California Public Utilities Commission
Proceeding R.23-02-016

Broadband Equity Access and Deployment (BEAD) Program
Community Engagement Listening Session in Los Angeles, CA

Tuesday, November 28, 2023 | 9:00am to 12:00pm
Junipero Serra State Office Building | Carmel Room
320 W. Fourth St.,
Los Angeles, CA 90013

Agenda

9:00 - 9:10: Commissioner Remarks & Overview of BEAD program

9:10-10:00: Public Comment

10:00-10:15: BREAK

10:15-11:00: Public Comment

11:00-11:15: BREAK

11:15-12:00: Public Comment

Questions for Members of the Public

General Topics

- Any topic related to the BEAD program that the public would like to share with the Commission.

Challenge Process

- What aspects or modules of the Model Challenge Process should be adopted or modified?
- What additional data sources, such as CPUC availability data or demographic data, should be utilized in the Commission's pre-challenge eligibility map?
- What forms of public and stakeholder engagement before the Challenge Process would be most valuable, and when should this engagement occur?
- Are there modifications or additions the Commission should make to the NTIA definition of Community Anchor Institutions?
- How should the Commission structure the required de-duplication process for removing locations with enforceable commitments to deploy broadband from the BEAD eligibility map?
- How should the Commission apply the definition of an enforceable commitment area to Tribal lands? Should the definition of an enforceable commitment be restricted for deployments on Tribal lands to those projects with a Tribal Government Resolution between a Tribal Government and a broadband service provider? What would constitute a Tribal Resolution?

Project Selection

- If applicants are allowed to construct their own project areas, what mechanisms should be used to: ensure complete coverage of unserved and/or underserved locations, and de-conflict overlapping proposals?

- If project areas are pre-defined, are there pre-existing geographies, such as counties, Tribal lands, or cities, that should be used, or should project areas be drawn based on clusters of unserved/underserved locations?
- How should the required scoring criteria, including affordability, labor standards, minimum BEAD outlay, speed to deployment, and technical capabilities, be applied to individual projects and weighted within a rubric?
- Are there additional scoring criteria, such as awarding points on the basis of equity or climate resilience, that should be included? How should those points be awarded?
- In the post-application process, how should the Commission prioritize identifying applicants for remaining unserved or underserved locations not included in an application? What inducements should be used to encourage applications for those locations?

Extremely High Cost Per Location Threshold

- What inputs should be used to determine the Extremely High Cost Per Location Threshold, such as cost models, application data, or other information?
- How strictly should the Commission apply the Extremely High Cost Per Location Threshold in selecting subgrantees?
- In the Initial Proposal, should the Commission adopt a specific threshold amount, a range of possible thresholds, different thresholds for different parts of the state, process for identifying the Extremely High Cost Per Location Threshold during the subgrantee selection process, or some other proposal for the Extremely High Cost Per Location Threshold?