groups, broadband consortia, which are really these unique entities here to California, national, regional, statewide CBOs, city governments, etc. that we are hearing from different kinds and types of folks that would potentially apply for funding. Next slide. In the interest of time, we're not going to go into the findings of the survey, but we do want to take the opportunity here at the Broadband Council to promote our next stakeholder briefing, which is, going to be on July 30th, from 2:00 –2:30 p.m., where we will go into some of the findings of the questionnaire and further engage with stakeholders because there are a number of questions we'd like to ask folks based on their responses, and just really would encourage folks to attend. Here's a QR code here, and we'll make sure to send out a reminder email to our ecosystem partners. Next slide. On the partner and stakeholder engagement, I think it's just important to demonstrate that we continue to go outside of where only our or CDTs sponsored events to meet entities where they are. We do attend large group presentations. There's a handful here. We were at the California Broadband Summit, the League of California Community Foundations and really partnered with the CPUC and CETF and a couple other entities for the California Advanced Service Fund public housing opportunities webinar. We're also continuing to do a number of market research and listening sessions with a number of entities here. So we know some folks like to speak out in public, and others want a more intimate setting, and our office makes our sales available to as many stakeholders as we can to make sure we're better informed about the needs of the program. We're designing to meet the communities. Next slide. Again, a big thing to stress here is that we built the Digital Equity Planning program with PUC and CETF and other Statewide members to underscore engagement and collaboration, and to meet folks where they are. There are a number of ways that individuals and entities can stay engaged in both further program, design and implementation of the Digital Equity Plan. These are just a few of them. There's the stakeholder engagement, you know, meeting series that I spoke about the listening sessions. There will be a public comment period for the subgrant proposal. Sometime in the fall we will reinstate the digital Equity implementation group, the alchemy of working groups exploring a community advisory group to bring in individual voices of members of covered populations. Not, you know, to make sure that their voices are heard, and then a

whole host of other opportunities to connect. There's a QR code here if folks want to subscribe to the Broadband for All email updates where we endeavor to inform folks again of all the work we're doing, and that concludes my presentation.

Thank you, Mr. Adams. Do any Council members have questions?

I have a quick comment.

Miss McPeak.

Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I'm impressed, Mr. Adams, that the distribution of the questionnaires you got in was pretty representative and getting 24% from Los Angeles County, which is a quarter of the population. Very good. So just congratulations on that outreach.

Thank you. Yeah, we're pleased with the response. And really, I think we're even more excited to re-engage in person with folks next Tuesday to further ask questions about what we've learned. I want to apologize and thank you, my staff, for reminding me if we got to pull up the presentation deck. There are 2 more slides that I needed to make sure that the public was aware we provided to the members. The upcoming milestones we want to make sure folks are aware of is that the stakeholder briefing series is going to continue through the summer and into the fall until we start up the Statewide Planning Group. The folks should be aware that NTIA is going to be launching a Digital Equity Competitive Grant program that individual entities within the State can apply directly to them, for this will be another source of funding that will land at the end of July, and also be a source of the stakeholder briefing we're having on July 30th. Please anticipate the state capacity, grant award being made sometime, you know, in the next month before the end of August. There is a NTIA native entity grant specifically for digital equity that will launch in September, and then the State capacity subgrant program will be launched in 2025. The next slide. Here is sort of on one timeline a lot of the information that I had already shared with you. I'm not going to go into detail on this just to tell you that there are a lot of sequential steps here along the way, and we are endeavoring to be as specific as we can where specificity, you know, where information allows that, and we're not we're providing ranges, but we will continue to evolve this timeline and keep you all aware of the progress and the necessary steps moving forward. Now that does conclude my presentation.

All right. Thank you, Mr. Adams, and just acknowledging the team that is working diligently to keep us organized and on track here. So appreciate that, with the last slides I just want to pause and see if there's any new comments or questions

that may have arisen. Not seeing any, so we will now move to Deputy Director Maria Ellis, who will provide us with a BEAD program update.

Can everyone hear me, alright? Alright! Moving on to the next slide, then. So this is just kind of take us back a little framing around where we're at with this program, the broadband access Broadband Equity Access and Deployment program, otherwise known as BEAD. In last year in June the NTIA, the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, announced that it would be allocated to California 1.86 billion for the implementation of this federal program. Part of those require the requirements of that it was that we want to submit what is called an initial proposal to the Federal Government by the deadline of December last year. And that the initial proposal, it was split up into 2 portions, Volume one which deals with challenge process which I'll talk about in a second, Volume 2, which is the outline of the solicit, that subgrantee solicitation process. We did, we submitted those and got approval for Volume One from NTIA in April, and then the Commission adopted rules for that adopted that in May, and we just opened our challenge process formally on July 8th, which I'll talk about shortly. One note is that you know this program, you know, is a bit more prescriptive, I think, than the other programs that we administer here at the CPUC. And so we have we are closely following the guidance and approvals from the NTIA as we are implementing getting approval for both of these volumes is really important. And we can't move forward without full implement to full implementation until we receive both approvals. Next slide. So this is just an overview. We've shown a timeline. This is a bit more detailed timeline than the one you've seen in the past. This is some of the work streams that the CPU see is working under. So I've talked about the planning documents that included the 5 Year Plan that we submitted last summer, and then the initial planning documents, Volume 1 and volume 2 that were submitted in December. Again, we received the approval for Volume 1 in April and are still awaiting reapproval for Volume 2. The important thing to note there is that the approval of Volume 2 starts at 365-day clock by which the CPUC. Will have to move through completed if completed, challenge process, if it hasn't done so already, if we haven't done so already as well as open the solicitation, cycle review applications identify, propose subgrantees, go through negotiations if needed, wrap all of that up into what is called final proposal and that is also submitted to NTIA for approval. So all that has to happen in a 365-day window and NTIA has to approve that final proposal before the CPUC can make formal grant awards. I'll talk about, I'm going to go over even more in depth about what the challenge process includes, but it's just worth noting that we are following the model challenge process, which is 120-day process outlined by seat by the NTIA. Started on July 8th and we'll be accepting challenges through August 6th. We expect deployment, you know, you know we're expecting the approval

of Volume 2 to sometime in late fall or late summer, maybe early fall and you know, as part of that if we wrap up 365 days later, roughly around that same timeframe late summer, early fall, we expect some deployment to be able to start in 2025. Next and we've been doing a lot of outreach, I think, just related to the challenge process alone. We've had webinars different office hours. And since the start that was all kind of leading up to the opening of challenge process so that people could be informed. But now that the challenge process is up and running, we're holding almost weekly office hours for folks that are interested in learning more about how to participate in that process. Next slide. So here, just want to talk a bit a bit about what that challenge process is, and why it matters. We're conducting that 120-day challenge process to determine which locations are served unserved and underserved. But the final decision on the challenges is made by the NTIA. So unlike the CSS Programs, the California Advanced Services Fund programs or the Federal Funding Account where objections are made to applications after they are submitted, the NTIA has set up a process that this kind of turns out on its head a bit. So we have, we were given a map by the of federally identified locations that were eligible to start for funding, and they are allowing states and stakeholders in that State to challenge that map and challenge those locations prior to the opening of the applications and solicitation window. And so what will happen is that through that challenge process we will, individuals are able to submit permissible, you know, challenges to either to either flip a location from served to underserved or unserved. But we can't add locations or subtract locations. And then the eligible challengers are the tribal governments, nonprofits, broadband service providers that are able to a lot, issue those challenges. And then, you know, after the challenge process is complete, we will submit a map to the NTIA with a result of California's challenge process and all of the supporting data. And the NTIA will work to validate all of that data and the results up to 100% and then they will either accept or modify our challenges and our outcomes, and then they will return a map to best that has the final map for solicitation. After that we'll open that the solicitation window, and there will be no challenges to applications, because we've already gone through the challenge process for the locations. Next slide. This is really my last slide, and it's a bit more detailed under, you know, dive into what the challenge process timeline is. That's that 120-day window so you'll see that we're going through August 6th is the time where we are taking those taking those challenges and then, after we gather those challenges will be in that evidentiary phase where we will be able to either provide rebuttal answers to those parties can provide rebuttal answers to that time. Then we'll enter the final determination phase which will resolve remaining challenges that are left unsolved. This is also for 30 days, and then we'll take a final decision and send the proposed list of eligible locations to the NTIA for their final approval on

their review. We are told by NTIA that the process, for, once we submit, our information will take roughly 30 to 60 days for the NTIA to validate the data. What you see here is the assumption that it takes 45 days somewhere in the middle, so we anticipate we could get our map back from the NTIA, the approved map from them in December, mid-December, which would put us into a solicitation window at this, you know, early in the next year. That concludes my brief update, hopefully on BEAD, and I'm happy to take any questions.

Thank you, Ms. Ellis. Do any Council members have questions?

I do. I know you would be disappointed, Jason. So thank you, Deputy Director Ellis. I'm just blown away by the complicated process that has been set up by the Federal Government. How much of that is actually in IIJA?

Can you? I would love to understand that question a bit more...

Well, my question is, and I'll maybe I'll just leave it as a rhetorical comment, I wanted to know how much of that back and forth was actually spelled out in the enabling legislation. The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act versus detailed this process of going back and forth between States and the federal government because in two years, when, you know, when we're having this review again, I'm going to ask: to what extent did all of this actually improve the product? No answer required right now. You're welcome to comment on it, but you know I'm just, I just think it's an unbelievably complicated process without a focus on results or outcomes.

So I would say a couple of things, certainly. So there are certainly this is coming from that, the funding is coming from the IIJA, so there are stipulations and rules related to that that are incorporated into this program, but also the notice of the funding opportunity, which really is the thing that this State of California responded to be able to access these funds and be the, you know, the administrator of these funds for the state, that really outlines the rules for the program. So it's the notice, if you will, at that's our what we live and die by. Here is that Notice of Funding Opportunity which really outlines all of the rules that the Federal Government has outline for this program. And then, in terms of goals, I do think there are some logical goals. That the federal government has put into this program. Are they easy to accomplish? Absolutely not, but do we think that we are, the word going to be able to deliver? Yes, we have to deliver, which is that we have to be able to find coverage for 100% of the locations identified for this program. So for context, the location, the number of locations identified as eligible for this program are amongst the smallest is the smallest universe of locations that are across all of our programs.

And I'm confident that you are making a very good effort. I'm commenting on the Federal requirements, not what you will be able to do in California. Notwithstanding those constraints.

Thank you, Ms. Ellis. Thank you, Miss McPeak. Not seeing any other comments, so I believe next we will move to our public comment period. Miss Nguyen, will you please provide the public comment guidelines, and begin public comment.

Of course, to ensure everyone who wishes to make a public comment has the opportunity to do so. We respectfully request one person per entity and 2 minutes per person. The order of public comment will be in-person comments, zoom and phone comments and email comments submitted prior to the meeting. No email comments received prior to the meeting, so we will begin. We will start with the first person in line at the podium. I do not see anyone. Next, we will hear comments from Zoom via hands raised, or for a call in, please press Star 9.

Natalie, you will be unmuted now.

Thank you, members of the Council, my name is Natalie Gonzalez, and I'm here on behalf of the Digital Equity LA Coalition and the communities most impacted by the digital divide. You're a dedicated group of local advocates focus on advancing all forms of digital equity. Our coalition is committed to ensuring that community experiences are accurately reflected on the BEAD map. Our coalition has been actively engaged in the BEAD challenge process. We have about 30 community partner organizations, municipal orgs, philanthropic education and private sectors across LA County, working diligently to analyze the data. Despite our efforts, we are consistently met with a system that is not designed for community needs. Communities have invested significant time and resources without compensation, hoping that they can find data that demonstrates what they have heard from community members about lack of access to reliable Internet. Our efforts are community driven, often relying on the work of local task forces and larger working groups from navigating the challenge process to finding a fair ISP partner and securing capital matches. Marginalized communities are asked to do too much with too little. The likely consequence, historically, marginalized communities with the most need will receive the least support. There was a strong will to get this right, but the process remains flawed. Urban and dense population areas are not receiving their fair share of resources and attention. The BEAD map often fails to capture the true extent of the digital divide in both urban and rural communities. This is simply communities uplifting their experiences and wanting to ensure that those in power overseeing the bead funding are aware of the local level experiences from where this is funding will be the most impacted. You have the power to rectify these disparities and ensure fair resources to

allocation. We urge you to find ways to improve funding to local communities, to improve broadband availability data in their communities on the State's maps, because there are high barriers to changing the data on the CPUC's BEAD map communities where the map overrepresents availability will not get the feed funding. It needs to close its broadband gap. As such we urge the State to utilize the state tools in its funding toolbox, such as the Casa Broadband infrastructure grant program to invest in communities where BEAD funds won't. Funding local communities to improve the accuracy and comprehensiveness of their data and create a more inclusive system that generally considers community input and experiences. Thank you.

Thank you. May we have the next person, please?

Hi, Kevin, you're allowed to unmute now.

Thank you. My name's Kevin Sievert. I'm with ta fiber to the home equipment manufacturer, and we have quite a few customers in California, and we're supporting them through this BEAD program. Just wanted to provide it to provide a couple of comments. First of all, on the timing, I would, I would request that you keep in mind that the NTIA has said that the approval time for the challenge process is, you know 30 to 60 days, but you know I'm sure you're well aware that Louisiana submitted their challenge results in January, and have yet to receive approval for that. So I would just make sure that you're you let everyone know that that schedule is very flexible and dependent on NTIA which has no, you know, legal requirement to respond within any certain time. The second point to address, maybe one of the questions about you know the, the complexity of this, this program? I will say that, yeah, there are, there is some of that complexity that is going to cause issues for small and medium service providers. And I would, you know, I'm hoping that the State will look at opportunities to alleviate some of those burdens for the small medium service providers, because I believe, you know, those are the ISPs that are going to make the difference in this space. I was leading the North Dakota Broadband office for quite a while, and I can tell you that the regional ISPs in North Dakota is the very reason why North Dakota is one of the best-connected states in this in the country. The other thing is there are going to be parts of this process that are absolutely critical and I do want to just emphasize the importance of ISPs taking part of the challenge process I've seen in many states across the country where the reporting to the FCC has been overstated by ISPs, and there's a there's a well-known understanding that the FCC map is flawed. And so, this is the chance for the State to get it right. There is a little bit of a hurdle to get the evidence in, but I just want to encourage all of ISPs big and small to not only look at their areas and make sure it's represented correctly, but then also go out and identify anyone else. Yup.

Thank you for the comment. Your 2 minutes are up. May I have the next person, please?

Georgia, you can unmute.

Great. Thank you. Good morning, Council members. My name is Georgia Savage, and I am the Deputy Director of Oakland Undivided. I would first like to thank the CPUC commissioners and staff members for recommending and approving the Oakland Connect Project, which is the city of Oakland's NTIA Last-Mile Grant. The city and our entire coalition are incredibly grateful and excited. As we will begin connecting some of the least connected areas in our county. We are encouraged to see the State prioritize community driven projects in the highest poverty communities and implore you to continue to do so with billions in investments still to be made. We were also excited to hear at the MMAC meeting last week that CDT planned to publish an updated map on Monday. So yesterday, showing which segments are part of the 8,000 miles confirmed with existing funding formerly known as phase one. Could CDT please confirm that the segments currently appearing on the interactive network map are confirmed with existing funding? We urge you to actualize the commitment to the 18 initial MMBI projects promised to communities in 2021. In Oakland, that's the I-580 portion that runs through East Oakland. Caltrans completed pre-construction of this segment, and this segment is included in our NTIA Last-Mile project. We're here in partnership to make this proposed investment a reality. Like most historically marginalized communities, Oakland residents are wary of promises of future investment. So it is crucial that CDT publishes this map publicly for all stakeholders to see. Thank you.

Thank you. May we have the next commenter, please.

Hi Lindsay, you may now unmute.

Hi! Can you hear me?

Yes, we can.

Awesome. Hello, members of the Council. My name is Lindsay Skolnick. I'm here on behalf of the California Alliance for Digital Equity. We are a data dedicated group of California based nonprofits, philanthropies, academic institutions and advocacy organizations focused on advancing all forms of digital equity. First, I have a clarifying question relating to this week's MMBI map update similar to the one Georgia had. Is the latest version of the MMBI map on CDT's website, the final mile map with the existing 3.87-billion-dollar funding? If the answer is yes, it'd be helpful to have more detailed information regarding the projects that are a part of the map and those that were left out ideally by comparing it to old versions of the MMBI map so communities have a clear understanding of the adjustments

without having to dig for archive data. We also suggest providing further information on the map updates during this week's MMBI stakeholder meeting. In an effort to continue increasing transparency and accountability on the MMBI, we feel it is vitally important that final map changes are clearly outlined and broadly communicated. Second, I wanted to share that Kate is pleased to see 250 million potential future dollars included in this year's budget for MMBI, though we remain disappointed that the promised investment to fully complete the network did not materialize. Securing additional funding for this project is an important step toward reaching our collective goal of closing the digital divide. Equally important is prioritizing, spending first where it is needed most. We are eager to see CDT transparently rely upon a criteria that ensures the funding is deployed in a way that prioritizes needs of the most persistently disconnected residents in the State, paid, recommends using a criteria that considers recent surveys and census data showcasing where high poverty majority, non-white neighborhoods are, as we know, income and race are the top predictors of broadband access. Thank you for your time and consideration of my comments.

Thank you. I see that there's more hand.

Alright, Patrick, you can unmute.

Good morning, Broadband Council members. My name is Patrick Messac, and I'm speaking today on behalf of Oakland's diverse and vibrant digital equity coalition. First, I'd like to reiterate our community's deepest gratitude for the partnership with the CPUC to help actualize the legislative intent of SB 156 by funding the Oakland Connect Last-Mile Project. It has been quite a journey to arrive at this moment, and we're grateful for the willingness of the Commissioners and staff to grapple with the legacy of divestment in historically redline communities. I'd like to specifically thank Commissioner Houck for taking the time to come to Oakland and to listen deeply and empathically to the concerns of our students, family, and civic leadership. Thank you for seeing us. As the counsel is named, this is a once in a generation infrastructure investment of which FFA funding is only one component, and I'd be remiss not to mention that the NTIAs burdensome requirements will make it virtually impossible for any marginalized communities to meaningfully participate in the thirty-day BEAD challenge process, underway, currently. Between Oakland and Fresno alone, we have over 15 million Internet speed tests and we won't be able to submit a single one, because the process is absurdly complex. We recognize that the CPUC is constrained by the NTIAs model guidance, but I just encourage us to be clear eyed about the limitations of this $1.87 billion, given that it will be based on a structurally and demonstrably inaccurate map, by no fault of the CPUC. Again,

thank you again for our state partners and let's continue to strive to make this generational investment different than all those before it. Thank you.

Thank you. Chief Deputy Director Johnson. I do not see any more comments in the room or online. And so that ends our public comment session.

Thank you, Miss Nguyen, and thank you to members of the public for your comments. Are there any council members who would like additional comments before we close the meeting?

Just really quickly, I wanted to just go back to Senator Bradford's comment on the public housing and again thank him for raising that it's a really important program to the PUC. We know it's important to you as you have really spearheaded this in the legislature, and I just wanted to make sure that we provide here and offer you a briefing to make sure that you get all the information you need about the program, the changes we made, the funding how that's happened and what we're anticipating for the future. So just want to put that out there, and whatever you need from us on the information side, we'd be welcome, being able to provide a briefing to you in your office.

Appreciate it we'll definitely follow up and get that information. Much appreciate it. Thank you.

Thank you, Commissioner. Any other comments? I'm seeing none. So, we're going to move to conclusion of the meeting. First, I'd like to thank the council members and presenters for their contributions today, and to the members of the public for your thoughtful comments. I also want to express my gratitude for those working so diligently to move things forward to close the State's digital divide and foster digital equity in California. Your work is valued and is taking critical steps in laying the groundwork to achieve Broadband for All. Our next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, October 22nd, from 9:30 to 11:30 a.m., here at the California Environmental Protection Agency and online. We look forward to seeing everyone there. With that we will conclude the July 23rd California Broadband Council meeting. Thank you.