

Middle-Mile Advisory Committee  
June 17, 2022  
Meeting Recap and Transcript

The Middle-Mile Advisory Committee met on Friday, June 17, 2022 at 10:15am PST at 450 N Street Sacramento and via virtual conference.

**Agenda Item 1: Welcome and Overview**

Chair Bailey-Crimmins welcomed everyone to the meeting.

A quorum for the meeting was established.

Member		Designee	Present	Absent
California Department of Technology	Liana Bailey-Crimmins		X	
California Public Utilities Commission	Alice Reynolds		X*	
Department of Finance	Gayle Miller		X	
Government Operations Agency	Amy Tong		X*	
Department of Transportation	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*	

\*Remote attendance.

Committee members Wood and Reynolds provided comments.

**Agenda Item 2: Executive Report Out**

Mark Monroe reported about the final initial map, procurement, and transition from planning to governance.

Committee members Tong and Wood asked questions, which Mr. Monroe answered.

**Agenda Item 3: Project Updates**

Mark Monroe provided the California Department of Technology's update focusing on major cost contributors and explaining project terminology definitions.

Tony Naughtin provided the Third-Party Administrator update focusing on the transition into development and execution phases.

Jonathan Lakritz provided a California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) update focused on last-mile efforts and grant fund windows.

Hardeep Takhar provided a California Department of Transportation update focusing on project delivery, dig smart, the initial 18 locations and the no-initial locations.

Committee members Miller, Tong, Wood, and Reynolds had questions, which Mr. Takhar, Mr. Monroe, and Mr. Naughtin answered

#### **Agenda Item 4: Public Comment**

Staff noted written public comments were submitted by (attached):

- City of Avalon

Public comments were made by:

- Jacqueline Kinney
- Stan Santos
- Manya Gillian
- LO
- Bryan Hughs
- Philip Neufeld
- Vasavi Pannala
- Patrick Messac

#### **Closing Remarks**

Committee members had no closing remarks.

Ms. Bailey-Crimmins thanked Committee members, staff, and attendees.

The meetings adjourned at 11:55am PST.

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

## Transcript

MMAC Meeting – Friday, June 17, 2022

For member project updates and public comment. Before we get started I'd like to take a moment of privilege and first thank chief deputy Russ Nichols for his leadership and as prior acting committee chair. He and I have worked for the past year and a half on this broadband initiative and he will continue to serve as a chief deputy in this capacity and make broadband a continued priority on his agenda. I also want to thank the Department of Tax Fee and Administration for their willingness to let us use their boardroom and the resources today. They've been a wonderful partner over the course of the last 30 days. Jules, with that, will go ahead and please call roll and review the meeting housekeeping items.

Good morning. We'll begin with roll call. Director Bailey-Crimmins.

Here.

President Reynolds.

Here.

Chief Deputy Director Miller.

Here.

Chief Benton.

Here.

Secretary Tong.

Here.

Senator Gonzalez.

Senator McGuire.

Assembly Member Quirk-Silva

Assembly Member Wood.

Here.

A few housekeeping items. There is time allocated at the end of the meeting for public comment. Presenters, please cue Cole to advance your slides. All committee members, please raise your hand to speak. The Chair calling on you helps ensure that you are heard. Also, for those using microphones in person, they are very sensitive and easily pick up

background sounds, so please be as careful as you can with any papers, jewelry or whatever you have. Madam chair, we do have a quorum.

Thank you, I like to first ask if there are any committee members who would like to provide some brief comments before we get started on the project updates. Jules, I see none. Oh yes. Assembly Member Wood.

Yes, thank you very much. I just want to make some comments. So, I'm very concerned about the fact that the CPUC has not received some of the data that we are asking for from the larger carriers. We're asking for subscriber level data that will help us assure that areas that are served are truly served. And I'm very concerned that, right now, it appears that the majority of carriers or ISPs have provided the data, however, the providers that provide service to the majority of Californians and have not. Hence, smaller carriers and ISPs are providing the data that's required by law, and the larger carriers are refusing to do that. It's important for us to know if these areas that, that are...the carriers are saying, are served are truly served. It's important for us to be able to then correlate that information too with our federal partners, so we can assure were getting the resources we actually need so it, it is troubling. They had a deadline, they missed the deadline, they had an extension and today is another deadline and I'm very, very concerned that this is going to hinder our efforts and will be the same arguments. It's proprietary...it's privacy, blah blah blah, the reality is this is information that's going to be directly reporting to the PUC, it's not meant to be public, and so I think those are those are not valid. This bill, particularly my bill was signed into law. It is in statute and the carriers are simply ignoring it and I think it's going to hurt us in the long run and I hope that we can actually do something to push this effort forward and get exactly what we need from, from this...from our, from our requests, thank you. Thank you.

Additional comments from any of the committee members. Alright, with that we'll go ahead and the first agenda item is the executive...

Madam Chair, I believe President Reynolds raised her hand.

Oh, sorry President Reynolds.

Yeah sorry, madam Chair. I was a little bit late with the hand raise. I just wanted to briefly thank Assembly member Wood for his comments. I know that I'm very supportive of them, I didn't want anyone to if I didn't speak up, I didn't want anyone to interpret my silence as not being in support, I really appreciate his statement of the issue that we are grappling with, with the data requests that we have made, it was entirely accurate. We have data requests out and some of the carriers have not provided, I also wanted to reiterate that. Yes, we do understand confidentiality is a concern, but the PUC is very experienced in protecting confidential information. We have mechanisms to ensure that proprietary information is kept confidential and this data is really essential to the state, critical to have up to date on the ground granular information to guide the investments that we're making and to ensure that federal dollars are coming to California and that they're being maximized and appropriately targeted, so this is really critical to our success here and I appreciate the Assembly member's emphasis of the issue that we're facing right at the moment, so thank you very much.

Thank you. Any further comments. All right, I see none. We're going to go ahead and start with the first agenda item, the executive report out. Mr. Mark Monroe.

Yes, good morning, Chair and committee members. I'm Mark Monroe with the Department of Technology, wanted to...we can go to the next slide here, just want to cover a few points of review. Last month, we announced that 10,000-mile map for the broader network that's been delivered to CalTrans so that they can start their pre-construction work on that, and we are working towards posting that map kind of a static version of that map on our website by, I think it's scheduled for this next Monday, and then, following that, similar to what we've done in the past, we will be working on a dynamic version of it that will allow more people to dial in more and kind of see, see the specific routes in terms of how they, you know interact with other roads and such next slide. And the other, the other point I wanted to mention in terms of procurement I think everybody's been tracking that we signed, we signed contracts for the procurement of fiber and related materials in May and in the cut of that, some of the next components we've been looking at are the huts the repeater huts and the electronic, electronics procurements as well as logistic coordinator. We are...our team has worked with DGS to identify some contractors. We already have contracts with that can perhaps help us with both the hut procurement and the electronics procurement, which will be certainly I think help streamline our process for going to contract for those, for be able to acquire those materials for the project without actually having to go out and do, go for bidding process and then so really what we hope to focus on starting in July is the logistics coordinator, this is, this, this position would be to really connect all of the materials that we are, that we're getting for the project with actual construction contractors, so that we can get the materials in the right place at the right time to make sure that we meet the federal deadlines. And with that, that's the end of my report out. Thank you.

I'd like to go ahead and ask the Committee members if they have questions for Mr. Monroe.

You know, I'm sorry, I skipped a slide, my apologies.

Sure, okay.

One other point I think just to kind of level set in terms of how we're approaching the...you know, CPUC approaching the project, you know for the...since SB 156 was signed in July of 2021, the Department of Technology is really you know, just moved as quickly as possible and really on all fronts to try to develop and plan this project. And so, we're now that we have the map out there, I think it's important to understand we're kind of moving more from this planning and standup phase into a governance phase, and so as we've you know provided CalTrans with the map, they're going to, they're moving forward with really that implementation in terms of construction in terms of doing the pre-construction work. Similarly, GoldenStateNet is our third-party administrator, is moving forward with both understanding the alternatives for leasing through IRUs, as well as the development of you know, that the schedule services and really pulling together, not just not just where the infrastructure is, but how it all ties together to provide a service and then as we will continue to work with the Public Utilities Commission in terms of coordinating with the Public Utilities...coordinating with regards to last mile and making sure that they get the information they need in terms of funding last mile projects that really tie into our middle mile. And the Public Utilities Commission will be providing an update on that surely so now I'm done.

Mr Monroe, thank you for the additional information, we do have a few questions. First question goes to Secretary Tong.

Morning, this is question for Mr. Monroe. I just wanted to make sure I clearly understand the transition of phase. As you mentioned that, up until this point, it is really the creation of this middle mile network map, if you would by working, leveraging what CPUC has provided as the baseline and then the third-party administrator GoldenStateNet has provided their recommendation and earlier, the map that you have shown Mr. Monroe, it's an overlap of the two so that there is a more inclusive map, if you would, to conduct further market research on the ability to fulfill that coverage either through the combination of construction, you know leasing where there's line or you know, looking at opportunities to kind of, I hate to use the word cold bill but leverage whatever is available out there is the primary. And because of that, the last slide you had is really CalTrans is taking the lead on the construction and leverage as much as their dig once project as possible to kind of expedite and then GoldenStateNet is focusing on leasing opportunity to see how many of those could be fulfilled that way, is that correct?

Yes, that is correct. That's an excellent summary of all that CDT has been doing with its business partners since SB 156 was signed and really try to make sure that we design and move forward with a network that really meets the needs of all Californians.

Alright, thank you.

Thank you, Secretary. Second question, Assembly member Wood.

Yeah, thank you and Mr Monroe thanks for your comments, I much appreciate it. Just curious on a couple of notes. What kind of outreach is being done to coordinate with cities and counties? We know local governments are going to have the opportunity to deploy infrastructure like we see in the city I live in, a little city of Healdsburg where we have immiscible power, so what...is there anything being done at this point to support those who hope that we'll be able to do last mile projects in their communities?

Yes, in addition to the various public roundtables that we've held in terms of you know, giving really an audience and being able to try to provide really targeted information for them. We have the Public Utilities Commission has been working on their last mile, working with the potential grant recipients for their last mile programs. And we work with them in terms of making sure that they understand where the map is going and what the opportunities are for interacting with them and then we're in this stage right now, GoldenStateNet is also helping us in terms of having some of that outreach and really we want to make sure we've design and develop the system in a way where everybody should be able to access it, and this includes putting you know, the vaults every 2500 feet right, so really there should not be a concern in terms of when people look at the 10,000 mile map as we move forward with it, there's going to...we're designing the network to have to maximize that sort of access.

So, at this point, it's probably premature to make uh...but I am curious, do we have any sense maybe of how many miles are going to be built versus how many miles might be leased?

You know, we don't. I think one of the big open questions right now is now that we have this 10,000-mile map out there and I'm going to go speak a little more to this when we get to the project updates, but you know we have the \$1.1 billion budget ask that was in the May revision. You know that, that's a big...that's going to be a big answer or a big part of the answer to that question.

And then finally, would your efforts be a little easier if you have the granular data that we've been asking for from the large carriers?

Yes, I mean we're, we're partnering with the Public Utilities Commission to make sure that we build to the right areas. We definitely need to have that data to make sure that that we're targeting all the right areas so yes, certainly having that data would really help inform us as we move forward. Thank you.

Thank you. Secretary Tong, I see that you have your hand up.

Yeah sorry for circling back. I do want to dovetail to what the question raised by Assembly member Wood in terms of local engagement. Mr. Monroe, I know I have helped kick-off several speaking tours that are in partnership with CPUC, CalTrans, and GoldenStateNet to make sure that information that is being shared here are also being offered at additional you know, through these speaking tours and listening tours frankly, to the locals. I wonder if there's a way to I believe those are all recorded. I wonder if there's a way to make sure those are made available to folks that could not join at the earlier session and then whether there are schedules that can be posted for upcoming session because the end goal here is really to make sure that the local has a voice, as well as not only seeing what's going on, but has a chance to raise their questions and being answered in terms of the state continue to refine this statewide map.

Yes, we definitely can find that out and make available on the BroadbandForAll website and the middle mile broadband website that information.

Thank you. Thank you committee members for the valuable questions. Any other questions before we go to the next agenda item. I see none. So, the next agenda item is also Mr. Mark Monroe for the Department of Technology update.

All right, thank you. So, if we move on to the first slide here is, as noted, we have...we put in a \$1 billion...\$1.1 billion request in the May revision and really what we're trying to show in this in this slide here is kind of what drives that obviously the mapping is a major component of that as we've looked at. Secretary Tong noted, as we have looked at both the map that was provided by the Public Utilities Commission as well as that provided by the GoldenStateNet and if recommended at this 10,000-mile network that is intended to reach out to you know, to reach out to those unserved and underserved communities identified by the Public Utilities Commission. So that, that really is a big cost driver, is that's the only one. You know, I think, as I think we've noted in the past, if we just look at inflation just outside

of what is currently happening with the economy, I think standard inflation was expected to increase costs for the project over the life of it between now and 2026 by over \$400 million. And then, when we look at the other potential labor shortages and material shortages that would be caused by increased demand across the country, we also expect costs to increase from that as well as for other, some other components of the projects such as repeater huts and regional exchange locations that tie us back into the broader World Wide Web. So, there you know, several different drivers of this and we just kind of wanted to repeat that and kind of show how you know the mapping is a big part of it, but that's not even all of it. So, if you go to the next slide. One of the things I wanted to try to cover really quickly here, you know, and we post the slides after each meeting on our website and so this is, you know, perhaps a valuable reference, but I know this that we, we tend to use a lot of terms and I try to make sure we, everybody understands those terms, so just real quickly when we're talking about fiber, we're talking about the glass cable that the signals run through. I think most people are familiar with that conduit is the reinforced plastic tubing that we, that we put down. And so, you know, obviously we need you know that, that's what protects the fiber. That's an important component of that we have used in our modeling, we've assumed two inches because that will handle any size of the fiber counts that noted above there. We were assuming a standard 288 is fairly future proof and being able to meet the needs of the various sides, numbers of communities. But yeah so, that's the conduit...when we get to vaults, I think I've mentioned those previously, those are also called pull boxes, we put them about 25, every 2500 feet and so, that's necessarily just for pulling the system through but all of these end up serving as potential points for a provider or for last mile providers to link into our network. And another component that I think we probably haven't talked about quite enough are the electronics and the repeater huts. So, repeater huts are really just small buildings that house the electronics, but when you think about the signals that go through wires just like anywhere else you know signals only good for a certain distance, I think we...generally speaking, we assume these fiber signals go for about 50 miles and so every 50 miles, we would have repeater huts with electronics that would, that would repeat the signal and that's so they're just what they sound like but really important for making sure that you know have a reliable signal going, so as we move forward with the project, these are kind of the big the big components and then the last one that I'll mention is that are the other regional Internet exchange points or IXPs. And these are, these are the points where our network will tie into the rest of the world wide web and so you know you can in theory, you could have one...we're probably going to have a number more than that, the idea is to be to have multiple access points for the network to be able to tie in and provide that reliability of service so from time to time, I'll try to make sure we define terms, so that people are kind of, we all kind of become familiar and have an operating lexicon here, but just wanted to cover some basic definitions of what we're talking about. Next slide. Then I've mentioned in the past, and I think it's been mentioned already that we are working internally with GoldenStateNet and some of our other partners to pull together a market sounding. When we look at the, when we look at the kind of services we want to offer, this needs to be able to...to be able to be operated by our third-party administrator and so we want to make sure we have a good understanding from both existing last mile providers and as well as potentially new last mile providers or even the communities that are still looking to have...to establish last mile service. We went through a combination of electronic surveys and interviews, really understand what their needs are in terms of the throughput in terms of the...uh, whether or not they would have the need or capacity to be able to do dark fiber leases if that's going to meet their needs, or if they really require a lit service. And so, we're



hoping that you know as we move forward with this and will report more in July, they're really in the process of working on this right now. But to be able to come back and it's going to really inform kind of what kind of service agreements we need to, we need to have...how we, what the revenues will be kind of what the cost will be, it's really going to be helpful in and identifying the business, the business model for how this moves forward. Next slide. And I think with that, that's the end of my presentation and see if there's any questions.

Thank you, Mr Monroe. I will open up to committee members. Is there any questions for Mr. Monroe? You did an excellent job answering all the questions. All right, we're going to go ahead and go to the next agenda item, which is GoldenStateNet, the third-party administrator and it's Tony Naughtin. Mr. Naughtin? Jules, is Mr. Naughtin online?

I do not see him. I see Mr Hunsinger.

Okay. We'll give Mr. Hunsinger an opportunity. Mr. Hunsinger did you want to give an update?

Oh, there he is.

Yes sorry, I was...I was muted on your end, my apologies.

Go ahead and proceed. Thank you. Mr. Naughtin if you're speaking, you are on mute.

I'm sorry, I seem to have been muted again, can you hear me now?

Yes.

Yeah, thank you very much. So, if we can move to the slide, we continue to work in a transitional state or a transitional phase as the third-party administrator transitioning as I said in the last meeting from the design phase to the real development execution of this network and the key areas of activity right now, we're continuing to focus a great deal on the development processes for the retransmission huts or ILA huts as we often times refer to them as. Approximately every 50 miles in the network, there will be such a re-amplification or retransmission hut, which means there will be over 180 of these huts across the network. And the implementation and integration of huts, it's really a key area I really feel that the approaches or risk management approach in the development of a network like this, and GoldenStateNet will be very focused on consistency and quality assurance of these huts working with an engineering integration partner to make sure that hut development and testing into production stage is extremely well executed. In addition to that, subsequent discussions on joint build opportunities have really significantly increased over the last several weeks, both in terms of the number of telecom carriers that have expressed interest in joint building with the state in this middle mile network and conversely, the potential number of miles and the network that could be constructed under these joint projects. The overall goals once again of joint construction, joint building are cost savings and furtherance of the dig once, dig smart approach to developing a network of this kind. In addition, discussions and activity with carriers and other service providers has also increased pretty, pretty significantly over the last several weeks and we're currently evaluating some of the specific dark fiber proposals there that have been made to us by

these carriers. Dark fiber could comprise a significant portion of the middle mile network where feasibility of new construction is lacking or, in some cases, it may be extremely expensive as opposed to the cost of leveraging existing facilities that are already in place. As we've stated before, and as Mark Monroe alluded to a few minutes ago, determinations of build versus buy will come out of the optimization process that we're engaged in right now with CDT. Further there's been continued quite a bit of continued work on the system layer design and program plan. Both documents are key to the execution of this program where generally speaking, just to refresh you on those, the system layer design is a living document. It is a publication, which contains the designs and operating policies for the network as opposed to the program plan, which is essentially a playbook of the processes and execution steps in the development of that network. Both of these documents are approaching what we would call version 1.0, probably by the end of this month and work continues also I should mention on the business plan for this network has also Mark alluded to a few minutes ago, where the business plan in this context is a projection of operating costs and revenues in order to project the network's ability to be self-sustaining for operation and maintenance purposes in the years ahead. We're now focusing quite a bit more on the scale and placement of regional exchange points again as Mark was mentioning, these regional exchange points will be primary access points for access and collection of last mile traffic and other users of this network under the open access policy is the network and, of course, in addition to those facilities being used for access, there will be a generous a lot of access vaults distributed approximately every 2500 feet in the network. The regional exchange points play a key role in addition to access as it relates to the potential placement of servers for other services to be provided through this network, many of those could be potentially third-party servers co-located into regional exchange points where the idea in this architectural approach is to get servers whether they're providing content or other types of services to customers, commercial or residential through this network, get those servers as close to the edge of the middle mile network as possible and that can be facilitated by regional exchange points, some of which are probably going to be co-located into existing carrier facilities. So that really wraps up the description of our core activities over the last month or so since the time of the last little mile advisory committee, and I should ask if there are any questions.

Thank you, Mr Naughtin. First, for the committee members, is there any questions for Mr. Naughtin? All right, I see none. We'll go ahead and go to the next agenda item. Thank you Mr. Naughtin for your update.

And my apologies, I just recognize that my video camera was not turned on, I'm sorry for that.

No worries., the Department of Technology should be able to help you on that.

Thank you.

You're welcome. Alright our next update is from Jonathan Lakritz of the Public Utilities Commission. Mr Lakritz? Thank you, Chair. Good morning, I'm Jonathan Lakritz and I'm a manager in the CPUC's Communication Division. I'll be providing a snapshot of recent activities that the CPUC has taken to support the last mile broadband initiative. Next slide please. This slide provides a snapshot of the CPUC's activities to implement the last mile

broadband initiative programs. As a quick reminder, the CPUC is engaged in four key activities to support the deployment of last mile broadband. Technical assistance grants will assist local governments and tribes to prepare for broadband infrastructure. We anticipate accepting applications in either June or July. Loan Loss Reserve Fund will enable entities and nonprofits to secure financing for broadband infrastructure. We anticipate issuing a staff proposal for public comment in August. The federal funding account will award grants to fund last mile broadband infrastructure projects in every county. We are currently developing priority areas and will be publicly releasing those areas prior to accepting applications. The suite of California Advanced Services Fund programs provide financial assistance with broadband infrastructure deployment in unserved areas as well as financial assistance to adoption activities with general grant award opportunities, as well as specific programs to meet the needs of public housing developments. In addition to a number of grant opportunities that will cover in my next slide, I want to note that the CPUC is taking comment on infrastructure funding rules and recently extended the comment period to June 27 for opening comments and July 5 for reply comments. Next slide please. This slide provides a summary of open grant opportunities to fund activities that support the last mile broadband initiative. Broadband adoption grants fund projects by public entities and community-based organizations to promote digital literacy and broadband access. Applications are accepted on a rolling basis and the next group will be considered for awards are due by July 1. Grants to consortia help regional organizations to develop broadband projects and complete the grant application process. Consortia need to apply by July 15. The third opportunity is for grants to build broadband networks offering free broadband services for residents of low-income communities. This would include residents of publicly supported housing, as well as farm worker housing. In addition to these grants, we anticipate a staff proposal regarding expanding eligibility to mobile home parks and other communities with low-income residents to be issued over the coming months. Applications related to free broadband service for low-income residents are accepted on a rolling basis and the next group that will be considered for awards are due by July 1. More information on these grant opportunities are available on the public web pages links for which are on these slides. Additionally, we can provide context for each of the grant programs to those who email [statewidebroadband@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:statewidebroadband@cpuc.ca.gov) and this concludes my remarks, thank you.

Thank you, Mr Lakritz. Opening up to committee members if you have any questions regarding the CPUC update? I see none, so thank you very much for your update. It was very informative. Our last agenda item before public comment is from CalTrans, Hardeep Takhar, we'll go ahead and turn it over to you.

Thank you. Good morning, my name is Hardeep Takhar. I've worked with CalTrans serving as the broadband middle mile network program director and will be providing the progress update today. CalTrans continues to collaborate with Department of Technology to develop projects to build the middle mile network on the state highway system right of way based on the system wide mapping provided by CDT. I'd like to start off with an overview of the project development strategy to build a 10,000-mile network by December 2026. The system wide map currently includes initial 18 project locations that cover approximately 844 miles of the state highway system that were approved to begin pre-construction work in November 2021, and the remaining non-initial 18 locations statewide that approximately cover 9078 miles. In order to accelerate building the middle mile network, we are evaluating existing transportation projects that can build the broadband elements for the middle mile

network, also referred to as the dig smart or dig once opportunities. These include highway projects that are currently in construction and highway projects that will be in construction or to be constructed within the next three years. And this effort is primarily focused to try to lower the cost for building the network. Where existing highway project opportunities are not viable within the network mapping provided by Department of Technology, CalTrans will develop standalone projects dedicated to build a network. Our goal is to complete preliminary engineering and environmental studies for both the initial 18 locations and the non-initial 18 locations by July 2023, complete preparation of the construction contracts by June 2024, and construction award by no later than December 2024 in order to comply with the federal funding timelines requirements to encumbered funds. For project locations that need more lead time due to challenges with environmental clearance, permitting, and working around existing utilities, we will consider opportunities to streamline delivery to get us to the December 2024 construction award by allowing sufficiently time to engage with the resource agencies to develop permit...permitting approvals, and also consider alternative delivery methods in addition to the traditional delivery methods that CalTrans uses. Our target will be to begin construction no later than January 2025 and complete construction by September 2026 to allow time for project close out no later than December 2026 in order to comply with the funding timeline requirements to liquidate the funds. Next slide please. CalTrans started by looking at all kinds of transportation projects and taking advantage to use every dig smart opportunity that we can. We are using criteria to ensure projects are viable and can advance implementing the middle mile network. This slide shows the number of potentially viable highway projects that can add broadband elements by trenching to include conduit fiber optic cable junction boxes and supporting elements within the state highway system right of way. These are potentially viable projects and not yet confirmed to move forward with adding broader broadband. The criteria we use to identify these viable products include our ability to comply with the funding timelines that require fund allocation by December 2024 and expanding the allocation by December 2026. We also look at the screening criteria for ability to add on broadband elements within the existing and approved environmental document are relative ease of revalidating this document, we also look at our ability to add broadband elements without the need to have additional permanent right of way acquisition. Projects are typically excluded based on their inability to accommodate the broadband elements and potentially...and that that can potentially result in delays and cost increases to the transportation project. Next slide please. This slide covers an overview of the dig smart opportunities that we have identified today. We are looking at approximately part of the initial 18 locations, we're looking at nine viable projects to build roughly about 95 miles of the network and as part of the non-initial 18 locations, we're looking at 10 projects to build roughly about 77 miles for a total of 19 projects that will build about 172 miles of the middle mile network and these projects, the initial 18 projects, this broken down also by start date for construction and some of them will start in 2022 and then others are going to be starting anywhere between 2023 all the way through December 2024 in some cases. Next slide please. Regarding the 18 initial locations, work on to...related to preliminary engineering and environmental studies is underway. Multiple projects...multiple projects will be developed within the 18 locations. Today, we've identified nine dig once opportunities that plan to build approximately 96 miles of the middle mile network and 28 standalone projects that will approximately build by 748 miles of the network, adding up to a total of 37 projects to build eight-hundred and forty-five...uh- four miles of the network. Next slide please. So, pre-construction work includes completing environmental studies to obtain permits and approvals from research agencies

and design work to prepare the construction contract packages. Environmental work for the initial 18 locations on the list of projects shown on the slide ranges anywhere from 5% to 60% complete and design work for the initial 18 locations is in the range of zero to 50% complete. Again, our target date for completing preparation of the construction contracts is June 2024. Actually, no later than June 2024, and we expect the construction will begin on these projects as early as July 2022 for the dig smart opportunities to no later than December 2024 for the remaining standalone projects. Next slide please. At the remaining non-initial 18 locations that add up to approximately 9,078 house of the network, we are currently identifying project opportunities to be in June 2022, which is underway to include both dig smart and standalone projects. Pre-construction is underway and opportunities that have been identified, 10 dig smart opportunities that plan to build approximately 76 miles for the middle mile network and 3 standalone projects that will build approximately 152 miles, adding up to 13 projects to build approximately 228 miles of the network. The target date for completing preparation of the construction contracts on these projects is no later than, will be no later than June 2024. We expect construction will begin as early as June 2023 for the dig smart opportunities to later to no later than December 2024 for the standalone projects. CalTrans continues to be committed to this broadband initiative and will continue to collaborate with Department of Technology to identify challenges and find opportunities to accelerate delivery to connect communities across the state. This concludes the CalTrans update, thank you for your time, thank you.

Thank you, Mr Takhar. Very informative. Like to open it up to any committee members that would like to ask questions. Yes?

Thank you, Mr Takhar, so I...it was informative, I had a hard time following pieces, especially of the timeline so, and I just would like a little bit more background and *how* and *when*, so maybe just the first slide I think and then your last slide were the most helpful just in terms of what we can expect *when*...so, could you maybe just go through that a little bit slower.

Sure. Can we go back to the slide number 2, please? Oh sorry, yeah...that one right there. So, as you can see here, the...our plan is to begin pre-construction work on the entire 10,000 mile.

Can you be a little bit more specific about what pre-construction work is?

Ok, sure...yeah. The pre-construction work essentially involves completing environmental studies to make sure that the alignments that we're proposing to build on are environmentally clear. We are using the least environmentally damaging alternatives moving forward, and we also have to complete environmental studies preliminary design, prepare the construction contract packages that we can put out for advertisement and bids, and then execute the construction contract, so all of that is considered preconstruction to its environmental and putting the construction package together.

Okay, and then so, that's the first phase that you're completing...beginning completion up right now.

We started, we started that process. Great. That is the pre-construction phase.

Okay.

And we plan to complete preconstruction phase no later than June 2024 for the entire, that is, that is the plan...delivery plan is to complete for the entire 10,000-mile network by no later than June 2024 to allow a sufficient time to execute the construction contract by December 2024 for the entire 10,000-mile network.

Okay, and then in terms of so, I'm happy to see that you'll...you'll meet the requirements of the federal law. How as you're doing preconstruction, obviously we have procurement out for some of the conduit fiber, what about making sure that we have the contracts for the actual construction work, what is the plan that you'll execute in order to ensure that we have folks to do the building?

Our plan to...as I had mentioned, we are looking for every opportunity to accelerate. You know, the June 2024 timeline is that it's no later than the timeline, so where we are able to accelerate the simple repetitive work for the lesser complex locations, we will be putting those contracts out sooner than June 2024 to balance our workload and essentially meet the timeline requirements for construction so again, we know where the complex locations are, we will be looking at working with the resource agencies to find ways to develop programmatic permits and also use alternative delivery methods, which is not the typical design bid build process that CalTrans uses. These are essentially delivery methods that could involve job order contracting or construction manager, general contracting, other procedures that can help us accelerate to get us to executing the construction contracts. Again, the goal is to execute those contracts no later than December 2024.

That can't...well, it's not a goal.

Yes.

That...that is what *will* happen, correct?

Yes.

Okay.

That will, yes

And then, I assume, and this is to Mr Monroe...just in terms of how we...I just, I just want to be clear that it will be contracted within six months and that meets the federal requirements of an encumbrance so that's question number one. And then two, if you could just be a little bit more specific in terms of the indefensible rights of use, the co-location sort of how that will all be built into the construction work that CalTrans will do. And then, so that's my two questions to you, Mr Monroe. And then to Mr. Takhar, just to be clear, the actual work that will be done in terms of the building and then later, the operations and maintenance, which is more a Mr. Monroe question that, that is all work that you contract for, correct?

Yes.

Okay, and so you're beginning that process now in terms of making sure that you have sort of eligible contractors and can execute those no later than the 2024 date.

Yes.

Yes, certainly...so I think I'll probably start with the second question first in terms of when we talk about what Mr. Takhar talked...talked us through here in terms of the pre-construction process, CalTrans I think their broad rule has been it normally takes them for these sorts of projects, approximately two years to go through. When they, when they go out, they have to go out and do surveys and really draw up every inch of the...of what we're building and where we're building it and so, that's a big component of drawing up the blueprints for it, and so an added component to that pre-construction is trying to identify and get updated a construction costs, and so we, now that CalTrans is able to start pre-construction on the 10,000 miles the intent is that, within the next year, as soon as possible by segment, you know however quickly Caltrans is capable, is able to do it, to get updated cost estimates and so, you know, broadly speaking, and I want to go faster and every one of these steps, but I'm just going to say, broadly speaking. If it takes, if we get updated cost estimates for the various segments, obviously building in different places throughout the state, different environments it's going to you know, there's going to be some cost, some cost variance there, but we get cost estimates that's going to tell us how much we can afford to build. And by then we will know what was in the budget in terms of any additional funding that's going to give us our total amount of funding for this project. And then we take, you know, we take that funding and we have to look at that updated cost estimate and we're able to decide then how much can we afford to build. And then, how much are we going to, and I use the term build here, I know, Tony Naughtin from GoldenStateNet also mentioned joint build so, you know these opportunities that we're also looking at, for you know other providers or anybody else who's going to be burying cable in the ground. We bury cable in the ground, burying into the ground is the most expensive part, and so we want to be able to share those costs whenever possible, to make our dollars go further, so I mean that's a component there that I don't mention every time, but it's always there. But basically, as we have an updated cost estimate, and we know how much funding we have available we're going to develop, we'll have to make the decision about how much we can afford to build.

Right, I think I'm going to just cut you off a little Mr. Monroe because it's not exactly my question I think that's helpful, it's more the interconnectedness of the network itself and sort of the resiliency as well, so it's not you know I say every time it's not just a question of what we're building, it's a question of how we're building the entire network. So, I think, I think that's really helpful and certainly understand the cost components, but just want to be clear from what I understand, from what everyone is saying this is, it really is, it, there's such a joint effort in terms of how we're creating the entire network, so the work that Caltrans is doing is happening in parallel with the work that GoldenStateNet and our consultants are doing to make sure that we have this entire network that will include some leasing, some joint builds, some colocation, all of this ring topography, which makes us more resilient. So, I think our challenges, just because we're building a whole network and not necessarily just a single construction project is to talk in those terms, because there will be so much

coordination and collaboration, so I think that's, does that make sense to you just in terms of a way to look at it.

Yea, I mean, and I'm sorry because I think that's what I'm trying to communicate... Okay... Maybe, maybe not successfully. The you, you're right in terms of this is a complete network, when we talk about the 10,000 miles that includes the ring topology that, includes that. GoldenStateNet, they really are, you know our experts in this area to help us take a bunch of segments and actually make them an operational network. Great. Right and so, that is correct, that is, the work that they are doing right now. The sooner we get updated information from CalTrans, the sooner we'll be able to, that's really going to feed those decisions and help us better understand and decide quicker what we can do.

Right, thank you, I don't know if...I know there's a couple of other questions, but if we wanted Mr. Naughtin to answer any of that.

My. Naughtin.

Thank you, had to unmute myself. Yeah, I mean as Mark has indicated, the coordination is really, it's a dual process going on right now where we're asking CalTrans to evaluate and provide costs projections while at the same time, exploring or, in some cases, evaluating proposals for dark fiber that have already been made to us by some of the carriers involved, and so coordinating those two activities, you also asked about regional exchange points. You know I mentioned in my presentation of a process by which we will make recommendations for where regional exchange points should be located. Key factors in that process involve adjacency to CalTrans' right of way wherever possible, and it will not be possible in every case, as well as, adjacency to last mile providers that will be able to use this network for access to the core as they are providing broadband services to their customers. So, it's a, it's parallel activities with coordination along the way, and resulting in yes contractual commitments whether its construction, joint construction, or dark fiber leasing. Contractual commitments to be made no later than the end of 2024, of course, under arbiter restrictions and expanded by the end of 2026, in case of dark fiber arrangements, it's quite possible that those could be completed with activation of certain segments for the network well before those funding deadlines.

Great, thank you, thank you...

And Ms. Miller I feel like I didn't quite get your other, your other question relative to the, to Caltrans or so. Assuming that two year timeframe, and again we're going to make you know efforts with CalTrans looking for ways to speed up, permeating to speed up that timeframe, but assuming that two years, yes, as, as noted that goes to, that takes us to July basically July of 2024, so I think as CalTrans has historically looked at its RFP process, if we were to then identify and try to move forward with construction we'd be looking at moving forward with some number of contracts that, you know, depending on how large, I think we, we're hoping for larger projects, but depending on how large the projects are, we're looking for some number potentially in the hundreds of contracts that would need to be developed. And so, if Caltrans were to go out and try to sign contracts for 10,000 miles right, that would be, you know, let's say that's 100 hundred contracts, those would need to be developed as RFP, would go out in July that would be you know, three months so August, September, so



by October, they would be able to start making decisions, to the extent they broke out the 10,000 over some period of time. You get, you kind of get the picture there is that all the funds have to be under contract by December and there's that three months process and so we're looking at any way we can to speed that up so that that Caltrans has more time to spread out that work to spread out the amount of time that it takes them to do the contracting and to speed up when they can actually start that.

Right, no, I appreciate that and to Mr. Takhar you know, obviously we know about the various districts in Caltrans, but just making sure that you know that the district collaboration remain strong and that ultimately it's the state that's accountable for it.

Thank you Ms. Miller. Thank you. And thank you, presenters, I do see others that have questions for Mr. Takhar.

Secretary Tong.

Yes, thank you, Madam Chair. Three points I wanted to make, two or more of a question, and I'll start with the statement. I think just hearing the last conversation, perhaps a suggestion to our team here that you know we used a word like, you know developing or creating a statewide network as a as a differentiator to build versus lease because the construction and the lease it's how to provide this coverage and the 10,000, but the goal, the ultimate goal here is using combination of all of the above as methods to provide this statewide network that has a coverage to, you know, all of the area that needed to have coverage. So, it's just something to think about in terms of terminology. And then, with that specific to Mr. Takhar, that timeline you show was helpful. I'm curious to see if perhaps at the next version of that timeline, to have another dimension of information being laid out, for example, right now that timeline is listing in a very linear way of showing the project between those are initial 18 versus non-initial 18. And then the timeline it's in more of you know, the...you know, the majority of these, you know, construction work or contract will be done by certain time. I think, as you have presented in a subsequent slide that there are also opportunities Caltrans are already in the middle of it, of leveraging those dig once opportunities. So those dig once opportunities, where pre-construction is already done, some are actually you know have contract for construction. I think it would be good to show that level of activity in the same timeline, it's a single view, so that it shows that, for the ones you can leverage dig once, what's the timeline for getting those connectivity, you know built. For the ones you do not have a leverage ability like dig once, what is the typical step to go through, and yes I've heard loud and clear from Mr. Monroe, that typical step you guys going to try to streamline even further to bring up the dates. I just want to make sure is that correct, is that a correct understanding.

Yes, Secretary Tong. Yes, that's correct.

Okay, and then, lastly, the last point I want to make is also when it comes to either permitting or procuring construction contracts, to the extent possible to looking at these as an opportunity for streamline and process improvement I would highly recommend Caltrans to leverage the resources that the administration can provide, to do so, you know I mean building this middle mile network it's already unprecedented enough. You know it's really an opportunity to see what we can do as a collective team to be very thinking outside the

box to streamline, to bulk purchase, or bulk permitting review, I don't know what that is, but that's what I would really encourage Caltrans to do.

Thank you, Secretary Tong. We are working with the resource agencies to streamline through programmatic permitting processes, so yes, we can report more on that at the next meeting.

As well as contracting for these constructions.

Yes, absolutely Thank you.

Thank you, Secretary. I also see Assembly Member Wood.

Yes, thank you. Mr. Takhar, would you, could you...could we put this, or somebody put the slide back up with the timeline I'd appreciate that because my question is related to that. Sure. This slide. Second slide. Yeah Thank you. Great, so, I'm looking at the timeline and we say, initial 18 locations began pre-construction work, and part of what I heard you say was we're still looking at CEQA. And as related to this, and my thought, my and, forgive me if I'm wrong, but my understanding was that one of the reasons these projects were selected is that, or these initial locations was selected is that, is that we were pretty well along in the planning process here. Now, if you're building a highway, I can't imagine a bigger impact to the environment than that. From, in your department, so I'm a little puzzled why putting conduit in or something would somehow trigger additional CEQA a work here, because it does, it seems like we're already disturbing the environment in a really dramatic way. Is this, is this overkill or is this, I mean I'm missing, what am I missing here because I don't feel like we should be having to do more of, more of that, and I thought, these projects were further along so help me understand that.

Yes, so yes, we are, we have started the environmental studies process, so there are locations along the initial 18 locations that were provided to us that we still need to go through the environmental process, both through CEQA and the NEPA process to identify areas that are either impacting the natural environment, so we still have to complete those studies, so we are completing those initial environmental surveys to identify, you know what are the resources and that we may be impacting, the, we do have the CEQA exemption process, the categorical exemption, and the categorical exclusions that are have been provided for the broadband work, but still, we still have to comply with the environmental laws that require us to address avoidance and minimization of impacts to the natural environment, so those studies have still have to be accompanied with the CEQA clearance so that is, that is the work that's underway, and that's what's taking time for us to get through that process.

I guess I'm just puzzled because I, my impression was that these projects, these were projects that were well into the planning process, and I have a hard time imagining that, that this additional work, in an area that's going to be grossly disrupted is somehow, requires additional secret documentation. Look, I am fully in favor of CEQA, but my goodness, how much overkill do we have to do here, because I really thought these 18 projects were further along and you, now we're hearing we have to do additional sequence studies on top of what

you're already doing to move this forward so that implies to me that these, maybe these projects weren't as far along as we were told they were. Help me understand that.

Assembly Member Wood, we have a committee member, Janice Benton that like to respond to you.

Thank you.

Yeah, thank you.

Great, great questions and great points Assembly Member Wood. Just one clarification, I'm not sure that we're understanding, so, the initial 18 weren't selected because they were further along, they were selected because they were opportunities to learn, and then also selected apart, and I'll defer to Mark Monroe on the selection of those locations, but it wasn't because that we had projects already in the works. Some of those initial 18 do align with the dig smart dig once opportunities, but not all of them, so some of them were initiating new standalone projects.

Well, that's fundamentally different understanding what I had my understanding was that these were projects that were welcomed into the planning process so that is not what I understood from the beginning. So...

Yeah, I would be happy to jump in here a little bit Assembly Member Wood, I think this conversation has come up before and I believe the team has you know made multiple explanation that the initial 18, it's really a sample of multiple projects at various readiness stage some are dig once that I, and I don't know the number so don't quote me on that, some of the 18 are dig once, which why I believe in the subsequent Caltrans' slide have mentioned those dig once that are happened to be 18, initial 18 the construction are like underway or close to begin some of the 18s are brand new stand alone and therefore, Caltrans and can use those to study the right of way, you know what are all those you know intricacy needs to be involved, some are specifically for GoldenStateNet to take a look, if any of those 18 could be an early lease opportunity as well as some maybe a joint build that you might be partnering with somebody and just go at it and think that was really the intent of the initial 18, if there was any if there was any perhaps you know understanding those one more ready than before, is that each of the 18 has a good purpose for them that they do not mean all of the 18 are ready to be you know, construction, I want to make sure that's clarified.

And I appreciate that Secretary Tong. I just I just thought they were further along quite frankly. And so, is it possible in a future meeting that we can actually get an idea of where each of these 18 projects is so we understand how many of them are still going to have, are still in the CEQA process and so on. So that we have a really good understanding of where these 18 projects are. That would I think that would clear up a lot of confusion certainly would, for me, because I, my impression was these projects were chosen because they were we were further along in the planning process and I obvious, it sounds like I'm mistaken, but I don't think I'm alone.

If I could add to that so certainly yes, we can do that, I think some of the slides actually have tried to show that we have a challenge in terms of how big they get in terms of what we're able to show here so maybe we can kind of work on something for next time to be able to zoom in a little better. What I will say, you know as Secretary Tong noted, I mean the overall, overall, we chose the 18 because we knew that that's where we needed solutions and we've went through the criteria that the Secretary talked about. In looking at any of the 18 a number of them and I'm looking at some of the slides here I think I'm going to use them number nine, nine of them at least had locations so you're looking at maybe an 80-mile project and there's a five-mile segment of that where a transportation project was planned for that CEQA work is done right. So that's that you're talking about five miles of an 80-mile project so I think there's a lot there's a fair amount of overlap in I'll just tell you, you know personally it's a challenge in terms of trying to lay out and explain these. Because of that crossover right, we want to focus on the dig once, some of them are 18 some of they're not part of the part of the 18. But I think that maybe we're part of the confusion is that, as we look at the 18, there are a number that have projects Caltrans projects that were that were planned and that are planned to be started over the next couple years and I think you know, looking at one of the tables here and I'm identifying at least nine of those. Three we think will start this year six will start in the subsequent years so maybe that causes...I'm sorry. Oh yeah.

Put up slide 9.

Slide 20 I think is the in the broader deck. I think there's a chance, that there we go...that is 18, so two more. There we go and so you can see here that's really and I apologize, I mean the map here is intended to show largely what you're asking for Assembly Member was but it's so we kind of work on how to better illustrate that but really what we're talking about here, as we look at the on the left, you see the initial 18 and of those you know what we're which are the dig smart opportunities and that's really what we're talking about so. You know again 18 nine of those locations where you're right some secret work has been done and so there's still, as I understand from Caltrans' process. Some sort of increased some sort of incremental increase in CEQA workload I don't think it's substantial certainly not like the rest of those projects would be but that's where some of that confusion might come in.

Okay, is there a way to some point, get a breakdown of why each of these 18 was selected?

Yes, I mean certainly we can you know if we want to kind of go into each of those 18, and I think we've had you know as the Secretary Tong noted we really were looking first of all for SB 156. Where had PUC done enough analysis to be able to say we were meeting those requirements in terms of identifying where solutions were needed right and so when we looked at the statewide map and all the work that was going on these 18 locations were identified they you know whatever else we're still making decisions getting public feedback on we knew that we needed solutions here, and I think that that's really where I focused on that each of them as Secretary noted. You know they have other components in terms of where Caltrans thought they could build sooner, where were there were these dig once or dig smart opportunities that kind of layered in there, so really it doesn't get much more impressive than that, I mean that really was what we're trying to do was to look at those priorities there and just get started where we could, and so we can start the process of learning okay.

Well, that may be, where the confusion is because you know, recognizing that those 18 were identified by the PUC. My impression would have been that and that's maybe where I'm wrong, but I don't think I'm wrong there that we thought, these were potentially further along than they are and to hear that we're still going to be years like quite a while to get CEQA documents on some of these areas is kind of discouraging because we're now into June we're almost a year since the bill was passed and you know so anyway that's where that's where my concerns come from.

Yeah I'm sorry to interrupt in, and I know, President Reynolds has her hand raised just specifically, I think the further along Assembly Member with all due respect I think this is where perhaps terminology it's further along in planning, but the planning is not solely construction of new work I think that's. . .

I think that's a CEQA as well. I mean that's part of the planning process.

Yeah, but I do think some of them so I'm not sure Dr. Wood where the confusions come from we've been really consistent that in order to leverage the economies of scale that we need to build the 10,000 miles. This is, it's not unlike building a house, I mean you wouldn't even have been able to sort of reconstruct a house within this year period of time. So, in order to get the economies of scale and the procurement, we need to execute the entire project, we chose those 18 projects. because we weren't ready on the 10,000 so that Caltrans could start all of the work they have, which included, so I think we are, in fact, I mean the fact that there's not a shovel in the ground I hear that, but the work that needs to happen in order to get those shovels in the ground, I do think a fair amount of that has been done some of it is much farther along because of the dig once opportunities which you have moved forward more than anyone else, given your legislation, but in terms of the reason for the 18 was where there was relatively little controversy, it could be across the state, so that we could begin all of this pre construction, including some of these initial environmental studies that are that can then allow us to complete the work within the three year time frame. And the important part is you keep referring to CEQA and there are some exemptions, especially within the right of way, so the environmental work and Mr. Takhar, I do think it's going to be important to really, I think there's two things we need Caltrans to do one is to really drill down on the timing on these 18. And two is to sort of better explain where the economies of scale are because I do think that's going to be really important in your timeline to give some certainty to this committee, I think this was a really good first step, I do think more detail is necessary. But those are I wouldn't call it the work had been done, I think it was creating these economies of scale for the research to then execute the completion of construction. So that's the work that's been done for a year it's gone much faster than we expected, I absolutely think we need to remain accountable and more precise on the timeline. And more precise kind of on what Caltrans is doing in terms of what you know now and how it will move along. I think you know we can take a little bit of a project management approach to this, Mr. Takhar in terms of actually listing out some of what we're doing, I think all of that is really helpful. But I do think it's I think it's a little bit somewhere in the middle of Dr. Wood because it's not that nothing has happened, a lot has happened. It's just that you're, I hear the frustration, but I don't think these projects were ever chosen with the intent that this was we already knew where the shovels were. Their projects were chosen with a statewide view so that the next 10,000 miles after these initial 18. All of these kinks would

be worked out and we would know how to get the contracts, how to get the supplies, whether how what the leasing look like. Where the resiliency was so I do think we need to be a lot clear on these 18, but it was never the intent that we chose them because construction was already happening, but I think if. If I could just summarize, I think, a more detailed timeline. And more kind of what has been accomplished because I do agree, it does sound like where we have similar presentations each time so I do think that'll be really important to really show the work in terms of how much you've actually accomplished, and I know it's significant, so I do hope that will help answer some of these questions.

Thank you, thank you very much for that and I guess the timeline we saw was the same timeline we saw in the last meeting. And so that did that wasn't really new information and, for me, and also, knowing that we have part, I thought we built into this some ability to seek exemptions and so we're still seeking, happy to seek additional CEQA documents. It'd be nice to know what they are why our process that we put in place isn't adequate and so that's where that so what got my mind going here was the fact that we're what I heard was we're having to do additional CEQA work, I thought wait a second, I thought I thought we had, I thought we had dealt with some of that in the legislation, and so that was that's where this that's where my thoughts are coming from and my concerns are coming from how much.

Yeah I have a similar question on the CEQA pieces actually, I do think that's a really helpful my guess is there's a distinction between environmental and CEQA, but I think just much, much more granular detail on that I think will be helpful.

Thank you appreciate it.

Thank you Assembly Member Wood and Miss Miller and Secretary we had quite a conversation there I President Reynolds you've been very, very patient I'd like to give you an opportunity to speak.

Thank you, Madam Chair my I raised my hand actually on this last issue, and I was going to raise exactly the point that Assembly Member Wood just raised. Recognizing that CEQA exemption that was built into SB 156 I was also confused about the environmental review conversation, and so I think combined with Miss Miller's really good you know framework for follow up, I think I would also like to understand what environmental review is being done now, and is the statutory CEQA exemption effective in doing what it was intended to do with these projects to expedite them and get them moving quickly, so my issue has been dealt with, thank you. Thank you.

All right, any additional questions for Mr. Takhar before we go to public comment.

I think just I just raised, my hand of a very short pile on, if I may, I think these are excellent conversation, and I appreciate. Assembly Member Wood you know, asking this because I think at the end of the day it is how to communicate the progress in a clear manner and a specific manner, so it doesn't feel like it's a swirl of information or same information being presented, I think you know, it's just again a suggestion to our presenters here for the next update specifically. Perhaps is it's a joint presentation between Caltrans and GSN because initial 18 is supposed to test it out a combination of dig once during construction to stand alone what needs to go to go through all of these CEQA or not I should call them the

permitting work, so it doesn't, it's not you know, limited to only the environmental process and then for the IRU. I know there's further work, I was also done in the initial 18 to take a look, where there are any of those opportunities we can learn from I think some presentations specific to that to spell out what lessons learned from each of the 18 that could inform us to how to move faster on the remaining network, it would be really helpful that's my recommendation.

Thank you. Assembly Member Wood.

I'm sorry I seem to be talking a lot today, but before you go to public comment I did want to say they say something I know at the very beginning, I made comments about the data that we are asking for from the incumbent carriers of the large carriers that haven't provided. And I want to, and I suspect there will be comments from the public about that, but I want to frame that a little bit before those comments come in and give an explanation for why. For years and years we have been told by carriers that areas are served. And when we asked for data about that we can't get it, and so what does that mean does an area of served mean that there's one person who has service in there and is the end and, if so, if there truly is service in that area available, why are others not taking it up, is it because of cost. Who knows, but, but in order for us to really understand the level of service in these areas that are supposedly served, we need that granular data. And my feeling has always been that that one of the reasons we don't get that data is that some of the carriers are it's about competition and they don't want the competition I you know that's my opinion I'm not saying that's fact. But just my opinion, but I do go back to I find it very, very interesting that the majority of carriers that have been asked to provide this information to the PUC have done so yet. The carriers that have provide the majority of services to people in California have not. And that is a fundamental challenge for us and a fundamental problem for us if we're going to get the federal dollars, the mapping, that we need to be able to do exactly what SB 156 calls for out there. And that's the spirit in which I asked that question, and I think it's time that we get that information. You can actually go on an AT&T website, or any of these others and say, is my area served, and they will tell you, if they can provide service for you. Now we can't do that with every asked address out there, we can't we don't have the capacity to do that, so what we're asking for them do is simply okay show us who is served. And that is information that would be, will be protected it's not going to be public. And the idea that they won't do that or cannot do that or will not do that, for a variety of reasons that we have been hearing for years and years and years is really, really frustrating, and if it imperils this project, if it imperils this and doesn't get coverage that people needed it's a huge disservice, and we need to hang that around their necks, because it is not appropriate. Thank you.

Thank you.

All right, we'll go ahead and Jules and move to public comment, so if you just be able to brief everyone on the guidelines and go ahead and start the comment process.

Certainly, Madam Chair, and please let me know if I need to adjust the volume of my speakers, so I don't have feedback for everybody. In order to ensure that everyone who wishes to make public comment has the opportunity to do so, we respectfully request one speaker per entity and two minutes per speaker. We will go in order of in-person public

comment, online submissions, zoom, Madam Chair, would you like to start the in person public comment.

Thank you, Jules there is no in-person comment at this time.

Okay, thank you, we do have a public comment from Lisa Lavelle for the city of Avalon. Miss Lavelle are you in attendance. I didn't see her name so what we'll do is we'll go ahead and attach your public comments to the meeting recap. Ms. Kinney, please go ahead.

Hi this is Jackie Kinney from the California Cable and Telecommunications Association I'm not sure can you hear me.

Yes, I can hear you Thank you.

Thank you, Madam Chair and to all the members of again Jackie Kinney with the California Cable and Telecommunications Association. Wanting to respond to the comments of Assembly Member Wood and President Reynolds earlier in the meeting. Let's just start out by saying appreciate the comments, we hear you and to emphasize very strongly that CCTA and the cable company, ISPs, key stakeholders are absolutely committed to ensuring the success of California \$6 billion broadband investment and to emphasize that the cable ISPs have been working to provide the PUC data for the broadband availability map to identify the underserved areas that lacked 25/3 service as specified in statute and to provide this data, consistent with both state and federal law related to the broadband mapping and also in compliance with all of the consumer privacy laws and your particular federal law specific to cable companies that prohibit disclosure of personally identifying information. The data request this year is different than it has been in the past in terms of the level of personal identifying information that the PUC is seeking, so I want to emphasize that the cable ISPs have responded, they have not ignored the data request they have responded. And they will submit further responses today. I want to emphasize very strongly the cable ISPs are seeking collaborative engagement with the PUC to further understand the concerns and to ensure a proper process that we so that we can be in compliance with federal privacy laws and state laws and also to ensure that California can expeditiously develop the broadband to identify those 25/3 unserved areas while also protecting consumer privacy, again we emphasize our shared commitment to achieving the goal of the success of the governor's broadband for all initiative, we appreciate further engagement to make progress on this issue with all the policy makers and PUC legislators in this committee. Thank you.

Madam Chair could I just recommend that Miss Kinney submit her comments in writing you were coming in and out Miss Kinney I don't know if there was no service, where you are, but just. If you could submit those comments potentially in writing as well, just so they can be reviewed, for the record.

Yes.

Building upon what was just said, if you lower your computer volumes your speaker volume down to about 10, or so it will get rid of the feedback, I had the same thing earlier, Mr Santos, please go ahead.



Oh yeah okay it's my speaker. Off mute.

We can hear you well, thank you. You're okay.

Very good. I'm very sorry that I'm traveling and I was unavoidable appointments up in the mountains, but yeah just one thing I would like to thank Representative Wood for being an advocate for the people, although I think he's being. His professional courtesy is admirable, but I'll say what maybe he can't say, which is the ISPs and the ILEX are playing poker with their assets, they have dark fiber they have trenches that could be very easily. The capacity could be increased, with a minimal effect on CEQA because I think CEQA allows increasing capacity if you're not going to, you know, make major changes, but that's just a comment I don't expect a response or anything, but I do have some questions, but rather than take up the time here it's very limited. I'd like to know who to direct them to. Working with the San Joaquin valley regional broadband consortium. I believe they have the best RFP or RFPQQ whatever you call it because we did a search of the wording in the kind of standard format and we found that there was nothing regarding safety, training, certifications high standards of construction, you know, to add to the durability of the plant if it's going to be this huge network then it's gotta last 30 40 50 years, and so we inserted that language but that's the only RFP that I see that has that. I don't think it's been done everywhere else, and unless you have something like that you think it would be boilerplate. Coming from the state through the agencies, now the second point is the IJA doesn't include significant language, it also includes a lot of language regarding engagement and consultation with labor and the labor forces out there should be part of the meeting to help you help the agencies and help whoever's the decision makers are, so they can plan, some of these infrastructure projects, because otherwise I think you know you're relying on certain information, and I think the more. Like if you had more of a workshop kind of environment where all this needs to be analyzed in a better setting more transparent setting. I think we might be able to help you but as long as what's happening with the ISPs continues, then it's going to be a poker game it's almost like they're waiting to run out the clock. So that to avoid the federal government clawing back the funds to put the state of California in a position where they have to say, hey you know what will give you what you want. We really need to get this done and they'll leverage their that timeframe and their position and those undisclosed assets. But to finish, just like to say, you know we appreciate what you're doing this is a great project. But it needs a little more engagement, last week I designed the project in the west Fresno with several city councils in a collaborative effort. And then I get a call from a city manager saying you know I'm getting a contact from somebody from I think it was either CalNet or somebody else he goes what's this about and I'm saying well. You know, we work on this as a collaborative and I was the one that designed the project but I've never consulted with and they're reaching out to those city councils and they're honestly thinking you know is this legit. Or who are these people.

Thank you, Mr. Santos. Manya Gilliam, if I'm not pronouncing it correctly, please correct me.

Hi that's okay it's Manya Gilliam, can you hear me okay.

Yes, thank you.

Great, so I just have a basic question about the [inaudible] program I have been watching the website to see when the guidance and grant applications will be available and it stated in June, and I know that. When they spoke about it, Jonathan Lakritz said, possibly June or July for applications so I'm just wondering if they can clarify the date or you know what local entity should be doing to look out for that. That was it.

We will take note of that and how somebody get back to you if you can go ahead and send us an email at the email address noted on the website also for everybody, you can always submit public comment at any time on that same website. The next person is noted it says L O, please go ahead.

Thank you, Madam Chair this is Dr. Lazerin with the Clinical Informatics can you hear me okay.

Yes, we can thank you.

Thank you, I find it very encouraging to see so much progress toward making broadband effective component of our state's infrastructure, I have one comment and one question. Perhaps I missed them but I didn't find the specific, measurable goals that are driving effort and your decisions listed on the middle mile website, perhaps they could be added or made more prominent if they are in fact already there and then I had one related question. From an equity perspective cost to access this infrastructure is going to be important going forward it's one goal of this process, to enable monthly cost of 100-megabit downstream access to be \$30 per month or less, and if not, is it too late to make that a goal, thank you all.

Thank you, if you could submit your questions through the email addresses as just mentioned somebody will follow up with you. Please go ahead, Mr. Hughes.

Thank you, I actually have a very simple question I'm kind of playing catch up. Are the grants available to California benefit corporations or just non-profits.

I'm sorry, Mr. Hughes we're having a little difficulty hearing you. Would have been possible for you to turn down the speaker volume on your computer?

Yeah let me do that. Okay, is this better.

Yes, thank you.

Okay, great Sorry, I have a very simple question and, basically, I want to find out are the grants available to California benefit corporations or just non-profits.

Again, if you have a question, if you can go ahead and submit it to the address on the website somebody will follow up with you.

Okay, thank you.

Mr. Neufeld, please go ahead.

Thank you, I want to thank those working on all this effort to provide broadband for all I'm representing the Fresno Coalition for Digital Inclusion I appreciate the concern for engagement with the public and consortia I would suggest that the grant timelines may be a little bit aggressive relative to consortia and public awareness of his opportunities and readiness for them I'd also suggest on a firm both the Chair and Assembly Member Wood comment regarding data. From an equity standpoint, we talked about getting data from carriers, I want to suggest that the consumers are not at the table relatively stable, it must be driven by a carrier and self-reported data. But it must not be driven just by carrier self-reported data, which is what we're generally talking about which would also include carriers facilities and connections to housing, but most importantly it's got to reflect the experience of consumers, and so I'd ask what is middle mile advisory and the last mile work doing on extending that experience, because otherwise, what happens is we don't have the quality in our urban areas of poverty and will consider them underserved and simply walk past those areas when it comes to bringing competitive high quality, affordable internet in those areas, so I just really ask for further engagement with the coalitions and the public that are ready to properly get those grant applications in. And as well that long term. advocate for data that is actually honoring the consumer voice and recognizes that their services that are often received are not at a standard price.

Thank you, Mr. Neufeld. If those on the phone have not press star nine and they'd like to submit public comment, please go ahead. Madam Chair is there anybody in person that has changed their mind and would like to make a public comment.

No, not at this time, I just want to remind. Sometimes we use initials on our banner, but we would still like to when people do public comment at least to announce themselves so it's just as a reminder.

Please go ahead, Mr. Messac.

Hi, thank you so much for the opportunity to speak today, Patrick Messac from Oakland I want to start just by thanking the state for their ongoing engagement with the Community of Oakland. And you're receptive just to community voice it's been really heartening for all members of our community. I'd like to echo, I'm sorry I didn't catch your name from Fresno, the timeline on the grants are rapidly approaching so just some consideration for opportunities to raise awareness about these upcoming grant opportunities and to streamline the grant process as much as possible, would be greatly appreciated and I just want to also thank Assembly Member Wood for emphasizing the importance of granular data, we know that here in Oakland ISP self-reported data is wildly overstated and we look forward to the opportunity to review. The granular data presented by ISPs, I do struggle with the argument that the ISPs is concerned with consumer data, you can go on to incumbent ISPs right now search an address. And they won't only tell your services available, but whether that address currently has service with that provider, so to say that they're willing to make it available on a public website, but not within like an encrypted state processes is very hard for me to understand and I'm wondering if they have another motive for not wanting to disclose that data so just thanks again for the ongoing engagement. And I look forward to open dialogue and transparent data so that we can serve Oakland and all the urban cores that have also often been overlooked. Thanks again.

Thank you. I have tried to unmute the next person, and I do not want to mispronounce your name I'm going to try and apologies in advance, Vasavi Pannala.

Thank you, this is Vasavi Pannala. This meeting, the first time attending and it's very informative to know what's happening. We are consultants and trying to help a city in Contra Costa county to apply for the middle mile grant program a federal grant funding and that's the first time we knew about this committee and then what's happening, so it's just a question that when a city or a local entity applies for this kind of grant funding, you said any collaboration, or some code that can be expected from this program or it's kind of a separate track or standalone effort that local entities take up. Thank you.

Mr. Messac I can't tell if you still have your hand up. Or you have another comment.

Apologies I meant to lower my hand.

It appears, we don't have any more comments public comments for today Madam Chair.

Thank you, and as Jules had reminded if you did have questions which many of you did, please go ahead and submit them to the email address that shows that Jules had provided we will make sure that someone gets back to you. I would also like to give an opportunity for the committee members to also make additional comments before we close because there was a lot of information shared so is there any additional comments. All right, I don't see any I just always want to give everyone an opportunity, so, in closing, I want to thank the committee members, the presenters and the public who contributed to a great session today the middle mile is an exciting project, and I look forward to continued collaboration with everyone and seeing the progress that is going to happen over the next several years. Our next meeting is scheduled for Friday July 22, 2022. Thank you, we look forward to seeing you in July, hopefully won't be triple digit weather. And with that we'll go ahead and our meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

[REDACTED]

---

**Sent:** Wednesday, June 1, 2022 10:35 AM  
**To:** CA Middle Mile Advisory Committee  
**Subject:** MMBI Public Comment Form Response

**Sent by:** Lisa Lavelle

[REDACTED]  
**Organization:** City of Avalon

**Comment:**

I notice this map has not been updated to include the undersea fiber route from the mainland to Catalina Island. I would be happy to speak with a member of your team on the importance of this portion of the map. This undersea fiber would become the primary access line that would allow our current microwave system to become the redundant back up system (unable currently to provide 5G access and unable to provide consistent and reliable 100 up/100 down). This would serve a local rural, underserved population of approximately 4,000 residents along with over a 1,000,000 part-time residents, primarily of Southern California, who make the island a second home or spend time here on a daily basis.

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