

June 7, 2014

To John C. Baker  
Communications Division (CD)  
California Public Utilities Commission  
(415) 703-1568  
Via email to [john.baker@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:john.baker@cpuc.ca.gov)

RE: Comments on Draft Resolution T-17443 – Effecting Priorities and Amounts of Upcoming KRV CASF grant applications.

Dear Mr. Baker:

Please accept these as timely comments regarding Draft Resolution T-17443.

### **Factual Error**

On page 76 the Kern River Valley in Kern County is un-factually designated to be **served**. It should be **unserved**. This is probably because the year old broadband maps (6/30/2013) show Mediacom serving this area. This is factually incorrect. Mediacom has not offered service in this area for years.

On page 10 of the DRAFT resolution the CD concedes that “there may be areas identified as served in the Broadband Availability Map that have been deemed actually ... unserved by public feedback.” On November 22, 2013 the CPUC’s own Robert B. Osborn ([ro1@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:ro1@cpuc.ca.gov)), Senior Analyst, Broadband, California Public Utilities Commission and Executive Staff at California Broadband Council provided this feedback in an email to me and the CASF staff:

“We had a call with Mediacom today, and they said that they are not accepting any new subscriber applications for the Lake Isabella area due to capacity constraints. We asked them to remove that area from their next data submission, which will be data as of Dec. 31, 2013. The Round 8 data, scheduled to go live on the interactive map in mid-December, however, will not reflect that change since we have already processed and submitted that dataset for the map.”

Earlier this year, the chair of the ESCRBC, Nate Greenberg, submitted an official priority area spreadsheet to Ana Maria Johnson clearly showing this area as unserved.

Although this may seem to be a simple oversight, it is of vital importance. Whether an area is served or unserved determines the priority and amount of grant receivable by an applicant. What could be more important? In fact the KRV will have two applications this year from Kern Valley Wireless (KVV) and the California Telehealth Network (CTN) that will be heavily reliant on the undeniable fact that the KRV is ‘unserved’.

Even though an applicant can challenge the ‘served’ classification, if the KRV is designated as such in the Resolution it will be an intimidation to prospective CASF applicants. This is an error that should be corrected, before the Resolution is adopted.

**MORE**

## Technical Error

On pp 53-55 "Attachment D" is missing or perhaps "Attachment E" is mislabeled.

Thank you in advance for accepting and properly registering these comments.

Sincerely,



Win Lievsay MCP+I, CCNP

(760) 278-3099

KRVR Board Member

<http://www.krvr.org>

Board Member Eastern Sierra Connect Regional Broadband Consortium

<http://escrbconsortium.org>



cc: ESCRBC Board, President and Vice President of KRVR Richard Rowe and Joe Ciriello, President of KVV, and President of CTN.

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that I have, by e-mail, this day served a copy of the above comments to all parties on the California Advanced Service Fund mailing list of the availability of draft Resolution T-17433 for public comments at the Commission's web site <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov>.

June 7, 2014, at Wofford Heights, California



---

Win Lievsay