

California Broadband Council (CBC) Meeting

October 22, 2024

9:30 a.m. – 11:21 a.m.

Meeting Recap and Transcript

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

The California Broadband Council met on Tuesday, October 23, 2024 at 9:30am in California State Teachers' Retirement System's Boardroom at 100 Waterfront Place in West Sacramento. Members of the public, presenters, and ex-officio members had the option to join in person or via virtual conference.

Housekeeping & Roll Call

A quorum was established for the meeting.

| Name | Organization | Member / Designee | Present | Absent |
|--|--|-------------------|---------|--------|
| Chair Director Liana Bailey-Crimmins | California Department of Technology | Member | X | |
| Commissioner Darcie Houck | California Public Utilities Commission | Designee | | X |
| Branch Manager Steve Yarbrough | California Office of Emergency Services | Designee | X | |
| Dr. Kristina Mattis | California Department of Education | Designee | X | |
| Chief Deputy Director Jason Kenney | Department of General Services | Designee | X | |
| Deputy Secretary Alejandro Espinoza | California State Transportation Agency | Designee | X | |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|----------|----------------------|---|
| President and CEO Sunne McPeak | California Emerging Technology Fund | Member | X | |
| Deputy Secretary Michael Flores | Department of Food and Agriculture | Designee | | X |
| Program Manager Josh Chisom | California State Library, Broadband Opportunities | Designee | <i>Online, X</i> | |
| Secretary Christina Snider-Ashtari | Office of Tribal Affairs | Member | X | |
| Senator Steven Bradford | Senate Energy, Utilities, and Communications Committee | Member | <i>Online, X</i> | |
| Mr. Emmanuel Aguayo | Assemblymember Mike A. Gipson | Designee | <i>Online, X</i> | |

Agenda Item 1 – Welcome

Madam Chair Liana Bailey-Crimmins welcomed Council members and attendees and provided a brief overview the California Broadband Council agenda.

Agenda Item 2 – Executive Report

Deputy Director Scott Adams provided a high-level recap of various Broadband for All programs and initiatives, including the Broadband for All efforts, Adoption and Affordable Connectivity Program, Digital Equity and Broadband Equity, Access, and Deployment (BEAD), as well as Stakeholder Engagement.

The following CBC members and presenters made additional comments:

- Senator Steven Bradford
- Director Rob Osborn
- Deputy Director Mark Monroe

Agenda Item 3 – Broadband for All Year in Review

Agenda Item 3.1 – Broadband Action Plan

Deputy Director Scott Adams reviewed the 2024 focus and highlights of the Broadband for All Action Plan. These highlights include Broadband for All Initiatives, Digital Equity & BEAD Implementation, Annual Action Plan Review & Revision, and Coordination & Collaboration. He also provided updates on Action Item #2: Funding, Action Item #6: Permitting, Action Item #7: State Properties, Action Item #12: LifeLine Program, Action Item #16: Low-cost offers & subsidies, Action Item #18: Digital Inclusion Stakeholder Network, & Action Item #21: Broadband for All Portal. Deputy Director Scott Adams referred to Director Rob Osborn to speak more about CPUC's progress Action Item #12: LifeLine Program.

The following CBC member made additional comments:

- Ms. Sunne McPeak

Agenda Item 3.2 – Middle-Mile Broadband Initiative

Deputy Director Mark Monroe of the Middle-Mile Broadband Initiative (MMBI) provided a 2024 project update. He shared that MMBI will provide monthly updates and a downloadable fact sheet showing MMBI at a glance, network development activities, and monthly spotlight on their partnerships. Based on the fact sheet dated on September 30, 2024, Deputy Director Monroe reported on miles under pre-construction and installation, network development activities for Caltrans, Joint Build Partners, IRU/Lease Partners, and Purchase Partners. He also announced partnership with American Dark Fiver, CVIN Contract Amendment, and YTel Contract. Lastly, Deputy Director Monroe shared a video on MMBI groundbreakings.

The following CBC members and presenters made additional comments:

- Secretary Christina Snider-Ashtari
- Senator Steven Bradford

Agenda Item 3.3 – Last-Mile Programs

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

The following CBC members and presenters made additional comments:

- Senator Steven Bradford

Agenda Item 3.4 – Broadband Adoption & Affordable Connectivity Program

Ms. Sunne McPeak from the California Emerging Technology Fund (CETF) provided a recap of the Impact that the Affordable Connectivity Program (ACP) had on California. She reported that 2,945,282 Californian households, 1 in 5 total California households, were enrolled in the ACP program as of April 15, 2024, which included a total of \$1,668,542,768 in total ACP support. Lastly, Deputy Director Adams shared what to look ahead for regarding broadband adoption since Congress did not renew ACP.

Agenda Item 4 – NTIA IJA Programs Update

Deputy Director Scott Adams from CDT and Director of Communications from CPUC Rob Osborn provided updates of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) Programs.

Deputy Director Scott Adams shared key milestones on the State Digital Equity Plan (SDEP) Implementation and Capacity Grant Program Design. He reported on CDT's stakeholder engagement efforts that took place since the last CBC meeting. Deputy Director Adams then presented on the Digital Equity Capacity Grant Program Structure, the draft Capacity Subgrant Design's two funding tracks, and other sources of funding to achieve the ambitious goals laid out in SDEP. The 30-day public comment period on the draft guidelines for the Digital Equity Capacity Grant Subgrant Program is open from September 30 – October 29. Organizations may submit their comments online via the Broadband for All Portal. Since the last CBC meeting, the NTIA Competitive Grant Application period closed on September 30, in which 20 applications were submitted and more than \$20 million requested in total funding. The NTIA Native Entity Digital Equity Capacity Grant opened on September 25, 2024 and will close on February 7, 2025. Finally, Mr. Adams shared an updated tentative timeline for the approximation of important milestones for Digital Equity Capacity Grant Program Design and Implementation.

Director Osborn provided updates on the BEAD program, including key milestones, timeline, and detailed BEAD challenge process. CPUC will conduct BEAD subgrantee Selection Process between Q1 and Q3 in 2025. The public should expect CPUC and NTIA to approve proposed grant awards by Q4 of 2025.

Agenda Item 5 – Legislative Update

Director Rob Osborn from the CPUC provided a legislative update on [AB 2765 \(Pellerin\) Chapter 740 backup electricity](#) and [SB 109 \(Wiener\) Chapter 36 Budget Act of 2023](#).

Following Director Osborn, Deputy Director Mark Monroe shared legislative update on [SB 108 \(Wiener\) Chapter 35 Budget Act of 2024](#) and [SB 164 Chapter 41 Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review: State government](#).

Agenda Item 6 – 2025 Focus and Meeting Schedule

Deputy Director Scott Adams proposed to Broadband Council members the 2025 Focus and Meeting Schedule. CDT staff proposed that the 2025 CBC meetings continue to prioritize the annual Broadband Action Plan review and revision as well as the Broadband for All initiatives. The Council voted to hold quarterly meetings on the fourth Friday of the month in 2025 on January 24, April 25, July 25, and October 24.

A motion was made by Branch Manager Steve Yarbrough and seconded by Secretary Christina Snider-Ashtari. The motion was passed by 10 Ayes and 2 Abstentions, due to their absence from the meeting.

Agenda Item 7 – Public Comment

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

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

The following members of the public made comments via Zoom:

- Patrick Messac
- David Griffith

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

Agenda Item 8 – Closing

Director Bailey-Crimmins thanked Council members, presenters, and attendees and noted the next meeting is Friday, January 24, 2025 at 9:30-11:30am at CoveredCA and online. The meeting adjourned at 11:21 a.m.

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

Transcript

Good morning and welcome everyone. We are going to call the 4th California Broadband Council meeting of October 2024 to order. The first order of business is roll call, Ms. Nguyen, if you would start the roll call and please remind everyone of the meeting, housekeeping items.

Of course. Good morning council members, and members of the public. Please note, in accordance with Government Code 1123.5. The California Broadband Council will continue to conduct hybrid teleconference meetings. And provide a physical meeting location for the public to view and participate in the California Broadband Council meetings. And with that, Council members please announce your presence, as your name is called.

State Chief Information Officer and Director Bailey-Crimmins.

Here.

Commissioner Houck.

Mr. Yarbrough.

Here.

Dr. Mattis.

Here.

Chief Deputy Director Kenney.

Here

Deputy Secretary Espinoza.

Here.

Ms. McPeak.

Here.

Deputy Secretary Flores.

Mr. Chisom.

Here.

Secretary Snider-Ashtari?

Here.

Senator Bradford.

Here.

Assemblymember Gipson.

Mr. Aguayo.

Here on behalf of Mr. Gipson.

Thank you. Madam Chair, we do have quorum. Now, housekeeping items for Council members and members of the public. This meeting is being recorded. We will be posting the recording of this meeting slides and transcript to the Broadband for All Portal attendees. Please note there is time allocated at the end of the meeting for public comments in person, via Zoom, via phone, and read through of public comments sent via email submitted prior to the meeting. Presenters, please cue Amanda to advance your slides. Committee members, please use the raise your hand feature on Zoom if you're online or raise your hand in person to notify Director Bailey-Crimmins to call on you to speak. There is, side by side, speaker view when PowerPoint are shared for best viewing experience, gallery view, when PowerPoint slides are not shared, closed captioning is available. And again, please use your hand raise on Zoom to raise your hand or star 9 if you call them by phone. Madam Chair, we can begin.

Thank you, Ms. Nguyen. First of all, I want to thank CalSTRS for allowing us to have access to their beautiful boardroom. We joke that it's always like, which boardroom are we going to be in? And everyone was able to find it today. I am proud as we wrap up 2024 of all the great accomplishments that Broadband for All has delivered, and you're going to hear quite a few from presenters um, as a reminder, Broadband for All is coordinated across many initiatives. If there's no one department, one organization that can do this to address the digital divide and to create digital equity requires all of us to lean in at the legislative level, at the administration level, at the community level. And so we're just very fortunate to be a part of that process. We also have a lot of initiatives that have gone from planning to implementation to me, that's where the rubber hits the road. That's where things are happening across the State. So, we're going to hear more about that. If we go ahead and go to the next slide we'll talk about the agenda. So just so that you're aware it's broken up into several categories. The 1st is Broadband for All you're going to get updates on where we are in relation to those initiatives. In addition, there's been a lot of progress in regards to IJJA.

Excuse me, lost my voice. A lot of progress on infrastructure, and what we've been doing across the State in regards to NTIA. We're going to hear from CPUC and Director Adams and Director Osborn and obviously Mark Monroe about that. We also have some legislative updates that will be discussed. And at the last we are going to talk about what 2025, I know it's hard to think about it, we're in October thinking about several months out, but really where we want to focus as a committee, and it will be up for a vote. So, with that I'll go ahead and turn it over to the 1st agenda item, which is the executive report out by Mr. Scott Adams.

Thank you. Chair and Director Bailey-Crimmins and good morning Broadband Council members and members of the public. It's my pleasure to give you a brief update on our work. Since the last meeting. My report will essentially cover. We can go to the next slide. Thank you. My report is just going to cover briefly some of the topics you'll hear more about later on in the agenda, as the director mentioned, our office is proud to report that there's been considerable progress made on broadband for all the initiatives and related programs. Really, the first that you see here is that significant progress continues to move forward on the implementation of the State's broadband for all Action Plan and a number of the action items that were outlined and assigned to the Department of Technology, the Public Utilities Commission, other member entities of this body and other State departments and agencies. And it's really encouraging to see that work continue. I think, secondly, when we take a look at, as reported in past meetings, the Statewide collaboration to promote the Federal Communications Commission's affordable connectivity program really led by the leadership of this Council and members on this Council, including CETF, you know the Department of Technology, the Public Utilities Commission Department of Education, and the State Libraries was very successful. And needs to be celebrated. It provided a strong example of what can be done with statewide collaboration. Despite the program's end. We're also pleased to report that there are many entities in this body and across the State, continue to do the important work of broadband adoption and to promote other affordability measures to increase adoption. The next thing I'd really like to report out is in terms of the digital equity and BEAD programs that the department of technology and the Public Utilities Commission, you know, have this interesting dual responsibility of managing programs that are related and connected, and we continue to make significant progress in our joint coordination on those federal programs included in the Infrastructure, Investment, and Jobs Act, that Director Bailey-Crimmins mentioned specifically for the Department of Technology, the Digital Equity Planning Grant and the State Digital Equity Capacity Grant, and with the Public Utilities Commission, the Broadband, Equity,

Access and Deployment program. And so, one thing to really underscore is that collectively, we are meeting, you know, very regularly on a weekly basis on how we develop and implement those programs together, because they stem from the same Federal funding source. But also individually, have made, you know, great progress. Given that these have been, you know, assignments given to our individual organizations. And lastly, what I'd really like to stress is that in this body knows, I think, more than anybody given its unique distinction, its uniqueness, and the nature of this full state collaboration. That stakeholder engagement and collaboration is incredibly important, as the director said, to achieve the aims of Broadband for All. And you'll hear from each entity that's reporting today how stakeholder engagement is front and center in their efforts. And you know, really, this year has been a year where we've continued to lean in on stakeholder engagement, and to continue to improve ways that we can be more transparent, open, and collaborative with stakeholders. So that concludes my report. I'm happy to answer any questions.

Thank you, Mr. Monroe. I'd like to open it up first to the dais to see if there's any questions or comments from any of the members. I see none. Are there any questions or comments online? All right? Oh, yes, Senator Bradford.

Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity, appreciate the update. The federal funds are only available for a limited time. So I'm just wondering is that money already, and it needs to be encumbered for specific projects and spent by a deadline. Will these funds be spent, or will we lose this opportunity.

Thank you for the question. There are a number of federal funds and programs that are funding various components of the of Broadband for All. Obviously, there's the funds that were really shaped and formed as part of Senate Bill 156 and allocated to the Middle-Mile Broadband Initiative and the Public Utilities Commission for their Last Mile programs. I think I would defer to them in their reports, but by measures it seems like they're moving along and trending well, to expend those dollars under the timelines. And in regards to the new funding that is coming in this year. The planning has been done on both the digital equity plan and capacity grant applications. The awards are imminent and pending, so those will start on a 5-year timeline. And similarly, I'm sure Mr. Osborn can speak to the BEAD program. They've overcome a significant number of hurdles, and we'll soon be in receipt of their funds, which will also the time clock has either started or will start.

I know that we were going to go more in depth in each of the presentations. But maybe just quickly. Could I start with Mr. Osborn, if you could answer Senator

Bradford's question, and then we'll go to Mr. Monroe who's doing the Middle-Mile.

Yes, thank you, Chair. Yes. And so, for the Federal Funding account, we are on track to utilize all the federal funds and with BEAD. We are also on track, meeting all our deadlines right now.

Yes, thank you. And then Mark Monroe with CDT and the Middle-Mile Broadband initiative, and yes, we are on track to. We already have all of our federal funds encumbered and under contract. Currently, we had them as of September of last year, under contract, and we will. And we anticipate having all of those funds liquidated by the end of 2026.

Thank you. Do I see any other questions from anyone online or in the dais? All right, I see none. So we're going to go ahead and go to the Broadband for All Initiative Review of Year in Review. The first one up is Mr. Monroe, again, from a Department of Technology update.

Thank you Director Bailey-Crimmins. If we could go to the next slide, please. As we've mentioned, like the California Broadband Council since 2010, has been a really unique entity of this sort of statewide collaboration of agencies and key entities that are coordinating the deployment of broadband infrastructure, and on an underserved communities and broadband adoption across the State.

In terms of this year, you know, the other important assignments that were assigned to the Broadband Council were really the Governor's Broadband Executive Order that came out in the really in the middle of the pandemic, and then the quick and great work that the Broadband Council and other stakeholders over 700 stakeholders developed the Broadband Action Plan, and just under 4 months during the pandemic. And so that's a central part of the work that the Council does. And we want to continue to report out on that. And so, what kind of initially shapes the broadband for all year in review is taking a look at the success of the broadband for all initiatives, the shift of from planning to implementation to the Digital Equity Plan, and then the Annual Action Plan, Review and revision which was voted on in October of last year, and completed at the beginning of this year. And then, as I mentioned, there's been extensive coordination and collaboration across the board. If you could move to the next slide, please. So, what we wanted to take the time and highlight here is some significant work that continues to go on in terms of either, you know, acting directly to the letter of the action items in the Broadband for All Action Plan or moving forward on some of the spirit of the action plan. And there's seven

particular items we wanted to call out. The 1st was Action Item number 2, which really directed the Broadband Council and State agencies to secure additional funding for the aims of the action plan. As I mentioned earlier, CPUC is soon to receive another \$1.87 billion in federal funding and the Department of Technology will receive \$70.2 million to implement the State Digital Equity Plan and develop a subgrant program on Action Item number 6, really, one of the important and forward thinking action items in the action plan was really looking at enhancing, permitting in all levels of government, and in the previous couple years. really using MMBI as a use case, there was great progress made with federal and state entities in support of the Middle Mile Broadband Initiative. However, there continues to be great work with members of the Broadband Council and other state agencies; the Department of Technology, the California Emerging Technology Fund, and GO-Biz continue to work with and convene with local jurisdictions, to provide guidance and smart and best practices on how they can prepare for particularly the last mile infrastructure projects that are funded by state and federal dollars to ensure that they're prepared to allow those projects to be completed within the timeline. When we look at Action Item number 7 that was directed to the Department of General Services to identify state properties for the use and deployment of Broadband. Really pleased to report that the Middle-Mile Broadband Initiative in design of their network 112 of the huts that will fuel. The network will be placed on Caltrans right of ways. There's another 20 or so that are going to be off the right of ways, but the Middle-Mile Broadband Initiative team. Thanks to the work of DGS and Chief Deputy Director Kenney have been able to identify other state properties to locate those huts. So that's an example of where you know the action item created a focus. And then the folks working on it, you know, move forward in the spirit of what was being asked. Action Item number 12, because affordability is really key. The Public Utilities Commission was asked to continue to improve lifeline. And I'm going to defer briefly to Director Osborn to talk a bit about that.

Thank you, Deputy Director Adams. So, a number of things on the LifeLine front. First, the program has been looking at ways to optimize program operations as well as increase participation in the program. With the end of ACP, we've seen a significant increase in participants in the LifeLine program. Now given that there is no ACP anymore. We are now looking at ways for LifeLine to provide an ACP type subsidy. So, stay tuned for more on that. Another area that we're focusing on is on participant enrollment in the program. Currently, LifeLine is heavily dependent on provider street teams and providers signing up participants into the program and we are in the process now of creating a customer portal where participants would be able to enroll and be qualified through the customer portal directly. And then choose a provider, so that there's

another avenue for people to participate. Finally, we're also, we have a proposed decision. Now that is pending where we would provide LifeLine services to people who are not willing to provide a social security number or who do not have a social security number. And that is not used for eligibility determination. It's for identification. But that is something that we are in the process of trying to implement. Thank you.

Thank you, Director Osborn. The last 3 action items wanted to draw your attention to is obviously Action Item 16, which directed Broadband Council members and State agencies to really move forward and promote the availability of low cost offers. That action item was revised to include the ACP. Thank you to the leadership of the California Broadband Council that made that a priority specific work, that the California Emerging Technology Fund, the Libraries Department of Education made. Really, that program continued into this year, and the final tally was, you know, almost 3 million enrollees that brought significant investment back to the State. And I know that Ms. McPeak is going to speak about that later, so I don't want to steal too much of her content. But it's a tremendous accomplishment, and I think the last 2 items are underscoring the importance of collaboration alignment. The action plan was very forward, thinking and emphasizing that collectively we had to work to develop a multi-level. You know, network of digital inclusion stakeholders. And so given the massive joint collaboration and outreach that's been done over the last 2 years. That network of stakeholders is now over 11,000. So, it's fairly significant. And then, lastly, wanted to quickly brief you. Action Item 21 directed the Department of Technology to establish a Broadband for All portal, which would be a central repository of information, tools, resources for stakeholders and residents to get information about Broadband for All, and we've continued to expand that site that was stood up a number of years ago. And I think there's 3 things that the Council and members of the public would be interested in is that we've twice both at the end of last year leveraged that portal to create our online public comment process. And currently, we've leveraged it again to do an online public comment process for the State Capacity Grant Subgrant program. Additionally, we're looking at ways that we can leverage the portal to support and increase transparency. And so, our team has worked diligently to create a digital archive of all of the meetings and artifacts and past events. But more importantly, and a latest addition to that was creating a digital archive for all of our monthly broadband email updates that go out so that folks who may not have seen those can see and refer to those. So that concludes my presentation. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Adams. Are there any questions or comments from the dais? Oh, I didn't see your sorry. I don't know. I only can say maybe raise a hand because I can't see her. All right, Ms. McPeak.

Thank you, Madam Chair. I turned on my mic, and I thought maybe that indicated somewhere that I wanted to ask a question. So, thank you again for this report. I'm fascinated on what you and Director Osborn just reported on LifeLine since we have a little bit of an interest in having some affordability backup backstop to whatever the federal government does. So, my question is, how far can you go without the legislative action to allow the subsidy for Internet? And can you today use any of the lifeline proceeds for public information that is advertising promotion publicly, as I see, for several of state programs, so can help me understand that if you could?

Thank you for that question, so on your first question, which is relating to how much we can do without any change to legislation. The Moore Act requires that lifeline provide voice services. So, in order to offer a standalone broadband service under LifeLine, we would need a change to the legislation. One of the options we're considering is having a Broadband pilot which would allow us to basically test. The waters, get providers on board offering a service, but a pilot is inherently limited in terms of the timeline, but that's something that we are able to do. Your second question was relating to advertising.

Right, do you? Do you have the authority, as you understand it, under the Moore Act. to use the proceeds that go into lifeline the revenues to actually do public awareness to get to the folks who are not aware that the program even exists.

So, I don't know the exact answer, but I believe we do. And that's something we're also looking into.

Great. It's good news. I've asked that directly to several people. So, you're the 1st one to give me an encouraging answer, including others in in high places. So, thank you for that information. Let me do a follow up if I might, Madam Chair, and it goes to what Deputy Director Adams pointed out about the success of California in the ACP enrollment. And all of us did a lot of hustle. There were lots of people on the ground doing outreach where I think we turned the tide, and I've reported here the analysis we've done with few charitable trusts on all 50 states. Where California turned the tide and did something that was unique. Unlike basically any other State. There were some states so small they could almost notify everybody at one way or another, California being the largest, having more than a million more households eligible for ACP than any other state. We also enrolled a million more than any other state where we

turned the tide was actually through direct notification. Meaning when a credible source, generally a public agency directly notify someone on a public assistance program where they've already been qualified, and the social security number is not an issue. Social security number wasn't an issue for ACP, but someone's already pre-qualified, especially the two big programs that people very quickly qualified for in less than 5 mins. If they had, the documentation went onto the website. If they had Medicaid/Medi-Cal in California, or the SNAP program CalFresh in California, it was really quick for them to sign up. That tide turned for California, when our Department of Health Care Services and the Department of Social Services did direct notification. They literally told people, if you're on Medi-Cal, you might be eligible for ACP on CalFresh. I think the PUC with LifeLine is doing that with social services to a certain extent. We, of course, have then run up the hill several times at the FCC. To do data sharing, which is for the FCC. To say, back to our state agencies. Who have done that qualification? Here are those on Medi-Cal. Here are those on CalFresh that signed up for ACP. Now, why would that be important? The 2.9 million households, almost 2.9 that were eligible for ACP. That we did not get to didn't even know about the program. According to our survey, they're the same people we need to reach on lifeline today, lifeline in the future that can cover Internet. Is there some way in which the CPUC and even the agencies here, can help us with that petition before the FCC to do the data sharing. In order for you to be able to directly notify where our state agencies you could qualify for lifeline, and the message needs to get to those who didn't sign up for ACP. They're the ones that are the most digitally disadvantaged and the poorest.

So, I'd be happy to talk with you more about that.

Yeah, okay.

Okay.

Thank you, Ms. McPeak. Alright. Is there any questions or comments from the dais? Online? Okay, we'll go ahead and go to the next item, which is Director Deputy Director Monroe, who's going to give an update on Middle-Mile.

Alright. People hear me. Good morning, Chair and members again. Mark Monroe, Deputy Director for the Middle-Mile Broadband Initiative. Here at CDT. We appreciate the opportunity to again provide an update to the Council members this morning on the MMBI project. This past year the CDT team and it's partners have continued to make tangible progress on the MMBI project. As we've moved from planning really firmly into implementation. We want to yeah, there we go. As we noted at the last Council meeting, based on the 2024 Budget Act, CDT's funding for MMBI remains at the 3.87 billion dollars level. And

while in the end the Budget Act did not provide an augmentation, we do note that the current funding level appears to be enough to reach all of the FFA Grant locations that plan to connect MMBI per the new statutory requirement. And we estimate that this will be just over 8,000 miles. We also want to note that consistent with the network architecture that CDT presented in July. We've continued to work towards finalizing the RFI squared and government to government partnerships that CDT was anticipating. These partnerships will be vital for building out the more than 7,200 miles of the network, or about 90%. These 3 partnerships that we'll be talking about today, cover more than 500 miles just since July. We also want to note that in August we held 2 groundbreaking events with one of our joint build partners, Arcadian in Willits, and in Sacramento. I think most people are tracking that, and some of you were able to attend. It was great, and we'll be hearing a little more about those today. But again, when those 2 segments are complete, that will be another 530 miles in the network. If we want to jump to the next slide. Next, few slides are components of a new one-page snapshot of the project that CDT will be posting on its website each month to provide updates on the MMBI project for stakeholders. Here we can see that, as of the end of September, CDT had more than 1,800 miles that had gone to construction, or almost 19% of the network. And then, by the end of the calendar year, we estimate that more than 3,000 miles of the network will have gone to construction. So, the team is charging ahead. If you want to go to the next slide. Here we see a breakout of the miles by delivery type from Caltrans construction 842 miles, 3,700 miles from IRUs, another 3,100 miles from joint build, and then 423 miles that we're purchasing, and this will allow stakeholders to track, not just the total miles from each source, but how each is moving from pre-construction into construction and making progress. Next, if we want to jump to the next slide, as mentioned, CDT signed several new RFI squared agreements, including a new joint build contract with our latest RFI squared partner, American Dark Fiber or ADF to build 10 segments that total 380 miles throughout the State, CDT and ADF already held a kickoff meeting last month. And ADF began construction on a segment in Ventura County last month as well. ADF anticipates starting construction on more segments by the end of this calendar year. And then, if we want to jump to the next, those are kind of our subsets of the one-page update that we'll be updating each month and posting on our website. But, in addition to that, since July, CDT. Signed a contract amendment with CVIN for development of an additional 158 miles of the network again consistent with the plan presented at the July MMAC. This, combined with more than 2,500 miles, for which CDT had already contracted with CVIN, will provide for approximately 34% of the network. I'm also pleased to announce that since we last met CDT signed an

IRU lease agreement with the Yurok tribe for the development of a 48-mile segment along State Route 101 that runs through the Yurok tribal lands, as well as segments in the counties of Humboldt and Del Norte. And again, as noted, altogether these new partnerships, such as these combined with the existing RFI squared partnerships, are expected to comprise more than 7,200 miles of the MMBI network. So just some really great progress and some great partnerships there, I think the next piece we have is a brief video that our team has put together regarding the two groundbreaking events. So, I'll turn it over for that.

California has embarked on a groundbreaking initiative to build the nation's largest Middle-Mile Broadband Network going through all 58 counties. The network is rapidly expanding toward more than 8,000 miles of middle-mile connectivity across California. Since July 2024, the Middle-Mile Broadband Initiative has broken ground on 3 new segments, bringing us one step closer to closing the digital divide in San Jose, we began work on the capital route. This route will connect communities across Silicon Valley, supporting both innovation and opportunity.

This is the route that will begin in San Jose, and then at the Nevada state line in Kings Beach.

So right now, we're connecting the conduit to pull back as far as the shafts. We're putting them on. We're going to start pulling back the conduit once we get to our exit, Peg. So that's where the drill head is right now, over there it's approximately 20 mins away. So, we're getting everything prepped and start pulling back the microduct.

In Willits, the redwood route stretches 280 miles through northern California, connecting rural communities to vital digital resources.

This is really important that we're going to be able to have Broadband in our community, and allow equal access, so that even children in rural communities have access to communications with their teachers and outside the area.

It really does take everybody doing their part together to build this. Every community along is going to carry bandwidth that's going literally across the plane.

And in Sacramento work on 256 miles of the capital route continues, ensuring our state's capital region remains at the forefront of connectivity and progress.

The COVID-19 pandemic truly showed us how dependent we are on the Internet, and how important broadband access is for equity. how important

broadband access is for families and making sure that everyone can get connected.

We are the 5th largest economy in the world. and what broadband will bring is new opportunities to build economic development. If it be where tribes are, where they don't have electricity. Now, we're bringing Internet to those areas should not matter where we came from. Some of us came from small towns. If you are urban, if you are rural, if you are suburban, California should have Internet for everyone.

California is not interested in temporary fixes, but a sustainable solution now will benefit our residents for generations to come. This project is a testament to California's culture of innovation, where government, private industry and community organization come together to solve complex problems.

In the next 3 months, the Middle-Mile Broadband Initiative will kick off construction on over 30 new segments, adding about 1,500 miles of fiber building toward more than 3,200 miles in active construction by the end of 2024.

Alright. So exciting, exciting progress. And that ends my MMBI update and happy to answer any questions.

Thank you, Mr. Monroe. Great progress all across the font, and we always love to see videos because it shows us sometimes we're in offices. And so going out into the communities and actually seeing how this matters to a Mayor, you know, Mayor Pro Tem. It's wonderful to see all the groundbreaking that's happening across the State. It looks like a we have a question from Ms. Snider.

Are you able to share that video, or is it publicly available like to share it with some of my colleagues?

It is going to be publicly available. I'm not certain when but yes, that is a priority, because we're very proud of it. And so, I think we're going to have it on our website very soon.

Great!

Yes.

Mr. Monroe, can you maybe send the members a link? I think it is going up on our website this month. But if we could make sure that it gets out to the members that would be great.

Absolutely.

Thank you, Mr. Monroe. Are there any other questions or comments from the dais. Yes, Senator Bradford.

Thank you and thank you for the update just real quick. It's my understanding that all of the Broadband projects that the PUC has proposed for LA County, thus far will rely on state owned middle-mile for connectivity. How is the CDT coordinating with those prospective grantees to ensure that those middle miles arrive in time for those last mile projects?

Yes, no, thank you for that question. We meet certainly weekly, but often daily, with the Public Utilities Commission to coordinate on this. And as these projects are being awarded, these FFA grant projects are being awarded. They're introducing us to the FTA Grant awardees. And we're starting/ introducing that process to make sure that we're not just the timing, but also the location. To make sure our vault, they understand where our network is going, where the vaults are going, and connecting with us on how best to connect. So, we're given the progress that we're making. I think we're all very much aligned in terms of being able to have both the middle mile and the last mile ready in the 2026 timeframe, if not earlier.

Got it. And, as you're aware, you know, as of today, there's no funding for last mile projects in LA County. And the PUC has proposed to fund 3 projects in LA County, totaling about 97 million dollars. How will that? But they won't take a vote until November 7th. So, how is that impacting any of this?

Sure. We're already meeting with the, setting up meetings with the grantees that were that, I think, are the PUC will be voting on next month. And starting the progress for those starting those conversations. And not just them, I mean any applicant that has submitted an FFA application and is planning on connecting to MMBI. We're continuing to meet with all of them and coordinate with them.

Alright.

Thank you, Senator Bradford. Any other questions from any members online or at the dais? Okay, I see none. And we're going to go ahead and go to the next agenda. Item. Thank you, Mr. Monroe. We are going to introduce Director Osborn, who is going to provide an update on last mile.

Thank you, Chair. Next slide, please. So, this provides a snapshot of the Last Mile Senate Bill 156 programs involved in the multi-year infrastructure investment from the left. We have the Broadband Equity Access and Deployment program. It's a 1.86 billion dollars federal program that was approved in the Infrastructure Investment Jobs Act, and I'll give a more in-depth update on this later. But just wanted to note that the Grant solicitation window is not yet open. Next, is the

California Advanced Services Fund. This is our legacy program that has been operating for a number of years. And there's 6 programs under its banner this past legislative cycle, we're able to get an increase in the local assistance budget that was approved. And this presentation later will have more detail on those programs. Next, is the Loan Loss Reserve program. This is a program that to enable tribes, local governments and nonprofits to finance broadband deployment. I'll dive a bit deeper into this program in a coming slide. But I want to note that the projected, but due to the state's projected budget shortfall the budget for this program was modified to 50 million that will be awarded this year. And then finally, to the far right is the Federal Funding Account. And this program aims to deploy wireline last mile infrastructure in every county. And I'll talk about some of the exciting updates on the awards here in more detail of the total funding available for the Federal Funding Account allocations are split among the county areas using a formula adopted in a Commission decision. That states that 5 million is allocated to every county to start, and then each county is further allocated. Funding based on each county's share of unserved locations. Next slide, please. So, the goal of the Federal Funding Account is to provide direct connection to unserved locations and end users. As a refresher, the first grant window closed on September 29th, 2023. So that was last year in that window, we had 484 applications that requested over 4.6 billion in funding and 63 distinct entities filed applications. To date the Federal funding account has awarded over 600 million for 68 projects in 30 counties, and the CPUC has made tremendous progress in an effort to bridge the digital divide. These awards reflect several benefits. So first, a variety of grantees have been awarded, including tribes and county organizations. Some of the tribes and county organizations awarded include the San Ynez band of Chumash Indians in Santa Barbara County, Nevada County Fire Fiber in the city of Fort Bragg. These awards benefit low income and disadvantaged communities throughout California. Nearly all 68 projects connect to a publicly funded open access Middle-Mile, like the State Middle-Mile Broadband Initiative, and to be specific, 40 of the 68 awarded projects plan to connect to the Middle-Mile Broadband Initiative. The Middle Mile Broadband initiative is a crucial component for these projects to catalyze and enable these projects serving disadvantaged low income and high-cost communities. These awards represent comprehensive on-time investments, implementing the vision of the Broadband for All initiatives and multi-year broadband investments and recommended awards are rolled out by county approximately every 2 weeks. Next slide, please. So to further showcase some of the progress made in the Federal Funding Account, I'll provide some additional highlights, so as of today, there are 68 awarded projects totaling 647 million, the recommended awards to an additional 8 projects for combined 157

million have been issued for public comment, and the total awarded and recommended projects will deploy approximately 2,000 miles of network and benefit approximately 2.9 million Californians, and these awards represent a diversity of approaches and communities. I'd like to highlight a few awards to demonstrate the diversity of applications. The award to the Tolowa Dee-ni', in Del Norte County of 4.8 million, will serve the tribal community anchor institutions and unserved locations in the Smith River area. An award in Alpine County in the east to the Golden State Connect Authority will leverage additional outside bond funding. And the last example are awards to a group of projects in San Luis Obispo County, whose awards will build on the state-owned open access. Middle-Mile Project with 6 projects, planning to bring social, economic and public safety benefits of high speed, Broadband to unserved locations. The Middle-Mile Broadband Initiative has been transformational and enabled many Federal funding account applications and awards that would not have been possible from providers that would not otherwise have been able to provide the service. And as I move from this federal funding account, please watch for new recommended awards approximately every 2 weeks. Next slide, please. So, the Loan Loss Reserve Program, the goal is to support public entities, tribes and affiliated nonprofits to finance and issue broadband infrastructure bonds. Unlike other broadband programs at the PUC, this is not a Grant program. A resolution adopted earlier this year implemented a 2024-2025 Budget Agreement that specified 50 million for the program this year. And a resolution was recently issued for public comment recommending awarding 50 million in Broadband Loan Loss Reserve funding to the Golden State Connect Authority, and this item is set to be considered by the Commission at the November 7th meeting. In awarding these funds, the CPUC looks forward to the program, enabling a multiplier effect to bond funded network build outs and demonstrating the impact and value of larger pool of funds could enable that could be enabled in the future. Next slide, please. The California Advanced Services Fund. Tribal Technical, sorry, not just Tribal Technical Assistance, adoption, public housing, and Tribal Technical Assistance. So, the CASF continues to serve as an important tool in supporting digital equity and the goals of Broadband for All. There's a number of account programs I'll speak to, and this slide covers the next opportunity for entities to apply for grants. The next application window for 3 of the sub accounts, and the status of the last round of applications are shown here. Note that the next opportunity for grant applications to be submitted is January 1st, 2025 for the adoption program, the public housing program and the Tribal Technical Assistance programs. And the bullets on this slide cover the status of the over 100 applications submitted in the last application cycle. Next slide, please. This slide summarizes the projects and awards in the last 6 months

and over the life of the CASF program by sub account. Since 2008, the CSF has helped close the digital divide in California by providing grants to build and expand broadband facilities. Grants were awarded for over 1,200 projects, totaling over \$448 million. Next slide, please. This slide provides a snapshot of the Broadband Adoption Account, which provides grants to support digital equity and Inclusion. The budget for this fiscal year is approximately 36 million. To date, the CPUC has approved 365 digital literacy grants that have benefited over 98,000 participants and funded 41 broadband access programs serving over 220,000 participants. Some program highlights are summarized at the bottom of this slide. Next slide, please. This slide provides a snapshot of the Broadband Public Housing Account. The program was revised and updated in 2024, and the budget for this fiscal year is approximately 30 million. The Public Housing Account has connected more than 21,000 housing units with free Internet access. Next slide, please. I think that might be going over to Scott. No, I'll put to Sunne. Thank you.

Thank you. Thank you. Director Osborn. Again. A lot of progress, a lot of great last mile programs that you are funding through your efforts, so great to see things moving. And it sounds like a lot of stuff is happening every 2 weeks. Even. So, that's a great cycle. I would like to open it up to my, the members of the Advisory Committee. Anybody from the dais that has questions or comments for Director Osborn? Right, Anyone online? Yes, Senator Bradford.

Thank you. Thank you again. Sorry for all the questions, but I'm really concerned. And despite reports that comps show LA County as one of the largest, unserved, not underserved, but unserved populations in California. The PUC will not be taking a vote on funding until on the last mile until November 7th for LA County. I'm concerned that these lower income and minority communities will not be getting their fair share of this investment dollars. given, the PUC has received approval to move forward with almost 1.8 billion dollars in BEAD funding. What is the PUC's plan to ensure that low income and minority communities are prioritized?

Thank you for that question, Senator. So, in the Federal Funding Account grant program rules, we prioritize disadvantaged communities. And that has been part of the program rules since the decision. So that's 1 aspect, and also with BEAD, there's a significant focus on digital equity as well. So those are definitely criteria that are used in scoring the applications and awarding grants.

Understanding that. But these communities are still lacking the infrastructure, even in black and brown communities of affluent makeup! They're not served at the same level as their white counterparts. So again, I understand what the rules

say. But what assurances is PUC is going to give us to make sure that they are prioritized.

Well, the I don't really have a direct answer to your question other than that's something that we are trying to focus on with these programs. And we definitely have, you know, we try to get the best data possible to identify where those priority areas are. I think one of the challenges we have is that both all of our programs are applicant driven. So, we need applicants to apply for areas to serve those communities. So that's part of the reason why, under the Federal Funding Account, we prioritized trying to expand the ecosystem of providers because we were finding that the large companies that have traditionally participated in the grant programs were not applying for areas that did not generate a certain return on investment. And so that's why we've been successful, I think, in bringing in counties, tribes, nonprofits, joint powers authority to apply for funding to cover areas that are not traditionally covered by the large companies.

Alright. And as it relates to public housing, you know, the grants approved for broadband public housing accounts have funded projects that do not appear to be capable of providing Internet speed that meet federal standards. I authored a Bill 1383 that would address that. Unfortunately, it wasn't signed, so can the PUC explain how they intend to use these public housing funds to ensure that public housing and low-income communities are not continue to face digital redlining that leaves them with sub-standard speeds.

Thank you for that question, and the public housing account has a requirement to deploy speeds that, I believe are in line with the federal deployment requirements. So, I think the challenge again, is getting applicants to apply for the money so that we can provide the grants. Certainly, again, there is a priority on trying to connect communities that have been overlooked for decades and trying to provide broadband to those communities. I think one of the benefits with the public housing account is that there is a requirement that there is service provided at no cost, so that there's not a price barrier for people to sign up for service.

But my question was on making sure they'd have the adequate speed. So how are we addressing? Making sure that they have adequate speed? That federal standard stated.

Thank you. So, I think, for the adequate speeds requirement. We, before we issue payment for the grant, we require speed tests be conducted at the location so that we can verify the deployed speeds actually meet the program. Grant requirements.

Thank you, Senator Bradford. Thank you, Director Osborn. Any other questions. Alright, I see none. Thank you very much. We'll go to Ms. McPeak, who's going to give us an update on broadband adoption and the ACP updates.

Thank you. Let's go to the first slide. And I do want to compliment you, Director Osborn, on the really succinct and clear presentation on the expenditures and pending applications for the California Advanced Services Fund. That's really helpful. So, thank you. And much of this. In fact, what you have in front of you, Deputy Director Adams, already covered. But it's worth revisiting, I think. What is always sobering to me is that while we in California outperformed every other State, there were 5.8 million households eligible for ACP. And with all of our efforts, in less than 2 years we got to 50%. I am absolutely confident that, based on what was happening in 2024 at the beginning, before the FCC ran out of money. We would have hit the goal that the California Broadband Council set, which was 90%. By the end of this year we were literally on track, and that is because the state agencies, other public agencies stepped in to do what I call direct notification. When we couldn't get that, we did direct mail, which is a pretty good proxy sending into the targeted zip codes for which we had really good data from the FCC. Actually on a monthly basis by zip code by county on a quarterly basis. But look at this data, 1 in 5 households were eligible for ACP. That means one in 5 households need affordable support to be online to take advantage of all of the technology be it for getting a job or getting their homework done in school, being able to get access to health care. It was also a very large investment or infusion of capital into the California economy through ACP, almost 1.7 billion dollars. That is a pretty substantial number to keep in mind what happens if we get affordability for everybody, because that's cash that circulates in one way or another in the community. So going to the next slide, is what the Department of Technology has nicely prepared here. From all the research we've done in reaching out directly to all the Internet service providers, there are some smaller companies who still have some offers, but they find it very difficult if they are not supported in cash flow a smaller ISP wireline, or wireless in communities. It's literally difficult for them as a business model to provide support. So we need to, we've already told the FCC and the federal government that that's an issue. But all of these companies have stepped up to do 2 things which is first to sustain what was their affordable offer prior to the Affordable Connectivity Program. Many of these were negotiated as public benefits out of corporate consolidations. The exception is Cox. Cox actually did this from the very beginning as a voluntary program, and they've kept that going. What the companies also did is stepped up to provide what we call a mirror offer to ACP. So an offer that is at least 100 megabits down, 20 up for \$30 a month. The one company that has done half of that, or halfway that is at the

bottom of the list. Here's the rub. This is what we have to provide right now to offer to the all of the 2.9 million who were signed up for ACP. We got to get them transitioned, and all of these offers that are the ACP mirror offers are good publicly until the end of this year, that is, no one company has made a public commitment in writing that they will even verbally, that they will continue to offer their mirror ACP affordable subscription rate beyond the end of 2024. None of them have said publicly that they're going to terminate them, but they just haven't made the commitment beyond 2024, and we're within less than a quarter within less than 90 days obviously. It's almost 60 days. We also are using these indirect notification, and I just want to again commend state agencies who are continuing to notify households. There are several counties that are doing direct notification. Alameda County and Santa Clara, over 260,000 households each, are being notified by mail. All of their CalFresh Medi-Cal households. Some of the smaller counties, Nevada, Siskiyou, Santa Cruz, Napa is trying to figure out how they're going to do it as an example. The county offices of education, Los Angeles County Office of Education, in particular, is sending this information you're seeing on the screen out to their districts. To then distribute. All of this is really a lot of effort which comes back to the hope that there will be a LifeLine reform. As Director Osborn talked about that to all of the Internet service providers who, I know, are listening right now. We appreciate the goodwill of their representatives in California. They are trying to get commitments from headquarters to sustain the offers, and I do want to note that you'll see with Cox that they have 2 different pricing amounts for a good speed if it's available in the territory, and there the differentiation is whether or not there's a child in school versus being simply on a public assistance program. All of this is to conclude that we need to keep the momentum that has been forged by the California Broadband Council through the leadership of the State agencies sitting here that we continue to work with the Internet service providers and legislators led by Senator Bradford and Assemblymember Gipson, to ensure that we in this next session actually secure affordable Internet. The 2.9 million households we've not reached almost are totally unaware that they're eligible for these programs. And that's going to take all of us working together very significantly. So, turning to the next slide. I'm actually going to go back to and defer to Deputy Director Adams to talk about looking ahead, because I think it's under your leadership that we're looking ahead from the department, from the chair of the Broadband Council, and that it's best that you highlight this.

Thank you, Ms. McPeak. And again, I think, kudos and congratulations to the Broadband Council and all of the many stakeholders who achieved this significant enrollment numbers for the ACP. And thank you for kind of underscoring what we're hearing across the nation from other broadband

offices that as significant and valuable a tool the ACP was for addressing affordability and adoption, that there's a significant gap in its absence right now, and that there's no number or no shortage of folks at the federal or state level that are looking at ways to address that gap, and part of it is, we need to continue to move forward until a replacement comes. If it comes at all. What we wanted to really demonstrate here is that as you highlighted, it's really going to continue to take this village that we've built to support broadband adoption and raise awareness of those low cost offers that aren't necessarily as widely promoted, and the opportunities that we have looking forward both this year and over the next 5 years, with the significant investments are that there's a number of California Advanced Services Fund Adoption account grantees that are going to be doing significant community-based Broadband Adoption work and raising awareness of low cost programs. There are the significant applicants that will be receiving funds from the State Digital Equity Capacity Subgrant program that will also be doing that work and identifying local affordable options for the covered populations in their communities that they're working to serve. And then, I think, lastly, a very encouraging component is the NTIA will be funding a significant number of competitive grants around the nation, and those folks will also be conducting those efforts. So, on the awareness front. There's work to be done. I think the silver lining is that with the increased availability and competition that occurs as a result of the Broadband for All Infrastructure investments. We've heard about the coupling of the Middle-Mile Broadband initiative with the public Utilities Commission's Last Mile programs, you know. There'll hopefully be an increase in availability there very much will be but a lowering of costs due to competition. And then and I think, lastly, when we look at the future, low cost offers that are associated, you know the CPUC has requirements that grantees about the Federal Funding Account and looking forward when the BEAD program grants go out that they have an affordable offer. So those are things to look forward to that are going to be implemented soon.

And if I might just then close to acknowledge the tremendous progress that was made by the Governor proposing in the budget that was adopted by the Legislature the increased expenditure for authority up to the 150 million for CASF collection that actually doubled the resources. So, when you see the recommendation from Director Osborn, or report on the applications that have are pending and can be funded that Director Adams just went through. It cannot be underestimated how valuable the California Advanced Services Fund is to augment what will be the capacity, grant and whatever NTIA does on the competitive grants, and I should have acknowledged. But now I can, that all of that direct notification that I just talked about that is, promoting these

affordable offers is supported by the California Public Utilities Commission, CASF Grant. It is a call center grant that we have, and that other CBOS have.

Thank you, Ms. McPeak and Mr. Adams, are there any questions about the ACP program, or we were just talking about the affordability initiative that we have as a as a board. We obviously focused a lot on ACP, we had that 90% target. That 90% target does not go away. Just because ACP, as I think that's where we're trying to hear from Ms. McPeak. It is still a priority of all of ours, and as such we are looking for avenues to get those 2.9 million members to of the current program into portable. And we still have to remember there was 5 million that qualified. So, there's still the other 50% that we are needing to reach. So, and I always thank Ms. McPeak for reminding us of the importance of this initiative, and we will continue leaning in. So, thank you very much.

Thank you, Madam Chair. Are there any questions online from any members? Yes, Mr. Aguayo.

Thank you, Madam. So yeah, actually, I want to extend appreciation on behalf of Mr. Gipson for well, a number of kind of rundowns and presentation, but in particular just had a question for Ms. McPeak about some of the mentions regarding the ACP. So, if Internet providers are required to notify households about their eligibility for ACP. What, exactly is going wrong there, then, are these folks that I mean could have been said already, but our providers not actually notifying them. Is there not a kind of standard way of doing so? What's going wrong?

Thank you, Mr. Aguayo, and I appreciate Assemblymember Gipson being so interested in this topic. So please extend to him my best.

The Internet service providers were required by ACP. The rules of the Federal Communications Commission to do 3 notices to everybody on ACP. The FCC actually, had templates for the language we have tracked down, and found all of those notices that all of those companies that were on the chart before did. However, we also know it takes at least 20 touches to most of the households, especially those who are on a day-to-day basis, simply trying to keep their lives together to actually pay attention when we do a direct notification campaign. A good return is 1%. It takes, then going back no less than 7 times to pick up about the 90% reaction, or somebody taking action. When we work with CBOS on the on the ground, and we do a lot, many of whom are funded by the PUC. We fund many of them. We will tell each of those CBOS and coach them to success that you have to reach 20 households about information in order to get one household through the door for, say, digital literacy training. So, it was why Emmanuel, that I went back to Director Osborn earlier and asked. Can the

existing program the lifeline, do they have legal authority to do public awareness? Most recently I see lots of ads from the department of aging on how to get assistance if you want to remain in your home, and that program is funded by obviously State dollars authorized by the legislature, and they are authorized to use the dollars for awareness. So, we really want to get to many avenues for awareness. But the most effective starts with direct notification. But you have to do it repeatedly in order to get people to pay attention. Now, some of the more remarkable phenomenon's that we're seeing because we have a unique telephone number associated with every communication channel. So, if Los Angeles County sends out a notice, there is a number for Los Angeles County, the Department of Health Care Services. Each of their mailings has a unique number. We're still getting calls at the call center for mail that the state agency sent more than a year ago. I will tell you. I have no idea who keeps mail that long, and then sits down and decides to go through it, but we know it was that flyer that they got because it has a unique number. So, there's residual as well. But more and more you've got to start with that direct notification from a credible source that needs to be backed up with outreach in the community, in language and culture. Now, here's what I also want to share, and then I'll to make sure that Assemblymember Gipson, and other policymakers are aware. The return on investment in public awareness, advertising in community and ethnic channels is off the chart. We never buy add space in English in a major channel, because you don't reach the people we need. If you buy Spanish speaking television. Oh, my God, the telephone lines light up immediately. If we buy Asian speaking language radio messages, the same thing happens, and that can be a huge return on investment if we on the public side have the authority to use those dollars for public awareness. But just to sum it up. You have to keep going back and back and back to reach the people who are just trying to get by every day, and we need to be much more strategic about how we use our resources to actually get responses.

Thank you very much. Any additional questions from anyone online or at the dais. Thank you, Ms. McPeak. You always give very thorough. You educate us while you're answering the questions, so we always appreciate that with that we can go ahead and shift to the next category.

And I apologize because I'm always off script.

We learn a lot. Thank you very much. The NTIA IJA programs. We are going to shift to updates on that in relation to the digital equity planning updates, a lot going on. It's been, oh, my gosh! A year since we had published the Digital Equity Plan. And we're looking at capacity grants and kind of what's going on next. And so, the first up is Director Adams, and then Director Osborn.

Thank you, Chair and Director Bailey-Crimmins. And I'm being instructed that we're a little behind schedule, so I'm going to try to be really efficient with my presentation. So it's a pleasure Council and members of the public to provide an update on some of the key milestones associated with both the Digital Equity Plan and Digital Equity Capacity Grant program implementation. And the 1st thing we'd like to start by is to really highlight some of the key milestones and the 1st is essentially, you know, reminding folks that it was on March 28th that the State Digital Equity Plan that we all developed, the statewide coalition with input from 50,000 Californians was approved by the NTIA. It was really the day after that the notice of funding opportunity for the State Digital Equity Capacity Grant came out and that outlined an allocation for each State. California was allocated 70.2 million dollars, and you know each state, they will receive that amount of funding, had to complete an administrative application. So CDT, The Department of Technology, on behalf of the State, submitted our application on May 29th and really between May 29th and now we have been in the curing and merit review process with the NTIA. So the award is pending. We're thinking it's imminent. But that's where we're at. Next slide, please.

What we wanted to really emphasize here is that while our application for the grant funds has been in the curing process, we've done everything we can to kind of move the program forward and have done significant engagement with stakeholders across the state and multimodal multi-level monthly stakeholder briefings. We've done market research and listening sessions, 2 questionnaires with our stakeholders, many large group presentations and in order to bring in additional funds, we did a number of competitive NTIA Competitive Grant coordinating meetings as part of our work next slide, please. And so, Director, one of the things we'd like the Council to know is that there are a lot of programs out there, and 70 million is a significant amount of money for the State to receive, to implement the plan, however, for a state as large as ours, with as much needs there are, we've taken great care in talking with stakeholders, hearing what they had to say that actually formed the Digital Equity Plan. But then moving forward, it's like based on the objectives of the Digital Equity Plan and the activities we'll be conducting, how do we maximize the funding we receive and not dilute it to have the biggest impact to the measurable outcomes that we're responsible for? So this is a high, level sort of visual to explain the program structure. The NTIA will be the federal grant administrator, the Department of Technology will receive the grant and be the administrative entity, do a number of grant administrative responsibilities and also includes implementing the Digital Equity Plan, doing updates and evaluation and how we we'll be allocating funding in this tranche of dollars is focusing on some centralized services that a need was called out for in the digital equity planning

process. How can we use our purchasing and procurement power to leverage tools for state partner entities, ecosystem partners, and subgrantees. The next bucket is really taking a look at state agency digital inclusion efforts, knowing that oftentimes state agencies have an ability, given the services they provide to have an impact at scale. So really, meeting with state agencies to see within budget what are the potential programs we could fund to have a major impact. The last and largest bucket of funds we're intending to allocate out of the planning grant is for the Digital Equity Capacity Subgrant program, and that is a program that will really be intended to provide subgrants to entities and coalitions, to implement activities that align with the State plan at the regional and local level, really focusing on digital navigation and providing digital literacy training connecting to low cost device offers, etc. Next slide, please. Part of the work that we've done over the last 4 months in our engagement with stakeholders, through our briefings and market research and listening sessions is develop a draft subgrant program design. And this was really the design we came up was intended to achieve 2 needs-a 1st funding track that would provide planning plus capacity grants for regional and local ecosystems, knowing that that's a lack in many parts of the state, the second track would be to targeted statewide ecosystems. So we know that there are 8 covered populations that the Digital Equity Act requires we focus our efforts on. So there would be, you know, some grants allocated to statewide entities that we're focusing specifically on innovations and building out the ecosystem to support those covered populations. And then the Digital Equity Plan also requires us to focus on 6 outcome areas. So really taking a look at education, workforce development, digital inclusion, essential services providing catalytic grants for entities to receive funding, to really move forward and develop innovative ideas and build coalitions around achieving outcomes for that area. I would say that part of you know, this design work was really done with input from stakeholders over the last couple of months. Could we go to the next slide, please? So part of the open and transparent process that CDT and the Administration are committed to is, you know, we have developed draft Digital Equity Capacity Subgrant program guidelines that really outline the structure of the proposed program, the funding tracks, the proposed funding allocation, pre and post award and other administrative constraints that were really designed to adhere to state and federal guidelines. We wanted to put those out to public comment. We're currently in a 30-day public comment period. We've created an online portal on the Broadband for All Portal that's very easy to access. The periods open from September 30th to October 29th. We're very encouraged from the feedback we've received from folks intending to or wanting to provide public comment. We want to say it's still open. There's 8 more days to go and really

encourage folks that want to have a say to utilize this public transparent, open process and put your comments in, and we'll review those. And, you know, look at your suggestions to see if there's further ways we could potentially, you know, modify or revise the program. Next slide, please. So other sources of funding we've definitely talked about the need for funding. There's just we're a big state part of our efforts, and excuse me, I'm not seeing the oh, thank you very much. So part of what the ecosystem did is the NTIA came out with another grant program that was included in the Digital Equity Act. It was the competitive Grant application, and this was about less than a billion dollars of funding that entities would apply directly to the federal government for so these wouldn't flow through the States, really encouraged by how California showed up there. I mentioned that we had coordinated meetings with over about 18 of the groups that applied but 20 California based, more than 20 California-based, application groups applied for over 250 million additional dollars through this program. Now, we've since understood that about 700 applications came into the NTIA, so it's very competitive. We're crossing our fingers, but this is another potential pool of funding that could help support Broadband for All, and digital equity in the state. Additional note, I would want to say on additional sources of funding is that the NTIA has established a native entity Digital Equity Capacity grant, that's a part of Digital Equity Act, you know, funding, and so, you know, we are, the application period opened on September 25th. It's open for a significant period of time. It won't close until February of next year, but we are very committed to working with members of the Broadband Council, other state agencies, obviously the Office of Tribal Affairs, and you know, California's federally recognized tribes to provide support for folks who could get significant grants through this program. Next slide, please, and so finally wanted to close.

We have a member that has a question with Secretary Snider.

Is that funding, rolling? Or is it going to be considered once it's closed.

I'm sorry I couldn't hear you, Secretary.

Is the native entity funding, is that rolling applications or is it going to be considered once the final deadline?

You know, I'd have to check with staff and could get back to you. What's been communicated is that the NTIA had a large window for the application period, but I'm not sure if there's going to be a kind of a rollover period, so we'll get back to you on that.

Thank you.

And I have one more slide, because I know, my boss always tells me it's important to give folks an understanding of what to expect moving forward, and I know that our partners require that to the extent possible. We've tried to provide specificity on what moves forward, there's always a degree of complexity when you know, we're, you know, working with a complex federal ecosystem that has to work through their process and providing specificity to the stakeholders to the extent that we would like to. What this graphic shows, and I would really, just, you know, want to show you is the 2 main milestones on the left on, you know, March 29th when the capacity grant opened, and when the application was due to the NTIA. On the bottom left in the gray, it shows the 5-month stakeholder engagement period really, in the middle, you see where we are right now, we went out with the 30-day public comment period on the guidelines. Knowing we would want to get a head start here because we anticipate there's going to be a 60-day period for requests for applications. Here in California we anticipate, you know, a 90-day review period, and then another 30 days to finalize agreements, and then, if I could draw your attention just to the 2 boxes on the top on the left, where it says, October TBD it's really the award receipt that triggers our timeline for the NTIA, and once we receive official notification, we'll have 9 months to identify every single, you know, expenditure associated with that 70 million dollars grant. So there's going to be a lot of work doing procurements and, you know, going through the subgrant process and identifying those. But this is the current timeline, and we will provide updates, you know, as soon as we get them, you know, utilizing our monthly stakeholder briefings as a vehicle for those. So thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Adams. Any questions from the dais regarding the timeline or potential equity update? Any online? Right? Just one question, Mr. Adams. I know. Obviously, you mentioned it's triggered by NTIA. I think we're still assuming on October timeframe. I know we don't have a lot of say over the federal, you know what their schedule is, but that's still the expectation. You haven't heard anything differently at this point?

We haven't heard anything differently. We yes, we anticipate sometime, you know, this month or potentially next, depending on their workload. But that's the timeframe we've been expecting.

And then once it is it happens you'll make some type of public announcement, so everyone will know the 9 month clock will start. Is that correct? Some type of public announcement? So they don't have to wait till we get back together to find out that the NTIA has actually moved forward.

Absolutely, I think through a number of means we'll communicate that out with folks through our monthly Broadband for All email update and the monthly stakeholder briefings, and to make sure that the you know the Broadband Council members and ecosystem partners are aware of, you know, important developments.

Thank you. All right, we're now going to shift to Mr. Osborn.

Thank you. Next slide, please. So just an update on the BEAD program. So some key milestones that we've achieved so far, in February 2023, we opened the BEAD rulemaking. In June last year the NTIA approved or allocated 1.86 billion for the BEAD program to California. After that the CPUC submitted and the NTIA accepted California's five-year Action plan, and in December last year the CPUC submitted the initial proposal volumes 1 and 2 final draft to the NTIA. In April this year the NTIA approved our initial proposal volume one which focuses on the challenge process and the Commission voted to adopt it on May 9th at the voting meeting, and then on October 3rd the NTIA approved initial proposal Volume 2, which focuses on the subgrantee selection process, and the Commission voted to adopt Volume 2 at its September 26th meeting, and at that point the October 3rd date, the approval of Volume 2 started the 365 day clock for us to submit our final proposal. Building on these milestones the CPUC will be conducting outreach during quarter 4 this year, conducting the subgrantee selection process, which will happen in the 1st 3 quarters of next year and both the CPUC and NTIA will need to approve the proposed grant awards in quarter 4. So all these activities are subject to NTIA review and approval. So I'll get into more detail on the next slide. So next slide, please. So I apologize, the text is fairly small, but the slides will be available on CDT's website or the Broadband Council website later. But just in brief, so the BEAD planning documents, the NTIA requires BEAD recipients to specify the process they'll use to carry out the subgrantee program. The challenge process, the CPUC is following the NTIA's model challenge process. It's something that they put out as a model for all states. And we made some minor modifications that were approved by NTIA. The CPUC started the 120-day challenge process by accepting challenges starting in July, and that window closed in September on September 19th with rebuttals and then the subgrantee selection process is that's contained in the IP, Initial Proposal Volume 2. Our next activity is a series of outreach presentations on that process this quarter and after the outreach a prequalification period will start, and we anticipate accepting grant applications in the 1st quarter next year after the challenge process results have been approved by the NTIA. Deployment is expected to begin in 2025, but timing is dependent on NTIA and Commission approval of the final proposal. Starting in 2023, the CPUC has been

conducting public outreach to gather input from potential participants and beneficiaries of BEAD grants. The CPUC participated in statewide public engagement with CDT last year. That was very successful, and the CPUC has continued outreach through webinars office hours and informational sessions leading up to and through the challenge process. Next slide, please. So in terms of the challenge process timeline, this is a public process to establish the locations that will be eligible to receive BEAD funds. And those are the locations that subgrantees may submit proposals on. We're currently in the 30-day final determination phase during which the CPUC will resolve the outstanding rebuttals to the challenges. And as a reminder, the public challenge process has 4 phases. There's the challenge phase which is in the far left in green. And that's where permissible challengers were able to challenge the existing BEAD map and submit evidence through the portal when specific locations that may not be accurately represented as unserved or underserved or served, submitted challenges, meeting the evidence threshold, moved on to the rebuttal phase, and that's where broadband service providers or other rebutters could provide evidence on challenge locations, and that phase also lasts for 30 days. And then the final determination phase will resolve the remaining challenges that are left unresolved at the end of the rebuttal phase, and that phase lasts for 30 days. So finally, the State will take, CPUC will take all final decisions and send the proposed list to the NTIA for review and approval. And at the end of the challenge process, a final map of eligible locations will be published, and that will be the basis for the grant applications. And that ends our last mile update. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Osborn. Are there any questions or comments from the dais?

Any questions or comments online?

Okay, thank you very much. You are also up for the legislative update, Mr. Osborn. You're going to lead the conversation, and then we'll pivot to Mr. Monroe.

Thank you. So next slide. Please believe we've got them listed here, there we go. So the 1st Bill Assembly Bill 2765 Pellerin. So this makes modifications to the public utilities code relating to backup power requirements that were created through the emergency disaster relief proceeding. That were intended to mitigate the effects of climate change on the State's communication grid and the network resiliency and emergency preparedness. So this bill amends the public utilities code and requires the Commission to report to the Governor and the Legislature no later than February 1st of each year, on the audits and inspections conducted to ensure compliance with the Commission's backup electricity rules

for providers of telecommunications service, including a list of violations that were identified, and if any actions were taken to correct those violations. The second Senate Bill 10, see, we got 109 next. So 109 is the state's budget shortfall, as I mentioned earlier, led to the reduction of the Loan Loss Reserve Fund allocation to 50 million, and that this bill requires that the awards are made from the Broadband Loan Loss Reserve program by on or before December 31st of this year. In addition, the bill provided over 252 million for last mile broadband infrastructure through for the Federal funding account, and those funds have to be encumbered by or sorry, allocated by December 31st, 2026, and encumbered, expended and liquidated by December 31st, 2028. The bill also included reporting requirements on or before October 1st, 2023, and bi-annually thereafter to provide a report on the last mile funding projects, the number of projects, the amount awarded amounts awarded under the capital Projects fund amounts awarded under BEAD, and amounts awarded under the General Fund. And that addresses 109. For 108 there are a number of requirements. I'm not sure, Mark, are you going to address that as well? Or there's also middle mile stuff in there.

Yeah, I was going to adjust or address the middle mile piece. Are there any other pieces you'd like to address?

I'll let you go with the middle-mile, because there's minor parts on last mile. All right.

Very good. Yeah. So SB 108 was one of the bills that made up the Budget Act of 2024, and it articulated some new reporting requirements for CDT. Required a project update report as of this last September which has been released. And it's basically an update to the March 1st annual report that CDT does every year. Similarly, it required by this November an update on the project with some new details requiring or including a network location by county, by region, by Caltrans district, and by legislative district. That also requires some details regarding costs by fiscal year and funding source, and as well as approved or pending last mile projects that anticipate connecting to the Middle-Mile Broadband Project, identified from programs such as BEAD and FFA and the California Advanced Services Fund have been discussed. And so this report is currently being finalized. And then SB 108 also required an assessment of, or an estimate of, what's going to cost to operate the network by January of 2025. So the CDT also is working on with his partners on developing these cost estimates. Do you want me to move on to SB164, all right. So SB 164 was a budget trailer bill this last year it required CDT when developing the network to prioritize segments needed to connect to locations that are receiving Last Mile grants from CPUC programs, such as FFA, BEAD and CASF, as I think most of us are tracking and as

noted, 105 FFA Grant applications that plan to connect to MMBI and CDT's current funding isn't as anticipated to be sufficient to reach all of those 105 FFA grant locations.

Does that conclude your presentation?

I think that, concludes the, unless anybody else has anything to add, I think that concludes the legislative updates.

Thank you, Director Osborn and Deputy Director Monroe. Any questions from the dais? Any questions online?

All right. Thank you very much for the legislative update. The last agenda item before we go to public comment is the 2025 focus and meeting schedule. This will be a voting item. And so, after we get a staff recommendation, we will be asked individually to for our motion to support. So we'll be instructed by Ms. Nguyen how to follow that process. But I just want to make sure everyone was aware. Mr. Adams, if you'd like to make your proposal?

Absolutely. Thank you, Director Bailey-Crimmins, and members of the Council. Could we go to the next slide, please? So the staff is making a recommendation to the Council on both the 2025 focus and the meeting schedule. And so our proposal is to again seek your approval, to work with the relevant agencies and entity partners to conduct the Annual Broadband Action Plan and Review vision revision process, to continue to report out on Broadband for All initiatives is the major content for the subject of the meetings, and then to hold quarterly meetings next year on the 4th Fridays of the month. Those dates that staff have identified are January 24th, April 25th, July 25th and October 24th.

Thank you, Mr. Adams, do I have a motion to support?

Clarifying question from Deputy Secretary, Dr. Mattis.

Hi, thank you. Can you please verify the time of the meetings? Would they remain the same at 9:30 to 11:30?

Yes.

Thank you.

I also have a question.

Thank you. Ms. McPeak.

So this is going to be hell with my schedule because I try to catch up with everything else on Fridays, but it's we can reserve them in advance. My question

is really for the legislators, because they usually go back to their district. Now I just want to make sure that the legislators will be able to participate on Fridays. I assume that they already said they could. Is that true?

It doesn't conflict with any meetings. Is that what you just said, Anh, I'm sorry?

I would say we did confer with our legislative staff.

Okay.

Now, it's always a complex undertaking to arrange the schedules for the members of the Council. I think what we were trying to do is to create a time that worked and created some space between the Middle Mile Broadband Advisory Council and the California Broadband Council, and that given we have the ability to conduct hybrid meetings that the 4th Fridays of the month were, you know, a good day to propose that we meet up.

I appreciate how difficult it is to find these times and then find the venues. I just. And I'm looking at them online. They're beautiful. They're participating that way. I just know that it might even make it more difficult, because they go back to district, that's all.

Thank you for the discussion. Is there a motion to support, or an alternative motion that any member wants to make? Anything at the dais? Okay, I have Mr. Yarborough CalOES a motion to support. Do I have a second one?

Second.

Okay, Secretary Snider has a second.

We'll go ahead and go around and do the vote. Ms. Nguyen?

Thank you. California Broadband Council members in favor of motion, please say aye, if you opposed, please say nay, and any abstention. I'll read your name one at a time.

State Chief Information Officer and Director Bailey-Crimmins?

Aye.

Mr. Yarbrough.

Aye.

Dr. Mattis.

Aye. Chief Deputy Director Kenney.

Aye.

Deputy Secretary Espinoza.

Aye.

Ms. McPeak

Aye.

Deputy Secretary Flores.

Mr. Chisom.

Aye.

Secretary Snider-Ashtari.

Aye.

Senator Bradford.

Aye.

Mr. Aguayo.

Aye.

Thank you, Madam Chair. The motion passes with 10 Ayes and one absent, and 2 abstention for their absences.

Thank you, Ms. Nguyen, all right is, I'd like, just before we go to public comment, we'll go to the room, and then I know we'll go to online and the calls as well, is there any other discussion or comment at the dais before we get started on public comment? All right, anything online? All right, Ms. Nguyen. If you go ahead and go through the public comment process.

Thank you. To ensure everyone who wishes to make public comment has the opportunity to do so. We respectfully request one person per entity and 2 minutes per person. The order of public comment will be in-person comments, Zoom or phone comments and emailed comments submitted prior to the meeting. For in-person comments, please form a line at the podium. For Zoom, please use the raise hand feature on the lower toolbar, for phone, please press Star 9 to raise your hand. Emailed comments received prior to the meeting will be read at the end. We will start first with folks in line at the podium. Madam Chair, I don't see any in person, so we'll proceed. We will hear comments now from Zoom and we do have a couple. So let's just a second. Mr. Patrick Messac.

Good morning, Council members. My name is Patrick Messac, and I am the Director of Oakland, Undivided. To open, I'd like to thank the CPUC for

actualizing the intent of the FFA Last Mile Grant program by investing state funds in areas long deemed uneconomic by incumbent monopolies. Despite these ISP attempts to block these equity-based projects, the PUC has remained steadfast. Thank you. In my brief time today I'd like to address 2 topics covered in the meeting. First on the adoption of low-cost plans, we need to proceed with caution, as we publicly fund adoption of private plans. These companies have a fiduciary responsibility to their shareholders to extract maximum profit from each Californian. Customer service reps are often paid on commission and are incentivized to upsell which they oftentimes do. These plans include eligibility requirements that are literally illegal under California law. Schools are forbidden from sharing enrollment data in the National School Lunch program for any purpose besides the provision of meals. Then, even if a resident is fortunate enough to navigate the complex and intrusive enrollment process, they are usually constrained by abysmally slow speeds. Earlier this month I spoke with Miss Karen, an elder, living in public housing on fixed income, who enrolled in an essentials plan at \$10 a month, and 6 months later her bill has climbed to nearly \$100 a month, and she has no idea why. Second, the Digital Equity Capacity Grant. We need to maximize the dollars getting to the community to support activities from trusted organizations. The draft plan may only protect half of the 70 million dollars for local or regional grants, with the rest going to state activities and grant administration. Alarming, this funding is anything but equitable under the current allocation formula. In Alameda County, each person in a covered population will get around 77 cents, in Alpine County each person in a covered population will get approximately \$177 plus BEAD funding that will almost exclusively benefit rural areas. Then, once a region gets its funding, subgrantees will be required to use state centralized services, and while we don't know what that entails, we believe mandating the adoption of state curriculum and surveys fails to honor the wisdom of organizations that know our community best. We encourage the State to reevaluate this trickle-down, top-down approach for this vital funding. Thank you, Council members and State partners for your commitment to expand access where it's needed most.

Thank you for your comment. Please, Mr. David Griffith.

Yes, thank you very much members of the Commission. My name is David Griffith, and I'm a supervisor up in Alpine County, and I understood correctly from Director Monroe, and also the references Senate Bill 164, the Middle-Mile will connect all last mile projects under FFA but there's at least one that that doesn't quite work for and that is the Highway 4 Corridor and starts off in Calaveras County and Arnold and ends up in Alpine County, in Bear Valley. That Bear Valley does have an FFA, approved FFA grant. But there's a 25-mile gap in

the Middle-Mile program. So, if there's any way to fill that 25 miles for Middle-Mile, it'd be much appreciated. Thank you very much.

Thank you for your comment.

Madam Chair, we do not have any more comments from Zoom and none were received via email prior to the meeting and that ends our public comment session.

Thank you very much, Ms. Nguyen. This has been a very, it's been a great and informative end of year 2024 at California Broadband Council. Thank you very much. All board members. I hopefully, we will see you again back on Friday, January 24th, 2025, from 9:30 to 11:30. We will be at the Covered California Boardroom, for those that participated in the past. We all work really hard to address the digital divide, to address that through programs through initiatives, making sure that we have measurements of how our initiatives are making progress. And obviously we are very appreciative of the departments that have been here, the presenters, the public that have been supportive, the obviously the members of the committee and the Legislature and administration. With that, we will call the California Broadband Council of 2024 adjourned and have a very safe holiday season.

Thank you, everyone.