<div align="center">Middle-Mile Advisory Committee
April 22, 2022
Meeting Recap and Transcript</div>

The Middle-Mile Advisory Committee met on Friday, April 22, 2022 at 10:00am PST at 10860 Gold Center Drive, Rancho Cordova and via virtual conference.

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and Overview

Chair Nichols welcomed everyone to the meeting.

A quorum for the meeting was established.

Member		Designee	Present	Absent
California Department of Technology	Russ Nichols		X	
California Public Utilities Commission	Alice Reynolds		X	
Department of Finance	Gayle Miller		X	
Government Operations Agency	Amy Tong	Jiwon Jeong	X	
Department of Transportation	Steven Keck	Janice Benton	X	
State Senate	Lena Gonzalez	(Ex-Officio Member)		X
State Senate	Mike McGuire	(Ex-Officio Member)	X	
State Assembly	Sharon Quirk-Silva	(Ex-Officio Member)	X	
State Assembly	Jim Wood	(Ex-Officio Member)	X	

Middle-Mile Advisory Committee Members Nichols, Reynolds, Jeong, and Benton attended the meeting at the onsite location; Miller, McGuire, Quirk-Silva, and Wood attended virtually. Senator McGuire joined the meeting a few minutes after roll call and left a few minutes early.

Reynolds and Quirk-Silva provided comments

Agenda Item 2: Executive Report Out

Mark Monroe reported about work to date, federal funding guidelines, and process to design the system. In phase where determining how to build the network to best serve unserved and

underserved communities throughout the state.

Agenda Item 3: Project Updates

Tony Naughtin and Erik Hunsinger provided the Third Party Administrator update including:
- An overview of middle-mile design objectives, factors, and processes
- A presentation of their recommended statewide middle-mile network design, including an explanation of their recommendation to divide the network into five development regions, an overview of topology, highlights of reach proposed region, and their recommendations for optimizing processes.
- Maps of their proposed network.

Committee members asked questions and Third Party Administrator staff responded.

California Department of Technology (CDT) Deputy Director, Middle-Mile Broadband Initiative, also responded and covered the content he planned to prepare while answering Committee member questions. Mr. Monroe noted:
- The benefits of the Third Party Administrator's proposed approach are that:
  - Caltrans can start the clock on the 18- 24 months of preconstruction work needed before construction can begin.
  - Caltrans can develop and refine its cost estimates to inform build and lease decisions.
- Moving forward
  - The Third Party Administrator will continue developing a map of existing infrastructure that can be leased using IRUs
  - CDT will determine how much the state can afford to build and how much will need to be leased.
- Important next steps include CDT:
  - Completing its review and analysis of the Third Party Administrator's proposed maps and design.
  - CDT providing a final initial "build" map to Caltrans to begin its systemwide preconstruction work.

Rob Osborne provided a California Public Utilities Commission update focused on relative timelines including those for:
- Federal Funding.
- Local Agency Technical Assistance.
- Loan Loss Reserve.
- California Advanced Service Fund.

Hardeep Takhar provided a California Department of Transportation update noting:
- The status of Caltrans work.
- The type of work related to the initial projects.
- Potentially viable projects.

Agenda Item 4: Public Comment

Staff noted written public comments were submitted by (attached):
- David Griffiths.

Written public comments were submitted after the start of the meeting (attached) by:

- Bill Allen.
- Robert Ross.
- Katie Simons.

Public comments were made by:
- David Griffiths
- Philip Neufeld
- Ted Williams
- Lisa Lavelle
- Bill Allen
- Sean Taketa McLaughlin
- Jon Rosen
- Patrick Messac

Closing Remarks

Committee members had no closing remarks.

Mr. Nichols thanked Committee members, staff, and attendees.

The meetings adjourned at 11:25am PST.

(meeting transcript attached; video and presentation slides from meeting posted to Committee web site)

Transcript

MMAC Meeting – Friday, April 22, 2022

Okay, we are now recording.

So, we will go ahead and kick off. Good morning, everyone. This is the April 2022 Middle Mile Advisory Committee. I'm Russ Nichols. I am chair of the committee. I want to welcome everybody to our new hybrid format. As we are coming out of the pandemic area we are going back to in person meetings. So, we actually have a site where people can attend the meetings in person now. We have panelists in the room as well as public seating, and we will be continuing this format into the future. We will probably change locations, so we have a more formal dais and setup for the meeting, as things continue to develop, but thank you for the patience as we adjust our processes and the way we conduct the meeting today. We have a great deal of content that we're going to run through today. Before we do that, we'll have a roll call. We'll also have an opportunity for the committee members to make some addressing comments, and then we'll move on to updates and public comment at the end of the meeting. With that, Jules, can you take roll call for us?

Good morning director Nichols. Here. President Reynolds. Here. Chief Deputy Director Miller. Here. Chief Benton. Here. Deputy secretary Jeong. Here. Senator Gonzalez. Senator McGuire. Assemblymember Quirk-Silva. Here. Assemblymember Wood. We do have a quorum. Before we start the meeting, a few operational matters. For everyone attending in person, we respectfully request that you both mute and turn off the speakers of any electronic devices you may have with you, so we don't encounter any audio feedback interruptions. For committee members and presenters attending in person there are microphones instructions taped to the tables. If you are not a committee member or presenter. Please refrain from raising your hand until the designated public comment period at the end of the meeting to enable time for the presentations. Although for the Zoom participants, the Q&A is visible, it will not be used and presenters, please queue Laura to advance slides back to chair Nichols.

And good morning again as we jump into this, we will start out with an executive report. But before we do that, let me see if any of the committee members have comments where they would like to address the meeting. I'll start with committee members that are in person in the room. President Reynolds.

I did want to update the committee and let folks know that we at the PUC approved a decision on our last mile grant program yesterday. So, this is the $2 billion from the legislature and the governor's package last year in SB156. And this program will enable providers to provide grants in unserved and underserved areas. We've built in a lot of flexibility and we've also built-in incentives for applicants to provide, to come forward with the best projects possible. And we're really looking forward to getting to work to get the money out the door to get grants in place and also encourage local governments and tribal governments to participate. So, it was a really exciting milestone in our broadband efforts. And we are very excited also to work with all of these, the members of the committee, all of our stakeholders as we move forward on next steps. So, thank you for the opportunity to update everyone on that exciting milestone.

Thank you, President Reynolds. Chief Benton?

No, I'm just letting you know I'm sitting in for our interim director Steven Keck because he's *<indiscernible>*, so thank you very much.

Thank you very much. And sitting in for Secretary Tong today, Jiwon Jeong. Thank you. All right, let me transition to the members that are on our zoom feed. Member Quirk-Silva, I see that you have your hand up.

Yes. Good morning to everybody. First, I want to thank the Chair of the CPUC. And the committee, we did hold a last mile hearing about three weeks ago, some of our discussion points, I think, were listened to in the sense of some of the new information that has been put out regarding the CASF grants. So, we appreciate that. We know that the steps that are made, I think some people are going to appreciate we know that there's others that either feel it goes too far or not far enough. But that's part of the job. I do want to say that we as a state legislative body had our spring recess last week. So, I was able to get out to charter spectrum in Orange County and see their operation firsthand, really appreciated that as it was not only informative, but it also had me thinking about a future discussion point not today. But perhaps in another agenda, which is for us to really delve into relating to the middle mile. How is CENIC and the Golden Net going to be looking at sustaining the network, meaning not just once it's moved forward, but in the future, we did see, firsthand, the training facility at Charter and Spectrum, not only what they're doing on lines, but also their workforce, their call center, all of those things that go with providing Internet, and we all know for our consumers, when their internet goes down, the first thing they do want to do is call somebody. So, what is that going to look like, as far as partners in the future as far as not just a call center, but repairing and maintaining. So that that came up pretty quickly as we were able to see all their supplies and parts and all of these things that go with providing Internet service. So that would be hopefully a future agenda item.

Thank you, member Quirk-Silva, we'll make a note of that for a future agenda. Member Wood. I saw a headshake there. I think that's a no. Yep, thank you and Miss Miller. Saw a headshake there as well so thank you, no comments for the opening. With that we will move on to the first item on the agenda. We'll pull up the slide deck. I'd like to introduce Mark Monroe, Deputy Director of the Middle Mile broadband initiative here at the Department of Technology and have Mark do his executive address. Mark?

Alright, good morning. Welcome to our first hybrid meeting here. We're excited this morning, we have I think an important milestone that we're going to be hearing about, as everybody's familiar with our goal here, building out a middle mile network here that really serves all communities in California, and reaches out to the unserved and underserved. And you know, where we came forward there this proposal was based initially on work done by the Public Utilities Commission in terms of identifying unserved and underserved communities and kind of connecting those up with state highways. This is you know as I think we're all familiar with, we had we have some timing, some important timing constraints, we have the federal requirement that the funds be you know, under contract within three years and that the project be completed within five and then we also have the challenge of going from where we're at right now to having Caltrans really go through the pre-construction process and, and design the system. And of course, we'll have the challenge of trying to make sure that the $3.25 billion that is spent goes as far as possible. And so, with that you know, we'll have to, as we get more information, we'll have to decide where we where we can afford to build and where we will need to lease existing infrastructure. So, in terms of the initial location on Utilities Commission has done, gone through a public proceeding, and really helped

provide a good tool there to really identify and clarify where the unserved and underserved communities in the state are. And Caltrans has worked, and CDT and GSN have worked together to, to kind of design what that system looks like in terms of you know the infrastructure that's in the ground and the actual, the actual fiber. And so, we're kind of in this phase now, where we are identifying how, how to how to build a network, how to design a network, that can function as a network that provides the resiliency and, and still was able to reach to reach the unserved community throughout the state. So, Golden State Net is an important partner in this project. And they have they bring what their experience and their years of industry of thinking about this not just in terms of identifying unserved communities and the freeways that connect them, which was, you know, it's a good solid start, but thinking about in terms of that network lens. And so, we have, we asked Golden State Net to put together a map that really, a next layer kind of draft that assumes of the state where to build everything, and what that would look like where which highways, which freeways would that go along. And so, what Golden State Net we'll be presenting here is, is what that looks like, and kind of the methodology for approaching that. Again, it's the initial draft is about 8,650 miles. And it does provide that important network lens for being able to operate as a network. And so, this is going to be important in terms of this will inform CDT how we can then use this as a tool to then move towards having Caltrans start pre-construction, and start that clock on all of the project. And then as Caltrans does that work, it will help us understand, refine estimates, and help us understand how much we can afford to build and then how much we'll need to lease. So, after Golden State Net provides its presentation, we will have some brief updates from Caltrans and from the Public Utilities Commission. And with that, I will turn it over to Tony Naughtin.

Mark, thanks very much. Tony Naughtin, Chief Operating Officer of Golden State Net. I'm accompanied here today from Golden State Net by Erik Hunsaker, our Vice President of Network Development, as well as Ron Hutchins, our Chief Technology Officer. I'm going to be very brief in my comments, which are just introductory really because the bulk of this presentation from GSN will be to review an overview of the entirety of the statewide network based on recommendations we've made to the California Department of Technology. We're presenting statewide middle mile maps for network design we've done. You'll see that we've divided the state into five development regions. We'll provide the overview of the topology and highlights for each such region, I should say. And this will support what we're calling an optimization process, which will be working with our partners CDT to take those recommendations and turn them into final decisions to be made by CDT and where appropriate, for new build construction on right of way handed over to Caltrans in a timely fashion. We can go to the next slide actually. The next slide is a just a header slide I believe. Yeah. So, design process. Sorry, this is a little different than what I was accustomed to seeing but the design of process. Sorry if we can keep going to the next slide. Thank you. Next one after that. Great. Thank you so much. So, the design process is largely a mapping exercise, I think you all know, recommended locations coming from the TPA are significantly anchored around CPUC, recommend routes that were publicly announced quite a quite a while back. We've engaged and continued to engage community groups, and other stakeholders as well as service providers whose input is important for this entire process. The broader recommendations for network development are really derived and based on the 18th initial projects, which are foundational to development of the rest of the network. Also very, very significant consideration of areas that are unserved from current design to build fiber routes and newly construct fiber routes wherever feasible. Obviously, cost and mileage projections are critical to this process. We have a very clearly stated budget with CDT that we're working within so we're trying to cover as much as we can within that budget of course, I'll move to the next slide...design factors. The focus here is

primarily on newly constructed routes for the middle mile network. Of course, wherever feasible we're going to try to do that but at the same time, we've recommended dark fiber and joint builds as well, in order to increase time to service in many instances, and also to make sure as many middle mile locations can be developed within the budget of $3.2 billion that Mark mentioned a moment ago, critically important as a factor in this process to align with organizations, most of them, last mile organizations that are already involved in this effort many of them also of course a cast of funding recipients as well as funding from other grants moving on to the next slide all of this is intended to support an optimization process, which is actually the process by which CDT will make final decisions on where network is supposed to be developed. We're going to begin this process with the CDT as if 100% of network will be newly built. And then of course, work it down from there, newly built where feasible and necessary. In instances where there may be more preferable alternatives for joint build or dark fiber solutions to comprise those segments of the middle mile network, those will be included as well. Joint builds, by the way are builds, newly constructed builds of fiber network with other network providers who are open access network providers themselves, where we can share the cost of newly built construction with a project that is either already underway or about to get underway in order to save money that can be applied elsewhere in this program. There could be of course, many questions about what I've briefly reviewed here. We're happy to take those in this session as time permits or, of course later on. I mainly want to give the bulk of our time to Erik Hunsaker, who is the vice president of network development, who is going to cover quite a bit of ground in about 20 plus minutes, reviewing recommended network elements and segments within the five regions that we've divided the state up into. Erik.

Thanks, Tony. The next slide, please.

Actually, let me let me interject here real quickly. We did have Senator McGuire who was able to join us so welcome to the meeting, Senator McGuire. I don't know if you have your camera on, Katherine if you can enable that for him.

Thank you so much. I'm unable to turn on the camera but grateful to be with you and good morning.

Good morning. Did you have any opening comments or questions?

Oh, as Tony has noted... Yes.

Hold on for just a second.

Yes.

Senator McGuire, any opening comments for the over the table?

No, thank you. Thank you so much. I'm grateful for that.

Alright, thank you. Sorry for the interruption. Erik, please proceed.

Thanks. I appreciate that everyone is able to attend today, this important update. What you're seeing here is how we've kind of broken out the state, there's quite a bit of recommended mileage,

and so we've kind of broke them into five regions. Next slide, please. So, here is the current version of the recommended map or routes for the Golden State Network. You'll notice that there's some changes from the previous update because as we've been negotiating and evaluating, we're naturally stepped through an optimization process. So, what you'll see here are not substantive differences from the original 18 projects, but overall tightening and improving of the network design. Next slide, please. Go ahead and skip that one. Yes, thanks. So, region 1 we'll go ahead to the next slide. This area, in vastly underserved area of the state, prone to outages and fire hazards. You see here that the…we call out the Caltrans districts if you would move to the next slide, please. And here, we're just highlighting some of the research that the CPUC has done for unserved areas. So this includes residential and non-residents from entities who are seeking improved bandwidth or bandwidth period. Some of these areas have no bandwidth at all. Next slide. This was part of the original 18 proposal, you'll see that there's a mix here of construction, identified open access networks that is existing carrier infrastructure that we are aware could be leveraged as a partnership. I think more importantly, there's a pretty strategic opportunity here in the Northwest corner in Siskiyou County and also in Humboldt County. There're some opportunities to partner with *<indiscernible>*, which we've highlighted. So, it's a pretty important development in that to county because it would close out the ring and provide resiliency to their existing network, which covers the entire county. In addition to that, we've identified partnerships with the two largest tribal entities in the state, the Hoopa nation and the Yurok nation who have indicated their willingness to collaborate with the state, Golden State, and figure out how to provide connectivity, which is pretty important to the region because as you can see, it creates a regional ring there. So those are some top priorities for this region. They aren't the final if we go to the next slide. What you're seeing again was the original 18 and now we've moved on to a larger recommendation to increase connectivity along Highway 101 up through to Crescent City, as well as bifurcating some of the larger regional rings. We're well aware that this particular view you're seeing spurs, will be…have to work out connectivity. There are not any Caltrans right of ways to solve that connection. But there's a desperate need for broadband. So, there might have to be some reliance on perhaps last mile, collaboration, either commercial or community collaboration and wireless backhaul for those spurs. But we are aware of those. The ultimate goal is a ring topology to create resiliency and redundancy for the communities. But this represents the current phase in, is a large portion of the 8,650 that Mr. Monroe mentioned earlier. Can we go to the next slide, please? Here we're just overlaying some of the information that we saw previously of the unserved areas and how the Caltrans right of way can be leveraged to meet the needs of those communities. Please continue. Next slide. And here. Yeah, that's fine. Yeah, thank you. What's of note here is that these, these areas of darker lines represent the information that the CPUC has pieced together, mapping the right of way from Caltrans to the underserved areas. And what we're simply showing here is that we've leveraged their research in our network design, we've closed some of the gaps to create regional rings, as you can see from the orange line, but overall, we've leveraged their efforts and research in our mapping efforts. Next slide, please. I think this is just a cleaner version of what we would want to construct. Please continue. So, I've already covered many of these collaborations, the tribal entities and the potential for commercial partnerships, if CDT so desires. Next slide, which I believe would be a reason to continue on. And there's a highlight of what region 2 might look like. Please continue. So, these areas represent a really diverse subsection of the State of California, the Caltrans District 4 Oakland, an area densely populated, but many areas, communities are economically under pressure. And so, the adoption of broadband is a top priority for those communities. In a similar story on the eastern portion of this section, however, it's a very rural area, you know large areas of farming community as well as people who perhaps don't have English as their native language. Continue the next slide. So here,

we're showing, again, the underserved potential you see, particularly in the urban areas, that large communities that represent a potential to connect and put in infrastructure to serve those communities. And then on the eastern portion, you see how widespread and disconnected they are from each other. So, opportunities to create connectivity in those communities is very important. Continue on. So here, was the original 18 projects. And I won't spend too much time on those because you'll see them again, as we step further. Next slide. And here's the current proposal which takes the original 18, and shows to Mr. Monroe's point how, if we construct the entire thing, it might look. So, these routes are under evaluation, you'll notice that they connect to the region to the north and to the region to the south providing interconnectedness between the regions with the ultimate goal of connecting to telecom centers across the state to provide key connectivity. Next slide, please. And again, here are underserved areas and how those prioritize routes will serve or could potentially serve those areas. Next slide. Thank you, and then the CPUC denoted routes. Miss Sasaki, please move on. Thank you. You can go ahead to the next one. Thanks, since time is of essence. And so densely populated areas, sparsely populated areas, mountainous regions, difficult areas to construct. These are areas where commercial entities do not build network because it doesn't have a payback opportunity to them. But broadband services is desperately needed. So, this represents an opportunity to put something in place that will last for generations. Next slide, please, which I believe will go to region 3. Thank you. So, there's a highlight of how we've defined region 3, and next slide will should show the Caltrans districts and I think we can move on. Again, underserved areas. I think this is very similar to the story that was just north in the Stockton area again, rural areas, areas that were that really could benefit from the infrastructure effort that the CDT, the CPUC have defined for potential broadband. If we go to the next slide, we'll see the 18 original. And then let's go ahead and move to the next. And you'll see that that's overlaid by the recommended routes, these additional recommended routes of construction would again tie the areas of need together and bring sorely needed resiliency and redundancy. So instead of having isolated pockets of infrastructure, they would be interconnected. As a total network topology. I want to point out that in one area in the Far East there, the Death Valley junction. Very little broadband in the area, we're anticipating actually quite a bit of demand for that network from mobile carriers and partnerships. As Tony noted before, we, as we've been going through this process to understand the community needs, part of that is commercial viability. And I think that goes to one of the points that was made earlier about ongoing sustainability of the network. So, we've already gained and garnered interest from commercial entities who are keenly interested in leveraging the network as well as communities. Next slide. Here, again, overlaying the underserved highlighted areas from the research that the CPUC has put together. And you can see how there are still areas that need to be served. The plan is that if we cannot reach that in the middle mile effort, then the opportunity to do some additional connectivity, bring the network closer to communities through last mile construction is always a possibility. Next slide. And again, this CPUC middle mile anchor map overlaid, I think we're ready to move on to region 4. We can go ahead and skip this slide. Thank you, just want to point out before we move on to region 4 that, again, an important tribal, the Tule River was on that map, I should have highlighted that I apologize, it was in that area. Severe economic, socio-economic factors are a barrier to adoption of broadband in these areas. And then of course, one of the benefits of Caltrans' construction process of undergrounding fiber is to reduce the risks against fire, fire and other environmental hazards. Next slide, I believe is an intro to "4", if we could move on. Thank you. Region 4 is I guess, in some ways a similar story to region 2 as far as the Bay Area, densely populated urban area. Many, many folks who are under socio-economic pressures maybe the unbanked or folks that maybe distrust commercial entities who need access to broadband, if we could move to the next slide please. Here's just a picture of the Caltrans districts, you'll see the greater LA area and

also Orange County. Next slide please. And again, just reaffirming what I stated earlier. Visually, you can see the unserved areas. This area is, has numerous carriers throughout the region. And many of them are open access carriers or had extremely competitive rates, but they're just not meeting the needs really of the constituents here in this region. Next slide, please. So here was the original 18. You'll see a mix of some middle mile open access network and CPUC recommended routes and then we, in the next slide, you'll see how we tied those together. With their public comment, we've had some additional connectivity drawn into this. CDT under the auspices of CDT and the CPUC, we will be evaluating the appropriateness of all of these routes, very difficult area to do construction, lots of pavements, lots of federal highways, coordination between many entities. But the goal will be to close out the middle mile and reduce backhaul connectivity so that communities and fledgling wireless networks or any other type of carrier could leverage backhaul and a more sustainable business model. Next slide please. And again, overlaying the severe need of unserved on top of the middle mile, recommended middle mile routes. Next slide please. Should be the CPUC anchor routes, yes. If we could move on. There. So that's, again, another picture of our recommended routes. And I think we're going to be moving to the next slide, we'll see some elements that I've already spoken to multiple carriers. Potential IRUs do exist, although construction is certainly a top priority for backhaul and then the need for analyzing which routes we really want to take advantage of and prioritize for middle mile to maximize the middle mile capabilities. I believe the next slide is just a highlight slide for "5" so we can move on, thank you. Here yet again, another diverse region, a mix of urban and rural with sorely needed connectivity, particularly in mountainous regions. Next slide. And here's a highlight, numerous tribal nations in this area. You can see that highlighted in the green there, a very large territory, a very large region with concentrated urban areas separated by mountains. Next slide. And numerous unserved communities, underserved and unserved. Let's move to the next slide, please, Miss Sasaki. Thank you. The original project that we had recommended as just a point of evaluation and opportunity here, represents a mix of construction, potential IRU, some joint build opportunities in collaboration with local area governments. And if we move to the next slide, I'll see…there you go. Thank you. So here is just the iteration and advancement of the next phase that we'll be evaluating with CDT. And so here is if per Mr. Monroe's original comment, what would it look like if we constructed the whole thing? I think there's great opportunities to diversify in some key areas from main carrier routes. In addition to that, there's a potential for stimulating some economic development there on the eastern shores and solvency with potential lithium capacities. And then finally, but not least, an opportunity to really create some meaningful connectivity for tribal nations throughout the region. Next slide. And here's just a reiteration of those pieces. Next slide please. The CPUC recommended routes, I also want to point out that one area of important diversity is inclusive of Blyth on the eastern border there, so diversifying connectivity out of that city, which is sorely needed, and has been a hot topic for those folks in the Coachella Valley. Next slide, please. So, there's the recommended final route. I think we can move on. So densely populated areas, tribal nations, socio-economic factors, all of the same things that we've been discussing from north to south. In addition, there are opportunities to connect to some important telecommute communication centers in San Diego, LA and on up through the state. We have opportunities to collaborate if we want or we can construct, which is the first priority of CDT and the CPUC. I believe that's all my portion, Miss Sasaki can we move to the next slide. So, there's the overall state map. And if you have questions, you can let us know. Thank you, Miss Sasaki for helping me.

Alright. Thank you, Erik and Tony for the presentation. Let me remind the folks that are attending the meeting virtually, we'll have a time at the end of the meeting for public comment. Several folks

have type things into the Q&A section, we will actually call on you if you raise your hand at the end and then you can ask or make your comment at the very end. At this point let me direct to the members of the committee and see if there are questions for Tony or Erik. No one in the room. Senator McGuire, since I can't see the folks on online right now, I will call you directly. Senator McGuire, any questions?

It's just a quick question. Thank you so much. So first and foremost, these maps are incredibly helpful on what that full build out could potentially look like. Had a quick question and I know all of us are going to be a bit biased, and I appreciate your patience that um, have been in conversation during the meeting with a Mendocino County Supervisor and just concern that on the map that the Mendocino County Board of Supervisors were a bit concern in regard to seeing it. Mendocino is not well served, they are not well served, but they are worried that it looked like a high surf County. I just wanted to clarify that on the map if that's all right. And that would be in region one.

Well, we use data from the CPUC. I realize that much of that data comes from federal resources and a lot of it's in dispute. But I do believe we did propose diverse connectivity through Mendocino. Correct me if I'm wrong, but we, you know, we are in an iterative process with CDT. So, under the auspice of Mr. Mark Monroe and Mr. Scott Adams and Director Amy Tong, we're revising these maps and these routes on a quite frankly, almost weekly basis to make sure that we're covering where it's appropriate.

No, absolutely. And I think the one challenge that I have on the federal maps is that if you have a few houses served then it looks like the whole census block can be served and especially in Mendocino Lake, Sonoma, Del Norte County, Humboldt County, we know that we have some of the most unserved and underserved households and regions. I think that would be the one concern that I would bring up the last question I have… I really appreciate your patience. So, can you also talk about build out, prioritizing build out as we move forward, now that we see what a potential system could look like? Talk about those next steps, please.

Yeah, thank you, because you really hit on something that I wanted to mention in my answer a moment ago. So, thank you for giving me that platform. There's two elements of our recommended design. The first is we're putting in a system, which is somewhat future proof in that, instead of designing as most carriers do from point A to point B, we're suggesting that the state have an incredibly flexible network and allow interconnection literally every 2500 feet with Caltrans constructs. So that means that we're ever in the future, any local last mile entity could connect, we want to make it available every half mile throughout the entire state. So, any plans today or tomorrow, we'll have an opportunity to connect to the network. The other thing is, is that there's a plan to have an incremental conduit for expansion of connectivity. And then finally, I want to mention that we're trying to keep the designs of the ring of the network topology fairly tight within 50 miles of amplification sites, and trying to keep smaller rings as much as we can. That's not always possible because of federal land, to afford the last mile entities to connect anywhere they might want to on the network. So, it's a large scale, flexibility and then also, quite literally in the trench, offering connectivity wherever your constituents might want to. Hopefully, that answers your question.

No, it does. It's just the last two comments here and to the rest of the committee. One is, I think, as we move along as well, would love to be able to have some coordination on if we're opening up a trench and there are power lines within that area that are in high fire threat zones, how we could

potentially partner with PG&E to get those damn lines underground since they haven't, how we can push them to do so in that trench. I just hope that we're thinking about that, especially looking at those IOU maps that have been blessed by the Public Utilities Commission, number one. And then the last piece is Miss Miller want to say thank you so much to Gail Miller. She is just a flipping All-Star, along with Mr. Monroe. I know they're aware of this, there is some concern, at least from the Senate working group about the need for additional dollars on the last mile. And when I say concern that we want to prioritize additional funding going into last mile, because we're concerned that there won't be enough in that pot at the moment and would like to be able to get an update at our next meeting on what those thoughts are for the last mile budget. That would be super helpful for us as we move towards the budget.

Thank you, Senator.

Mr. Chair.

Yes, Miss Miller?

And thank you to Senator McGuire. I do think that it's an important piece on the last mile. And I think, I don't know if when the CPUC presents today, they'll be talking about that as well. So, we just asked that, that we also, Senator, I don't know if you heard the President's update on the meeting? Yeah, perfect. Okay, so we have at least the start of that. And then when we do the last mile update, I think it'll be important to do the loan loss reserve update, too, because that will really have a lot of influence into the last mile as well, so thank you for that.

My comment wasn't meant as a, you know, any type of insult to anyone, I just think that as we move forward, I think you speak for our Senate working group, that we're going to come up a bit short and need to be able to put some additional dollars into the last mile. And as times are good, I think we should put those money, those dollars towards it, and especially for hitting the Gann Limit, would qualify and hope for those infrastructure funds. So just a thought and throwing that out there. Thank you so much.

Thank you, Senator. Other members of the committee have questions or comments? Member Wood, I see you coming off mute.

Yeah, just curious. As we start looking at the total number of miles out there, do we have, and if I missed this, I apologize, I got pulled away for a second, but any idea how many miles are going to be built versus how many miles are going to be leased?

So, to answer the question, that, of course is what the optimization process is intended to achieve, is make those determinations of what will be newly constructed versus what will be leased. And also, what could be the subject of a joint build with other open access operators. So, what we're trying to do is emphasize and give priority to newly built construction in that process, and then determine what the step downs are, if in fact, a given locale could be more, more feasibly served with an alternative such as a dark fiber IRU, and really reviewing those case by case within each region. So, don't have a specific answer for that question today. We've been moving forward in conjunction with Mark Monroe and Scott Adams, with a basic assumption that approximately three fourths of the entire new middle mile network development would be newly constructed. So, if we take the approximate 8600 miles times 0.75 that would be a very round answer to your good

question. We won't know the full and final answer until we've worked all the way through the optimization process. It could be more than that. It could be less than that.

So, do we have any timelines on the optimization process?

Yes, we do. We are intending to work with CDT. CDT has given us a timeline where the objective is to try to complete the process by no later than June 30th, so that we can start handoffs to Caltrans either pre-construction process and even prior to June 30th, provide as many of those handoffs to Caltrans for newly built fiber as we can, well before the 30th. So, for example, *<indiscernible>* locations where no fiber network exists today, as well as other locations, we've identified the initial 18 projects that take into account the types of considerations that are required under SB 156, and where those 18 projects are foundational to enable rings and line extensions from the core 18 Foundation.

And if I can jump in there real quick to provide some clarification. So, now that we have this map, we know that the highest priority for us is really to get a statewide construction map that was really, you know, the key part of this exercise is to be able to answer the question, if we were to build everywhere, where would that be? Right, where are all those miles that they would need to build? And so, this answers that question or provides an answer to that question. And CDT will now look at this map and see if there's any route altercations you want to make, or alterations you want to make, if you want to add, if you want to subtract, and just kind of work with folks that have been on that in the next few weeks here, but the idea is to get that map to Caltrans to start their pre-construction work as soon as possible. So, you know, as I think we've kind of become more familiar with, you know, Caltrans has this pre-construction process that they need to go through. A key important part of that is going to be refining their estimated costs. So, when we circle back to the question of how much is going to be built versus how much is going to be leased, the initial answer to that question is, it depends how much you can afford to build, and that thing goes back to those getting updated cost estimates. And so, I think one of the reasons we want to get Caltrans focused on the broader system, and all of the potential areas that we need to build, is so that we get those estimates. And so that, as we move forward in that, you know, in the next year here, and then hopefully, sooner than that, and we start to get those estimates, that's going to help us understand, right, so this map here, for example, it represents about 8650 miles. And so, let's say, we add 50 miles to it, just for round numbers. So, we get Caltrans, a map that says, hey, if we were to build this 8700 miles, you know, go ahead and start your process on that. As we get estimates on that, that's going to help us understand what is that percentage, right. Mr. Naughtin mentioned the, kind of roughly, the three quarters funding level, you know, the $3 billion dollars provided would cover. That assumes we would have to lease the rest. But until we have updated cost estimates, it's harder to determine that. And so then, and now that we have this map, and while Caltrans is starting their pre-construction process, we can have, as Mr. Naughtin mentioned, they can continue their process of identifying, alright, what infrastructure is available to lease, if to the extent that we can't afford to build in various areas? And I think that's the next step in terms of getting to that answer, is to understand how much it's going to cost to build. And then we just did simple math after that, in terms of how much do we need to lease. And then as we're able to identify that, that goes back to the optimization process that Mr. Naughtin was talking about in terms of determining how to stretch the money that we have as far as possible to reach all of those communities.

Okay, so I appreciate that. So, it sounds like a complete map is a ways out because of the optimization process and all the interactions here. So, I would just say, I guess, that one of the challenges, and I'm just putting an exclamation point on something that Senator McGuire said, is that as we start looking at counties, like rural counties, that are really underserved or unserved, recognizing that the cost to get to those counties is going to be significantly higher, probably because of the remote nature of that. We just don't want to forget that there are a lot of folks that are unserved, completely unserved, and hope that that continues to be a high priority for this effort.

Absolutely, and that's, you know, as we look at the optimization process, as you know, there's a number of areas in the state where there is not an option for lease, there's no existing infrastructure. We have to build that. And so, you know, and that's one of the advantages of getting Caltrans started on this process now, is that, you know, we know for a lot of those areas, there's no reason to wait on starting that process, so that we can make sure that we can get it done within the federal time frame.

Thank you.

Thank you, Assemblymember Wood. Assemblymember Quirk-Silva.

Yeah, thank you for that very robust presentation regarding new maps if you want to say it that way. I'm a little bit confused, because we initially had the 18 maps, and now we're having the regions put, if you want to say, on top of that. So, my question is, between the original 18 projects, and now the new regions, do we have a priority of what area we're going to start in, like our number one priority area, and I would concur with my colleague, Assemblymember Wood, that there are some places that, of course, don't have any connectivity, we know that it's going to be more expensive. But, if we don't prioritize those areas, we may well be, and you have heard me say this before, where we get moving, and then we run out of funds. And if we end up, you know, kind of doing a little bit here or there and across the state and don't have these first projects on the list that are underserved or unserved, I should say, then we could find ourselves having an issue. I also agree with my other colleague on we are probably going to have to have more of an investment and that is certainly something that we should think about, I think, as soon as now, knowing that there's only going to be so much expenditure before we run out and then we may be only through half of the projects. But, last I would say is on the leasing part, if we're going to be mapping out how long you can lease for and how much that's going to cost, because what happens after that? I mean, if it's a 20 year, you know, we have to have these long-term sustainability plans. But my biggest question is, are we going to take the regions and prioritize them in order of need.

And so, what I would say to that is that we really want to get the entire network map to Caltrans, and then we can work with them on where are, as I think Mr. Naughtin or Mr. Huntsinger had mentioned, where are any of the areas where we know that there's no other option, right. But we don't have, you know, I always kind of remind people, we have now less than three years to get all of this under contract. And so, we really need to get started on all of it. I think that, and we will be working, as we give Caltrans the map that, you know, if we're going to build the whole thing, this is where it would be. We want to focus with them on where are any of those locations where we know that there's no alternative but to build, and as well as working with Caltrans and identifying where it's going to be the most costly. And as they kind of, they do their work, that's going to help

us prioritize further in terms of if something's going to be more time-intensive versus less time-intensive, I think those are all going to be points of consideration that the CDT will be working on with Caltrans with GSN, in terms of, kind of, moving forward. But, when we talk about prioritizing, we definitely want to get to all those areas that have no other alternative. And I think that, you know, I want to get that map in front of Caltrans, and then we can identify those areas and make sure that we're building there, but we're going to need to be taking the same approach to the rest of the state as well. And then, in response to your second, your other question about the leases, that's a concern we have as well. And, you know, we're looking at spending the one-time funding for, when we talk about IREs, those are standard 20 years, they can be different, but I think that's kind of a standard. That's an important question, because we will need to then either extend those in another 20 years, in which case we would need to be setting aside revenues. Operationally, as this thing moves forward, to be able to pay for those, or, and I think this would be the preference, would be to use some portion of the revenues collected over the 20 year period, to then continue building so that if the intent is for the state to really own and operate its own system, then we want to make sure that, to the extent that's possible, we build that into our assumptions on an operational basis going forward.

And if I may add to Mark's answer, our general approach in negotiation of dark fiber areas is to seek a right of first refusal, which could be exercisable within 12 to 24 months of the expiration of a 20-year term, typically. There will be some instances where that may not be possible, but that will be our default approach, is to try to seek rights of first refusal on those dark fiber areas, so we could then be talking about periods of time well beyond an initial 20-year term.

Thank you very much. Thank you member Quirk-Silva for the question. Just a reminder that we do have other presentations from PUC, Caltrans, and CDT. We are running a little behind schedule. Obviously, a lot of interest in the importance of the maps that have been presented today. So, I want to thank both Erik and Tony for that presentation. Immense amount of work has gone into the planning for that entire map and much more to come as we move forward through that, obviously. With that, Mr. Monroe, did you have additional items to close out that discussion?

I think I've covered all my talking points in this discussion, other than to say, and I think everybody understands, you know, kind of our next steps here, we want to quickly take this map and appreciate all the work GSN has put into it. And we keep moving forward to getting something to Caltrans in the weeks to come here so that they can start their clock, their process. And then based on that, that's really going to inform how we proceed relative to ultimately where we end up building versus where we end up leasing.

Thank you, Mr. Monroe. With that we'll transition over to Mr. Robert Osborn from the Public Utilities Commission.

Good morning. I'm Robert Osborn. I'm Director of the Public Utilities Commission's Communications Division. I'm going to provide an overview of the timelines of the various last mile and broadband program work. Next slide, please. So, this slide covers the public process the commission has undertaken to implement the federal funding account, since it was enacted this past July. And shown on the timeline in August, the CPUC scoped the federal funding account into the broadband proceeding. Between October and December, the PUC drafted proposed program rules. In January this year, the US Treasury released their final rule on the federal funding and as President Reynolds said yesterday, the PUC approved the proposed decision on program rules.

And if the 156 tasked the CPUC with dividing the $2 billion from the federal fund account between urban and rural counties, so 1 billion is slated to go to urban counties and 1 million to rural counties. The decision adopts the utility reform network's comparative analysis with seven methodologies in the record. The decision also made some changes to the scoring criteria and to grant recipient obligations. Next slide, please. The broadband package tests the CPC with awarding 50 million in technical assistance grants to public entities and non-profits to provide service in their communities. The funds can cover a range of costs to deploy last mile broadband infrastructure, including environmental permitting, needs assessments, and strategic plans and also forming a joint powers authority. Eligible award amounts under ministerial review are up to $500,000 per local agency or tribal government per fiscal year. And anything above that would go to commission resolution with a maximum amount of 1 million. On this local agency technical assistance timeline, just want to highlight a few dates. So, in September, the PUC issued a staff proposal with program rules released and solicited comments and reply comments. And this was under the CASF proceeding. In January of this year, the CPUC released a proposed decision, solicited comments and reply comments, and at the end of February, CPUC adopted final program rules. We're in the middle of our outreach efforts, you see on the red dot there. And we are planning to have a public webinar in May that we're scheduling that will hopefully be recorded so that others can watch it. Not necessarily on that very date. Next slide, please. So now switching to the loan loss reserve. So briefly, the loan loss reserve has $750 million committed over three years. The purpose is to assist local governments and non-profit entities to finance and build their own last mile broadband infrastructure. The loan loss reserve will provide collateral to local governments to enable better borrowing rates and terms for bonds issued to deploy infrastructure. Here are some key milestones. So, in September, the PUC issued an amended scoping ruling to include development of the loan loss reserve program. In March, the PUC issued a ruling requesting comment on the loan loss reserve structure, the eligibility requirements financing and reporting. And as that proposal is planned for August of this year for public comment, we're targeting the first quarter of 2023 to vote on and adopt the final program rules. Next slide, please. So, in January the PUC developed a draft program rules proposal for legacy CASF sub-accounts and sub-account allocations, assigning resources to program development and implementation. On March 1st, ruling proposed modifications for the public housing account, the adoption account and the consortia account. The ruling also proposed CASF sub-account allocations and invited public comment on that proposal. On April 13th, we issued a proposed decision on the rules and funding allocation. So, comments are due on May 3rd, and reply comments are due on May 9th, and a scheduled vote is planned for May 19th. So once the rules are approved, the PUC plans to begin accepting applications for public housing and adoption with July 1st due date for the public housing and the consortia on July 15th. And then, for infrastructure and line extension, we're targeting quarter three and quarter four this year. And that concludes my remarks. I'm available for questions.

Thank you, Mr. Osborn. Let me start with the committee members in the room. Any questions for Mr. Osborn? For the committee members that are with us remotely. Miss Miller, any questions or comments?

Thank you, Mr. Chair, just look forward to more information, the loan loss reserve, and how we can help those local communities really be a big part of ensuring service to the areas. Thank you. Assembly Member Wood. Senator McGuire. Not seeing your camera pop on, I'll assume the answer to that is no. Thank you very much, Mr. Osborn for the presentation. We will now move on to Caltrans presented by Hardeep Takhar. Please proceed, Hardeep.

Thank you. Good morning. My name is Hardeep Takhar. I work with Caltrans as the broadband middle-mile network program director. On behalf of Caltrans, I'll be providing the progress update today. Caltrans continues to collaborate with Department of Technology to identify viable projects to build the middle-mile network within the state highway system right away based on the maps that have been provided today. These include the initial 18 project locations open for construction, and also the state by California Public Utilities Commission's middle-mile network map. In order to accelerate building the middle-mile network, we are evaluating existing highway projects that can take on this work, which include highway projects currently in construction, and highway projects to be constructed within the next three years. Existing hybrid projects that we're looking at right now are being screened to avoid and minimize impacts of environmental resources, the need for right of way, existing utility conflicts, and also to see if we can meet the existing project scope and schedule within the timeframe that are set to deliver the middle-mile network as well, which is December 2026. Today, we have identified 74 existing projects that may be viable to add on broadband to the state highway system within the state highway system right of way. The existing highway projects opportunities are not available within the mapping that's provided by Department of Technology and Caltrans is looking into developing standalone projects that are dedicated to build the middle-mile network infrastructure. Caltrans is currently focused on advancing pre-construction activities on these projects that include obtaining environmental clearances. So, we have initiated studies to identify biological and cultural resource impacts, and CDT and Caltrans continue to collaborate to outreach with federal state resource agencies and tribal governments to facilitate these consultations. The purpose of the outreach is essentially to establish early understanding of the permitting processes that will impact timelines and the delivery of projects and find ways to collaborate to streamline and develop mitigation strategies for unavoidable impacts if they are expected to occur. We've also initiated subsurface utilities investigations, and essentially to identify existing underground utilities such as high-pressure gas lines and electric lines that could be in conflict with the work that's being proposed. We're also conducting field site reviews to determine constructability to make sure the construction means, and methods and equipment needed to build a middle-mile network infrastructure is feasible. And in terms of project design, we have developed plans and details for placement of conduit, vaults, and fiber. We're also identifying the placement of conduit and vaults to avoid areas where we can avoid environmentally sensitive areas and existing utilities as well. We've modified existing design and encroachment policies to accommodate the middle-mile network infrastructure within the state highway system right of way to provide flexibilities in the process as well. So, for project locations that are more likely to have challenges with environmental clearance permitting and working around existing utilities, we will sequence the work at these locations with our partners to make sufficient time to address these challenges. In order to streamline the project delivery process and be associated with the associated challenges. In addition to the traditional design build delivery method, we will be taking advantage of alternative delivery methods, which include the construction manager general contracting process with a job order contracting and design, build alternatives, where they're appropriate. That should conclude my presentation. I can open it up to questions. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Takhar. Let me start with the panel members in the room. Anyone have questions for Mr. Takhar? And for the panel members that are with us remotely, Ms. Miller?

Thanks, Mr. Chair, I do think next time from the Caltrans, I know how incredibly hard you're working, but if we could maybe just get an update on timing, that would be super helpful. And then

also, I think on the environmental review, just a little bit more detail on that. And then finally, I'm going to get, I hope, Assemblymember Wood and Senator McGuire on the dig once questions. If we could just talk a little bit about how that's all going to come together in this project. I would really appreciate it. Thank you very much. And I have to apologize, Mr. Chair, I'm actually going to hop off a little bit early this morning. So, I apologize for that, just in about five minutes, but thank you so much for all your time.

And for Assemblymember Quirk-Silva, any questions for the panel or for Mr. Takhar? Or Assemblymember Wood?

Yeah, just thank you to Ms. Miller for preempting my question.

Great minds. Thank you very much. I'm not seeing any other questions. We will move into the public comment section of our meeting. Let me ask Jules to provide the parameters for the public comment process. Jules.

Hello again, in order to allow everyone who'd like to make public comment the time to do so, we respectfully request that comments are limited to one person per entity and two minutes per person. For those on Zoom, please raise your hand to make a public comment. For those in person, please go to the designated area to do so. We will go in order of online submissions, Zoom, phone, in person. And we'll do one more round to ensure we capture everybody. There was one public comment submitted from David Griffith of Alpine County. Mr. Griffith, are you in attendance? I looked for his name and didn't see him. He had some concerns about a specific section from Arnold in Calaveras County to Markleeville in Alpine County and we will attach his comments to the meeting recap.

Jules, he happens to be in the room, and he is approaching the podium now.

Thank you very much. It's good to see everybody, or most of you in person, as opposed to avatars and pixels. The question I have, I guess there's two questions. One is, oh sorry, I should have introduced myself. David Griffith, I'm a supervisor in Alpine County. Current chair of the board. We're working hard on last mile, but can't get very far until we know where and when the middle-mile will be. I know you're aware of the problem and you're working hard on it, but it's frustrating, not just for us, I'm sure for local communities everywhere. And the specific exception that mentioned from Highway 4, from Arnold in Calaveras County, through to Bear Valley, and then Alpine and then on to Markleeville in Alpine County. That's one of the areas where we want to put in last mile, but if the middle-mile is not going to be there, it's going to be hard to do and it seems to sometimes be on the maps and sometimes not be on the maps, which is very frustrating. So I encourage you to think everybody else will, too, because the sooner we can get some confirmation and where and when the middle-mile will be, it will be really helpful. And thank you all very much for all the work you're doing on this. It means a lot to unserved communities everywhere in the state, not just us. Thank you.

Thank you very much for your comment, Mr. Griffith.

Mr. Neufeld, please go ahead.

Thank you. Appreciate this important work and everyone's hard efforts to move it forward to better include those who are underserved and unserved and just want to say Fresno Coalition for digital inclusion as a cross sector collaborative, submitted two memos on February 2nd to the respective middle-mile agencies, identifying priorities for middle-mile and regional exchange in Fresno County. Based on our local knowledge here, this included anchor institutions, county city, Fresno Unified School District Office of Ed[ucation] taking our local knowledge and we've provided that we've also got evidence of under representation of underserved in areas of urban poverty and multi-dwelling complexes. Note that the previous preferred scenarios by the CPUC and the CPUC maps do not reflect reality on the ground relative to the underserved and unserved. We've got an app we built that shows how many of our students are underserved, and how many people in Fresno housing authority complexes, for example, are underserved. Instead of less than 5000 metro Fresno, it's more like 25 to 75,000. So, this substantial data that's been shared with the CPUC are, so our concern is this, our work is informed, well, first of all, our work is informed by current and planned builds of fiber within our region. And we want this investment that's limited to reach as much as possible. We're seeing the maps we saw today. Not attention to the information we provided that hopefully with IRUs and otherwise could reach further. So, our memos are a call for regional exchange. But we received no response from any of these agencies. And today's maps don't seem to acknowledge the public feedback we gave. Albeit it was on February 2nd, it took a lot of local effort to gather that data, to work with ISPs to provide that to the different agencies. So, we'll be sharing that with MMAC, but we want to find some way to have an audience with folks who are building out this future proof network. We know some things about our region, for example, canals provide a right of way that can cut through areas where that will better connect potential middle-mile. And if we don't properly reach areas that need the last mile with an open access middle-mile, we won't have competitive, affordable services in those areas. We're doing everything we can to leverage our spend and increase reach through all the different organizations in our region. And we just ask that we have an audience with the CPUC and Golden State to that effect to make sure that we're on the same page about what we have as good data and local knowledge and that that's shared and heard by Sacramento.

Thank you, Mr. Neufeld. Mr. Williams, please go ahead.

Hey, this is Ted Williams, supervisor for Mendocino County. I appreciate the presentations and the robust discussion. One thing that would help us local government being good partners in this effort is some time estimates. When do we think middle-mile will break ground in our county? And when do we think it'll wrap up and be ready for interconnection with the counties last mile. And I recognize the nature of these projects, the nature of government, those dates will likely change. But if you can figure out a way to give us dates sooner than later to work against, knowing that it's a moving target, I think we can be better partners. Thank you for the opportunity to speak and the discussion.

Thank you. Before we move on to the next person, for those on the phone who would like to speak, if you could please press star nine so we can see your hand raised. Ms. Lavelle, please go ahead, and please correct me if I pronounced your last name incorrectly.

Hi, thank you so much. You pronounced it perfectly. Lisa Lavelle, city council member for the city of Avalon on Catalina Island. Thank you all for the work that you're doing on this. Just wanted to say thank you for including the island and the city of Babylon on the map. And looking at further investigation requiring that. I would love to help those involved connect with a couple of different

parties that are currently working on undersea fiber to connect Avalon's 4000 residents and over 1 million annual visitors with the rest of the mainland and the ability to utilize the internet and safety discussion portions of what we need for our community correctly and be able to have that redundancy where right now microwave is the only option here. I do also want to ask that if we could look at Caltrans considering the publicly regulated boat routes that connect the island and its residents to the mainland as a potential to add to the Caltrans coverage map. That would be amazing. That would encompass regions four and five and also the cities of San Pedro, Long Beach, Newport Beach and Dana Point. We're encouraged by the movement that's been taking place throughout the state on this project. And I thank all of you for your hard work, and being able to allow us to provide better education, better health services and commerce access for all of our residents. Thank you.

Thank you. Mr. Allen, please go ahead.

Thank you. I'm Bill Allen, President and CEO of the Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation, and we're the co-conveners of the LA-Digital Equity Action League in Los Angeles County, one of the state's Regional Broadband Consortium. I just want to first of all appreciate all the speakers and all the agencies who are working so hard to connect all of the unserved and underserved residents of this state. But I did want to note that in Los Angeles County, as was stated during the presentations, we have a number of historically disinvested and marginalized communities. And they are very concerned about the potential IRU solutions in their communities, partly because of the lack of access points when compared to the number and locations of access points that would be available in a state-built fiber network through their communities. And partly because of the uncertainty about what happens when the initial IRUs expire. So, my question really, for the advisory committee and the state agencies is, how can the state ensure truly equitable deployment of new fiber builds so that we don't continue to under invest in these same communities? Thank you.

Thank you, before we go into the next online person, Nick in the room, physically, can you please prep the people who'd like to make public comments in person? And we will go ahead to Mr., is it Taketa? Can you please correct me if I pronounced it incorrectly? You've muted yourself.

I'm sorry. Ready?

There you go.

My name is Sean Taketa McLaughlin, I'm at Access Humboldt up in Eureka. And I just want to, first of all, just thank everybody for the time, the thoughtfulness, and the time you're spending to help make the process transparent and accountable. That's very important to us. And we really appreciate the elected officials and everyone else involved. I just want to make two quick points. One is we really appreciate the PUCs efforts to ensure an affordable floor of service in their recent discussions about how to use federal funds and having a 5050 symmetric floor when public funds are used to build infrastructure to the end user. We really support that. I know that's not on your agenda here. But I think we really are seeing an intelligent process that you're all going through. And I also want to acknowledge we really are encouraged by the agreement with Utopia, and we look forward to hear more about that memorandum of agreement with Utopia to help design and make sure that these connections, land and communities in ways that really benefit the range of issues that we have, from public health and safety and education and community development

and culture and arts and civic engagement, that are all so much impacted by the work you're doing. So, if we can hear anything more about the Utopia, or see any documentation on that, we'd be curious. Thank you again for your time.

Thank you. Mr. Rosen, please go ahead. You've muted yourself. Why don't we go ahead with Nick, with the in-person people, while Mr. Rosen determines how to unmute himself.

Jules, no one in the room for comment.

Okay, not sure what's going on. We've given you permission to unmute. I do want to point out that a couple people have used the Q&A function. As we mentioned, we're not using that functionality. The reason is, is because we want to provide the most equitable experience for those participating both online and in person. Everybody does have the opportunity to submit public comments online at any time at the middle-mile site. If you just search California middle-mile initiative, the site will pop up and you'll find both how to submit online public comments at any time you like, as well as be able to sign up to get meeting notices and updates. So right now, we don't have anybody else online. Is there a last call for attendees to provide public comment? I see Mr., is it Messac? Please correct me if I'm off base with pronunciation.

Yes, that's correct. Patrick Messac from Oakland. I'll be very brief. I just want to express my gratitude to Golden State and the state for their ongoing collaboration to uplift the needs of our most marginalized communities in Oakland's flatlands. You know here in Oakland, we are perhaps unaccustomed to such an ongoing and collaborative effort and we're just really grateful for this participation and really hearing the voices of our communities as we strive for a future proof resource that really meets the needs of our most marginalized. So, thanks, again, and we look forward to the ongoing work together.

Thank you. Is there anybody else? Last call to raise your hand, online or in person? We're not seeing any. Chair, Nichols.

Thank you, Jules. Alright, with that, let me make one last call to the members of the committee for any closing comments. And the members online for closing comments. Alright, with that, thank you very much for joining us for this month, April 2022, broadband middle-mile advisory committee meeting. As SB 156 laid it out for us, we will continue these meetings. The next three meetings will be planned also as hybrid meetings, likely in a different physical location. We will be publishing that as we have the details become available. The next three meetings: May 20th, June 17th, and July 22nd. We invite you to join us and thank you for your participation. Unless anything changes, we will, as I mentioned, continue with that hybrid format. So, thank you again for joining us. With that, we will close the meeting and see you next month at the middle-mile advisory. Thank you, everyone.

Sent:	Thursday, April 14, 2022 11:42 AM
To:	CA Middle Mile Advisory Committee
Subject:	MMBI Public Comment Form Response

Sent by: David Griffith

Organization: Alpine County

Comment:

The current map, 2021 May Revise at https://middle-mile-broadband-initiative.cdt.ca.gov/pages/data-and-analysis shows two colors, blue which I understand to mean that it will be built, and grey which on previous maps showed as they would also be built. I'm particularly concerned about the section along CA Hwy 4 from Arnold in Calaveras County to Markleeville in Alpine County, which would connect a number of communities along the way. Is this section no longer going to be built, and if so is there anything we can do to raise its importance. Thanks, David Griffith, Alpine District 5 Supervisor

If you want to unsubscribe from these emails, please use this [form](#).

Sent: Friday, April 22, 2022 10:46 AM
To: CA Middle Mile Advisory Committee
Subject: MMBI Public Comment Form Response

Sent by: Bill Allen

Organization: LAEDC

Comment:

Some of our historically underinvested communities in LA County are concerned about IRU's rather than new fiber builds limiting the number of access points to connect and leaving them subject to future uncertainty when IRU's expire. How can the MMAC and state ensure equitable deployment of new fiber builds so that we don't continue to underinvest in these same communities?

If you want to unsubscribe from these emails, please use this [form](#).

Sent: Friday, April 22, 2022 11:04 AM
To: CA Middle Mile Advisory Committee
Subject: MMBI Public Comment Form Response

Sent by: Robert Ross

██████████████████████

Organization:

Comment:

21 years has passed since this was initiated, When Clinton was president, he promised High Speed to Rural and outlying areas as well...????????????? I'm still waiting! What ever happened to the High Speed Fiber Ring that was installed about 10-15 years ago???? I watched as that project was underway on HWY49 between Placerville and Plymouth and yet, there still isn't any reliable HIGH SPEED INTERNET OPTION for my neighborhood in Swansboro- (Placerville) I'm so tired of EMPTY PROMISES!!!! Give us the access we've been promised for 20 plus years, our current POTS system won't even support ISDN, nor DSL. Always EXCUSES from AT&T as to why a viable option "isn't available" I call B.S.!!!! Looks like more $$$$ wasted on empty/broken promises . So tired of this mess- NEVER VOTE DEMOCRAT #NEWSOMISATYRANT #RECALLNEWSOM #DICTATORNEWSOM

If you want to unsubscribe from these emails, please use this [form](#).

Sent: Friday, April 22, 2022 11:13 AM
To: CA Middle Mile Advisory Committee
Subject: MMBI Public Comment Form Response

Sent by: Katie Simmons

Organization: Butte County Administration

Comment:

Rob Osborn mentioned they are halfway through meeting with local governments on technical assistance for last mile projects. What cities/counties have they met with and who is left? I want to be sure Butte County is on the list and I am included as our staff broadband lead. Thanks!

If you want to unsubscribe from these emails, please use this [form](#).