IDAHO TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT'S NEGOTIATED RULEMAKING PUBLIC MEETING REGARDING RULES GOVERNING UTILITIES ON STATE HIGHWAY RIGHT OF WAY (BROADBAND AND SMALL CELL)

MODERATOR: RAMON HOBDEY-SANCHEZ

July 20, 2021

3:00 P.M. - 5:00 P.M.

TRANSCRIBED BY:

VICTORIA HILLES

	lic Meeting		July 20, 2021
	Page 2		Page 4
1 2 3	(Begin transcription of audio file.) THE MODERATOR: Good afternoon, everyone. We're just here at 3:00 p.m. Going to give a couple more	2	Right-of-Way." And pertinent to this particular chapter is the documents that are incorporated by reference, and those two documents Utility
5	minutes for folks that may show up here, and we'll short start here promptly. All right. Thank you, everyone.	5	Accommodation Policy and also related to that is the Guide for Utility Management. And so that Guide for Utility Management
	Appreciate that. Just wanted to give a couple extra minutes before we got started here. Again, thank you,		is really the draft that we've been emphasizing and discussing. And so it's these two documents that we
	everyone. And good afternoon. My name is Ramon	9	seek input from the stakeholders. We want to make sure we're updating our materials, and then also
11	Hobdey-Sanchez, and I'm in the Office of Governmental Affairs at the Idaho Transportation Department, and	11	accommodating this broadband and conduit technology as we move forward.
	one of my roles is the Department's administrative rules coordinator.		We are still in the informal stage of the process, so this is the negotiated rulemaking process.
	The Department wants to welcome everyone that's physically here with us at the auditorium at HQ	16	Staff will continue to analyze and dissect the comments that have been submitted and were made at the
18	and those online. This is our third negotiated rulemaking meeting regarding utility accommodation in the State's right of way	18	<i>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </i>
20	the State's right-of-way. Today I will be the facilitator for today's session, but I'm fortunate enough to have some	20	stakeholders to submit written comments, whether it's in the form of a letter or e-mail. We did have a change in our deadline. So originally, that deadline
22	great colleagues with me as well. We have Lisa Hoag, who'll be helping us stay on track and manage the	22	for comments was June, but based on this third additional meeting, that deadline is now July 28th.
24	WebEx application, our chief engineer, Mr. Blake Rindlisbacher, and our Broadband Program manager,	24	So a week from tomorrow is the deadline for all comments to be submitted.
	Page 3		Page 5
1	Robert Beachler.	1	8
2	We also want to thank everyone in advance		important to the Department. We want to hear from
	for your patience as we do kind of go back and forth	3	stakeholders, everything from how you think the
	from commenters that are physically here in the	4	process has been, whether it's meeting-wise,
5	auditorium to those that are virtually using the	4 5	process has been, whether it's meeting-wise, logistics, and then specifically the comments and
5 6	auditorium to those that are virtually using the application and/or phoning in.	4 5 6	process has been, whether it's meeting-wise, logistics, and then specifically the comments and documents we have posted on the web page. That's the
5 6 7	auditorium to those that are virtually using the application and/or phoning in. We truly look forward to hearing everyone	4 5 6 7	process has been, whether it's meeting-wise, logistics, and then specifically the comments and documents we have posted on the web page. That's the direct information we really want folks to review
5 6 7 8	auditorium to those that are virtually using the application and/or phoning in. We truly look forward to hearing everyone like we have at the past couple meetings. This is a	4 5 6 7 8	process has been, whether it's meeting-wise, logistics, and then specifically the comments and documents we have posted on the web page. That's the direct information we really want folks to review that again, the ITD Draft Guide for Utility
5 6 7 8 9	auditorium to those that are virtually using the application and/or phoning in. We truly look forward to hearing everyone like we have at the past couple meetings. This is a really important piece of the process, and it's really	4 5 6 7 8	process has been, whether it's meeting-wise, logistics, and then specifically the comments and documents we have posted on the web page. That's the direct information we really want folks to review that again, the ITD Draft Guide for Utility Management is one of the most pertinent ones.
5 6 7 8 9	auditorium to those that are virtually using the application and/or phoning in. We truly look forward to hearing everyone like we have at the past couple meetings. This is a	4 5 7 8 9 10	process has been, whether it's meeting-wise, logistics, and then specifically the comments and documents we have posted on the web page. That's the direct information we really want folks to review that again, the ITD Draft Guide for Utility
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	auditorium to those that are virtually using the application and/or phoning in. We truly look forward to hearing everyone like we have at the past couple meetings. This is a really important piece of the process, and it's really important to the Department. We want to make sure that we have direct input and engagement from our stakeholders and interested parties. This will help	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	process has been, whether it's meeting-wise, logistics, and then specifically the comments and documents we have posted on the web page. That's the direct information we really want folks to review that again, the ITD Draft Guide for Utility Management is one of the most pertinent ones. For those that may not know, a lot of this information, all of it is available online. What you're seeing right now is the "Utility Accommodation
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	auditorium to those that are virtually using the application and/or phoning in. We truly look forward to hearing everyone like we have at the past couple meetings. This is a really important piece of the process, and it's really important to the Department. We want to make sure that we have direct input and engagement from our stakeholders and interested parties. This will help define a project that is jointly invested by all	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	process has been, whether it's meeting-wise, logistics, and then specifically the comments and documents we have posted on the web page. That's the direct information we really want folks to review that again, the ITD Draft Guide for Utility Management is one of the most pertinent ones. For those that may not know, a lot of this information, all of it is available online. What you're seeing right now is the "Utility Accommodation Rulemaking" tab on our rulemaking web page. So it's
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	auditorium to those that are virtually using the application and/or phoning in. We truly look forward to hearing everyone like we have at the past couple meetings. This is a really important piece of the process, and it's really important to the Department. We want to make sure that we have direct input and engagement from our stakeholders and interested parties. This will help define a project that is jointly invested by all parties involved, and we really want to have a	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	process has been, whether it's meeting-wise, logistics, and then specifically the comments and documents we have posted on the web page. That's the direct information we really want folks to review that again, the ITD Draft Guide for Utility Management is one of the most pertinent ones. For those that may not know, a lot of this information, all of it is available online. What you're seeing right now is the "Utility Accommodation Rulemaking" tab on our rulemaking web page. So it's super easy: "itd.idaho.gov/rulemaking."
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	auditorium to those that are virtually using the application and/or phoning in. We truly look forward to hearing everyone like we have at the past couple meetings. This is a really important piece of the process, and it's really important to the Department. We want to make sure that we have direct input and engagement from our stakeholders and interested parties. This will help define a project that is jointly invested by all parties involved, and we really want to have a partnership-type atmosphere.	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	process has been, whether it's meeting-wise, logistics, and then specifically the comments and documents we have posted on the web page. That's the direct information we really want folks to review that again, the ITD Draft Guide for Utility Management is one of the most pertinent ones. For those that may not know, a lot of this information, all of it is available online. What you're seeing right now is the "Utility Accommodation Rulemaking" tab on our rulemaking web page. So it's super easy: "itd.idaho.gov/rulemaking." So happy to answer any questions as we
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	auditorium to those that are virtually using the application and/or phoning in. We truly look forward to hearing everyone like we have at the past couple meetings. This is a really important piece of the process, and it's really important to the Department. We want to make sure that we have direct input and engagement from our stakeholders and interested parties. This will help define a project that is jointly invested by all parties involved, and we really want to have a partnership-type atmosphere. As far as the details, goals, and	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	process has been, whether it's meeting-wise, logistics, and then specifically the comments and documents we have posted on the web page. That's the direct information we really want folks to review that again, the ITD Draft Guide for Utility Management is one of the most pertinent ones. For those that may not know, a lot of this information, all of it is available online. What you're seeing right now is the "Utility Accommodation Rulemaking" tab on our rulemaking web page. So it's super easy: "itd.idaho.gov/rulemaking." So happy to answer any questions as we work through today's meeting.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	auditorium to those that are virtually using the application and/or phoning in. We truly look forward to hearing everyone like we have at the past couple meetings. This is a really important piece of the process, and it's really important to the Department. We want to make sure that we have direct input and engagement from our stakeholders and interested parties. This will help define a project that is jointly invested by all parties involved, and we really want to have a partnership-type atmosphere. As far as the details, goals, and objectives for today's meeting, Robert will be	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	process has been, whether it's meeting-wise, logistics, and then specifically the comments and documents we have posted on the web page. That's the direct information we really want folks to review that again, the ITD Draft Guide for Utility Management is one of the most pertinent ones. For those that may not know, a lot of this information, all of it is available online. What you're seeing right now is the "Utility Accommodation Rulemaking" tab on our rulemaking web page. So it's super easy: "itd.idaho.gov/rulemaking." So happy to answer any questions as we work through today's meeting. Logistically, again, we do have folks that
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	auditorium to those that are virtually using the application and/or phoning in. We truly look forward to hearing everyone like we have at the past couple meetings. This is a really important piece of the process, and it's really important to the Department. We want to make sure that we have direct input and engagement from our stakeholders and interested parties. This will help define a project that is jointly invested by all parties involved, and we really want to have a partnership-type atmosphere. As far as the details, goals, and objectives for today's meeting, Robert will be providing those shortly.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	process has been, whether it's meeting-wise, logistics, and then specifically the comments and documents we have posted on the web page. That's the direct information we really want folks to review that again, the ITD Draft Guide for Utility Management is one of the most pertinent ones. For those that may not know, a lot of this information, all of it is available online. What you're seeing right now is the "Utility Accommodation Rulemaking" tab on our rulemaking web page. So it's super easy: "itd.idaho.gov/rulemaking." So happy to answer any questions as we work through today's meeting. Logistically, again, we do have folks that called in and are on virtual, so we've got everyone
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	auditorium to those that are virtually using the application and/or phoning in. We truly look forward to hearing everyone like we have at the past couple meetings. This is a really important piece of the process, and it's really important to the Department. We want to make sure that we have direct input and engagement from our stakeholders and interested parties. This will help define a project that is jointly invested by all parties involved, and we really want to have a partnership-type atmosphere. As far as the details, goals, and objectives for today's meeting, Robert will be providing those shortly. Just for some quick context, because a lot	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	process has been, whether it's meeting-wise, logistics, and then specifically the comments and documents we have posted on the web page. That's the direct information we really want folks to review that again, the ITD Draft Guide for Utility Management is one of the most pertinent ones. For those that may not know, a lot of this information, all of it is available online. What you're seeing right now is the "Utility Accommodation Rulemaking" tab on our rulemaking web page. So it's super easy: "itd.idaho.gov/rulemaking." So happy to answer any questions as we work through today's meeting. Logistically, again, we do have folks that called in and are on virtual, so we've got everyone automatically muted. For those that would like to
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	auditorium to those that are virtually using the application and/or phoning in. We truly look forward to hearing everyone like we have at the past couple meetings. This is a really important piece of the process, and it's really important to the Department. We want to make sure that we have direct input and engagement from our stakeholders and interested parties. This will help define a project that is jointly invested by all parties involved, and we really want to have a partnership-type atmosphere. As far as the details, goals, and objectives for today's meeting, Robert will be providing those shortly. Just for some quick context, because a lot of us have been together now for the last four,	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	process has been, whether it's meeting-wise, logistics, and then specifically the comments and documents we have posted on the web page. That's the direct information we really want folks to review that again, the ITD Draft Guide for Utility Management is one of the most pertinent ones. For those that may not know, a lot of this information, all of it is available online. What you're seeing right now is the "Utility Accommodation Rulemaking" tab on our rulemaking web page. So it's super easy: "itd.idaho.gov/rulemaking." So happy to answer any questions as we work through today's meeting. Logistically, again, we do have folks that called in and are on virtual, so we've got everyone automatically muted. For those that would like to participate online, we just encourage you to use the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	auditorium to those that are virtually using the application and/or phoning in. We truly look forward to hearing everyone like we have at the past couple meetings. This is a really important piece of the process, and it's really important to the Department. We want to make sure that we have direct input and engagement from our stakeholders and interested parties. This will help define a project that is jointly invested by all parties involved, and we really want to have a partnership-type atmosphere. As far as the details, goals, and objectives for today's meeting, Robert will be providing those shortly. Just for some quick context, because a lot	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	process has been, whether it's meeting-wise, logistics, and then specifically the comments and documents we have posted on the web page. That's the direct information we really want folks to review that again, the ITD Draft Guide for Utility Management is one of the most pertinent ones. For those that may not know, a lot of this information, all of it is available online. What you're seeing right now is the "Utility Accommodation Rulemaking" tab on our rulemaking web page. So it's super easy: "itd.idaho.gov/rulemaking." So happy to answer any questions as we work through today's meeting. Logistically, again, we do have folks that called in and are on virtual, so we've got everyone automatically muted. For those that would like to participate online, we just encourage you to use the raise-your-hand function and/or the chat box. We're
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	auditorium to those that are virtually using the application and/or phoning in. We truly look forward to hearing everyone like we have at the past couple meetings. This is a really important piece of the process, and it's really important to the Department. We want to make sure that we have direct input and engagement from our stakeholders and interested parties. This will help define a project that is jointly invested by all parties involved, and we really want to have a partnership-type atmosphere. As far as the details, goals, and objectives for today's meeting, Robert will be providing those shortly. Just for some quick context, because a lot of us have been together now for the last four, six weeks, going over these materials, I just wanted	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	process has been, whether it's meeting-wise, logistics, and then specifically the comments and documents we have posted on the web page. That's the direct information we really want folks to review that again, the ITD Draft Guide for Utility Management is one of the most pertinent ones. For those that may not know, a lot of this information, all of it is available online. What you're seeing right now is the "Utility Accommodation Rulemaking" tab on our rulemaking web page. So it's super easy: "itd.idaho.gov/rulemaking." So happy to answer any questions as we work through today's meeting. Logistically, again, we do have folks that called in and are on virtual, so we've got everyone automatically muted. For those that would like to participate online, we just encourage you to use the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	auditorium to those that are virtually using the application and/or phoning in. We truly look forward to hearing everyone like we have at the past couple meetings. This is a really important piece of the process, and it's really important to the Department. We want to make sure that we have direct input and engagement from our stakeholders and interested parties. This will help define a project that is jointly invested by all parties involved, and we really want to have a partnership-type atmosphere. As far as the details, goals, and objectives for today's meeting, Robert will be providing those shortly. Just for some quick context, because a lot of us have been together now for the last four, six weeks, going over these materials, I just wanted to again mention this is our third negotiated	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	process has been, whether it's meeting-wise, logistics, and then specifically the comments and documents we have posted on the web page. That's the direct information we really want folks to review that again, the ITD Draft Guide for Utility Management is one of the most pertinent ones. For those that may not know, a lot of this information, all of it is available online. What you're seeing right now is the "Utility Accommodation Rulemaking" tab on our rulemaking web page. So it's super easy: "itd.idaho.gov/rulemaking." So happy to answer any questions as we work through today's meeting. Logistically, again, we do have folks that called in and are on virtual, so we've got everyone automatically muted. For those that would like to participate online, we just encourage you to use the raise-your-hand function and/or the chat box. We're monitoring the chat box, and so that's another

 1 Blake we've got Lisa and Robert. 2 And with that, 1'd like to go ahead and just hand it over to Mr. Bacchler, and we'll jump ito' some of his presentation and comments. 3 MR. BEACHLER: Just to note, up on the website there, we also include the transcripts from the last we we may to also include the transcripts from the last we rectangs if you wanted real detailed information. 10 Also, our PowerPoint presentations are posted there 11 also. 12 All right. Thank you. 13 Okay. For today's meeting agenda, we're 13 oging to - Ramon has said our introductions. 14 going to - Ramon has said our introductions. 15 Again, thank you for your time and your 16 consideration today. 17 We're going to go over the scope of the 18 Utility Accommodation Policy and some of our goals and 9 objectives of this rulemaking. And then we - what we 20 really wanted to emphasize in this meeting was going 21 over the cerelved in the previous two 22 meetings, to note those, present those ideas and 23 comments provided by the public and just kind of make 24 sure that we are hearing everyhody right, and 25 lumintelligible] any points and clarification. This 11 would be a good opportunity. 21 would be a good opportunity. 22 morting commondation. And as Ramon noted, that sin 23 or relawant do recally capture that and 34 present that because those comments are based on 34 comments provided by the public and clarification. This 12 would be a good opportunity. 23 Section 30.30.3.4.3. "Rules Governity Cultities on the 34 stare Hight-of-way. 34 M these types of devices have connectivity needs, so 35 and have and als Rumon noted, that sin 36 the traveling public, and als Rumon noted, that sin 30 mean and that demands on the right-of-way is used to a condition projects with the installation of 35 present and becament and staff users to height. 35 And then we'll have another opportunity 36 more oth he		Page 6		Page 8
10 Also, our PowerPoint presentations are posted there 11 also. 12 All right. Thank you. 13 Okay. For today's meeting agenda, we're 14 going to Ramon has said our introductions. 15 Again, thank you for your time and your 16 Consideration today. 17 We're going to go over the scope of the 18 Utility Accommodation Policy and some of our goals and 19 objectives of this rulemaking. And then we - what we 20 really wanted to emphasize in this meeting was going 21 over the comments we received in the previous two 22 court due on those, present those ideas and 23 comments provided by the public and just kind of maka 24 sure that we are hearing everybody right, and 25 Louintelligible] any points and clarification. This 26 To all den we'll have another opportunity. 2 aregated excavations. And by effectively managing 4 we presented in our last two meetings. 5 And then we'll have another opportunity 6 for those both here in person and virtually to provide 3 And again	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	And with that, I'd like to go ahead and just hand it over to Mr. Beachler, and we'll jump into some of his presentation and comments. MR. BEACHLER: Thank you, Ramon. THE MODERATOR: Yep. MR. BEACHLER: Just to note, up on the website there, we also include the transcripts from the last	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	"require updates to our guidance, policy, and rules." We want to also establish our requirements for "permitting broadband and small wireless facilities." And in all this, we need to ensure that we're in compliance with both State and Federal regulations and requirements. So I'm going to touch on the goals and
12 All right. Thank you. 13 Okay. For today's meeting agenda, we're 14 going to - Ramon has said our introductions. 15 Again, thank you for your time and your 16 consideration today. 17 We're going to go over the scope of the 18 Utility Accommodation Policy and some of our goals and 19 objectives of this rulemaking. And then we - what we 20 ore of up primary goals and objectives is 19 use the comments we received in the previous two 20 receiligible] any points and clarification. This 21 we are hearing everybody right, and 22 comments provided by the public and just kind of make 24 sure that we are hearing everybody right, and 25 Land then we'll have another opportunity. 2 The you rulemaking is focused on 3 present that because those comments are based on what 4 we presented in our last two meetings. 5 And then we'll have another opportunity. 2 for those both here in person and virtually to provide addindo.gov/rulemaking." 10 Are you rulemaking is focused on 11	10	Also, our PowerPoint presentations are posted there	10	"orderly use" of the right-of-way for all utilities,
14 going to - Ramon has said our introductions. 15 Again, thank you for your time and your 16 consideration today. 17 We're going to go over the scope of the 18 Utility Accommodation Policy and some of our goals and 19 objectives of this rulemaking. And then we - what we 20 really wanted to emphasize in this meeting was going 21 over the comments we received in the previous two 22 meetings, to note those, present those ideas and 25 [unintelligible] any points and clarification. This Page 7 1 would be a good opportunity. 2 mould be a good opportunity. 2 mould be a good opportunity. 3 present that because those comments are based on what 4 we presented in our last two meetings. 5 And then we'll have another opportunity 6 for those both here in person and virtually to provider, additional input and comments. 8 And again, our website: 9 "itd.idab.gov/rulemaking." 10 Are you rulemaking is focused on 11 utility accommodation. And as Ramon noted, that's in 12 our Idaho Administrative Procedures Act, 13 Exter Highway Right-of-Way. 14 manage it well, the demand will exceed the available 15 tholocatin, digin, methods for installing, <t< td=""><td>12</td><td>All right. Thank you.</td><td>12</td><td>wireless facilities. And the idea is that we have a</td></t<>	12	All right. Thank you.	12	wireless facilities. And the idea is that we have a
16 consideration today. 16 space and affect other users of the right-of-way. 17 We're going to go over the scope of the 18 Utility Accommodation Policy and some of our goals and 19 objectives of this rulemaking. And then we what we 18 the policy of "Dig Once," and this allows us to place 20 really wanted to emphasize in this meeting was going 10 not so much designated but at once, so we're not 21 over the comments we received in the previous two 22 meetings, to note those, present those ideas and 23 comments provided by the public and just kind of make 24 sure that we are hearing everybody right, and 25 (unintelligible) any points and clarification. This 23 Page 7 1 would be a good opportunity. 1 construction projects with the installation of 2 brain wated to really capture that and 3 present that because those comments are based on what 4 we presented in our last two meetings. 1 construction projects with the installation of 2 brain wate are hearing verybody right, and 20 receit wate and facilities saves on costs incurred by 3 repeated wate are hearing werybody right, and 20 receit wate and 3 would be a good opoptunity. 1 construction projects with the installation of 2 brain wate are hearing werybody right, and 20 receit wate and 3 and ten well have anoth			14	manage it well, the demand will exceed the available
17We're going to go over the scope of the18Utility Accommodation Policy and some of our goals and19objectives of this rulemaking. And then we - what we20really wanted to emphasize in this meeting was going21over the comments we received in the previous two22meetings, to note those, present those ideas and23comments provided by the public and just kind of make24sure that we are hearing everybody right, and25(unintelligible] any points and clarification. This28Page 71would be a good opportunity.2But we wanted to really capture that and3present that because those comments are based on what4we presented in our last two meetings.5And then we'll have another opportunity6for those both here in person and virtually to provide7Ard again, our website:9"itd.idaho.gov/rulemaking."10Are you rulemaking is focused on11utility accommodation. And as Ramon noted, that's in12our Idaho Administrative Procedures Act,13Section 39.03.43, "Rules Governing Utilities on the14State Highway Right-of-Way."15the inght-of-way.16Contained in TD's Guide for Utility Management.17Contained in TD's Guide for Utility Management.18Contained in TD's Guide for Utility Management.19TD's an internal document that staff uses to help				
 19 objectives of this rulemaking. And then we what we 20 really wanted to emphasize in this meeting was going 21 over the comments we received in the previous two 22 meetings, to note those, present those ideas and 23 comments provided by the public and just kind of make 24 sure that we are hearing everybody right, and 25 [unintelligible] any points and clarification. This 20 Page 7 21 would be a good opportunity. 22 But we wanted to really capture that and 3 present that because those comments are based on what 4 we presented in our last two meetings. 5 And then we'll have another opportunity 6 for those both here in person and virtually to provide a diditional input and comments. 8 And again, our website: 9 "itd.idaho.gov/rulemaking." 10 Are you rulemaking is focused on 11 utility accommodation. And as Ramon noted, that's in 20 our Idaho Administrative Procedures Act, 13 Section 39.03.43, "Rules Governing Utilities on the 14 State Highway Right-of-Way." And that helps regulate 15 the location, design, methods for installing. 16 relocating, adjusting, and maintaining utilities 17 within the right-of-Way." 18 And this is incorporates by reference 19 rultiple utility Accommodation Policy, which is 20 contained in TID's Guide for Utility Management. 21 That's an internal document that staff uses to help 			17	One of our primary goals and objectives is
 21 over the comments we received in the previous two 22 meetings, to note those, present those ideas and 23 comments provided by the public and just kind of make 24 sure that we are hearing everybody right, and 25 [unintelligible] any points and clarification. This 21 having incurring repeated excavations and 22 disruptions to the traveling public. 23 One of the biggest cost elements for 24 deploying broadband is burying fiberoptic cable and 25 conduits underground. Coordinating highway 27 having incurring repeated excavations and 28 disruptions to the traveling public. 29 and then well have another opportunity 20 for those both here in person and virtually to provide 30 And then well have another opportunity 41 didato, advinistrating. 10 Are you rulemaking is focused on 11 utility accommodation. And as Ramon noted, that's in 12 our Idaho Administrative Procedures Act, 13 Section 39.03.43, "Rules Governing Utilities on the 14 State Highway Right-of-Way." And that helps regulate 15 the location, design, methods for installing, 16 relocating, adjusting, and maintaining utilities 11 withit he right-of-way. 18 And this is incorporates by reference 19 TID's 2003 Utility Accommodation Policy, which is 20 contained in ITD's Guide for Utility Management. 21 That's an internal document that staff uses to help 	19	objectives of this rulemaking. And then we what we	19	multiple utility facilities in a designated area or
 22 meetings, to note those, present those ideas and 23 comments provided by the public and just kind of make 24 sure that we are hearing everybody right, and 25 [unintelligible] any points and clarification. This 26 [unintelligible] any points and clarification. This 27 mouth be a good opportunity. 28 But we wanted to really capture that and 3 present that because those comments are based on what 4 we presented in our last two meetings. 5 And then we'll have another opportunity 6 for those both here in person and virtually to provide 7 additional input and comments. 8 And again, our website: 9 "itd.idaho.gov/rulemaking." 10 Are you rulemaking is focused on 11 utility accommodation. And as Ramon noted, that's in 20 curl daho Administrative Procedures Act, 12 Section 39.03.43, "Rules Governing Utilities on the 14 State Highway Right-of-Way." And that helps regulate 15 the location, design, methods for installing, 16 relocating, adjusting, and maintaining utilities 17 within the right-of-way. 18 And this is incorporates by reference 19 TID's 2003 Utility Accommodation Policy, which is 20 contained in ITD's Guide for Utility Management. 21 That's an internal document that staff uses to help 				
24 sure that we are hearing everybody right, and 25 [unintelligible] any points and clarification. This24 deploying broadband is burying fiberoptic cable and 25 conduits underground. Coordinating highway24 deploying broadband is burying fiberoptic cable and 25 conduits underground. Coordinating highway2Page 71 would be a good opportunity. 2 But we wanted to really capture that and 3 present that because those comments are based on what 4 we presented in our last two meetings. 5 And then we'll have another opportunity 6 for those both here in person and virtually to provide 7 additional input and comments. 8 And again, our website: 9 "itd.idaho.gov/rulemaking."1 construction projects with the installation of 2 broadband facilities saves on costs incurred by 3 repeated excavations. And by effectively managing 4 current and future demands on the right-of-way space 5 by providers, we'll be better suited to do that. We 6 want to serve the greatest interest through 7 "colocation and other space-saving practices." 8 We also want to leverage the right-of-way 9 usage to connect current and future ITD facilities and 10 roadside devices. So this can include maintenance 11 facilities, automated traffic recorders, dynamic 12 message boards, weigh-in-motion facilities, scales. 13 All these types of devices have connectivity needs, so 14 we want to manage our right-of-way to help support 15 those.16 We want we also want to create a 17 competitively neutral environment that is unbiased in 18 the treatment of utility providers.19 ITD's 2003 Utility Accommodation Policy, which is 20 contained in ITD's Guide for Utility Management. 21 That's an internal document that staff uses to help24 deploying broadband is burying fiberoptic cable and 25 contained in TD's G	22	meetings, to note those, present those ideas and	22	disruptions to the traveling public.
25 [unintelligible] any points and clarification. This25 conduits underground. Coordinating highway28Page 7Page 91 would be a good opportunity.2But we wanted to really capture that and1 construction projects with the installation of3 present that because those comments are based on what4 we presented in our last two meetings.1 construction projects with the installation of5 And then we'll have another opportunity6 for those both here in person and virtually to provide2 by providers, we'll be better suited to do that. We6 for those both here in person and virtually to provide7 additional input and comments.88 And again, our website:99 usage to connect current and future ITD facilities and10 Are you rulemaking is focused on11 utility accommodation. And as Ramon noted, that's in12 message boards, weigh-in-motion facilities, scales.13 Section 39.03.43, "Rules Governing Utilities on the14 State Highway Right-of-Way." And that helps regulate16 We want we also want to create a17 within the right-of-way.16 We want we also want to create a17 competitively neutral environment that is unbiased in18 And this is incorporates by reference19 ITD's 2003 Utility Accommodation Policy, which is19 I want to "focus on the exchange of19 ITD's 2003 Utility Accommodation Policy, thich is1 wurt to "focus on the exchange of20 contained in ITD's Guide for Utility Management.21 Kan's an internal document that staff uses to help29 I want to "focus" and other "financial transactions." And				
 would be a good opportunity. But we wanted to really capture that and present that because those comments are based on what we presented in our last two meetings. And then we'll have another opportunity for those both here in person and virtually to provide additional input and comments. And again, our website: "itd.idaho.gov/rulemaking." Are you rulemaking is focused on utility accommodation. And as Ramon noted, that's in our Idaho Administrative Procedures Act, Section 39.03.43, "Rules Governing Utilities on the State Highway Right-of-Way." And that helps regulate the location, design, methods for installing, relocating, adjusting, and maintaining utilities And this is incorporates by reference TD's 2003 Utility Accommodation Policy, which is Contained in ITD'S Guide for Utility Management. That's an internal document that staff uses to help constance in Agreement. 				
 2 But we wanted to really capture that and 3 present that because those comments are based on what 4 we presented in our last two meetings. 5 And then we'll have another opportunity 6 for those both here in person and virtually to provide 7 additional input and comments. 8 And again, our website: 9 'itd.idaho.gov/rulemaking." 10 Are you rulemaking is focused on 11 utility accommodation. And as Ramon noted, that's in 12 our Idaho Administrative Procedures Act, 13 Section 39.03.43, "Rules Governing Utilities on the 14 State Highway Right-of-Way." And that helps regulate 15 the locating, adjusting, and maintaining utilities 16 Rolocating, adjusting, and maintaining utilities 17 within the right-of-way. 18 And this is incorporates by reference 19 ITD's 2003 Utility Accommodation Policy, which is 20 contained in ITD's Guide for Utility Management. 21 That's an internal document that staff uses to help 20 contained in ITD's Guide for Utility Management. 21 That's an internal document that staff uses to help 20 contained in ITD's Guide for Utility Management. 21 That's an internal document that staff uses to help 20 and the is an internal document that staff uses to help 21 That's an internal document that staff uses to help 22 broadband facilities saves on costs incurred by arepeated excavations. And by effectively managing 24 current and future demands on the right-of-way space 21 booke 22 boadband facilities and services" rather than the "collection 23 broadband facilities and services" rather than the "collection 24 broadband facilities and services" rather than the "collection 25 broadband facilities and services" rather than the "collection 24 broadband facilities and services" rather than the "collection<		Page 7		Page 9
 And our scope of the Utility Accommodation Rulemaking is really focused on alternative uses of the State highway right-of-way by nonpublic utilities In order to manage our right-of-way, we 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 would be a good opportunity. But we wanted to really capture that and present that because those comments are based on what we presented in our last two meetings. And then we'll have another opportunity for those both here in person and virtually to provide additional input and comments. And again, our website: "itd.idaho.gov/rulemaking." Are you rulemaking is focused on utility accommodation. And as Ramon noted, that's in our Idaho Administrative Procedures Act, Section 39.03.43, "Rules Governing Utilities on the State Highway Right-of-Way." And that helps regulate the location, design, methods for installing, relocating, adjusting, and maintaining utilities within the right-of-way. And this is incorporates by reference 	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	construction projects with the installation of broadband facilities saves on costs incurred by repeated excavations. And by effectively managing current and future demands on the right-of-way space by providers, we'll be better suited to do that. We want to serve the greatest interest through "colocation and other space-saving practices." We also want to leverage the right-of-way usage to connect current and future ITD facilities and roadside devices. So this can include maintenance facilities, automated traffic recorders, dynamic message boards, weigh-in-motion facilities, scales. All these types of devices have connectivity needs, so we want to manage our right-of-way to help support those. We want we also want to create a competitively neutral environment that is unbiased in the treatment of utility providers. I want to "focus on the exchange of

	Page 10		Page 12
1	need to undete our Utility Assemmedation Deliev and	-	the general contractor working on our projects "to
	need to update our Utility Accommodation Policy and		the general contractor working on our projects "to
	our Guide for Utility Management, which will "provide		provide access to trenches" during the construction
	a framework for managing broadband facilities within the right of way."		projects, so that "all parties can place their utilities" in "at the same time." So this would
	the right-of-way."		
5	And by developing policies and procedures		require more coordination with providers.
	for "accommodating and managing access for broadband	6	And, for example, working on bridges, one
	infrastructure" within the right-of-way, we wanted to do that "on a competitively neutral and		individual made a comment that all conduits be placed
	1 2		at once so we can accommodate all those requirements and that the direction and the conduit the
	non-discriminatory basis." So as noted earlier last month on		
10			direction of the conduit and the timing and placement should be coordinated with the utilities and the
	June 15th and 24th, we held two public meetings here		
	in Boise and virtually. And so we wanted to summarize these concents and comments that were provided at		providers ahead of time.
	those concepts and comments that were provided at	13	So part of our earlier presentations was
	those two meetings, and that's what we're going to		on our outreach efforts over the last couple years to
	cover in this next section.		show the location of major-ground-disturbance and bridge-replacement-type projects that ITD that are
16	So during these meetings, we presented		sponsored by ITD, these State-sponsored projects, and
	information on the scope and the goals and objectives		we show the locations of those projects to allow more
	of the rulemaking process, presented information on policies, regulations, some concepts for accommodating		advanced notification of those types of projects to
	facilities and better coordination. Comments were		encourage providers to coordinate with ITD early in
	given both in person here in the auditorium and		the process so we can plan for and accommodate those
	virtually.		facilities.
22	So our first one we received were some	22	Now, what would be another question was,
	concerns from "rural providers." They voiced concern		what would be the effects on other utility services.
	over larger broadband providers that would be able to		So we received a question on how this rulemaking will
23	over larger broadband providers that would be able to	25	so we received a question on now this fullmaking with
	Page 11		Dego 13
			Page 13
1	-	1	
	"come in and out compete the local providers." Many		affect other utilities.
2	"come in and out compete the local providers." Many of these providers "use federal funds" to deliver	2	affect other utilities. "The result of the rulemaking process for
2 3	"come in and out compete the local providers." Many of these providers "use federal funds" to deliver broadband services across rural areas, and there was	2 3	affect other utilities. "The result of the rulemaking process for broadband accommodation" doesn't "does indirectly
2 3 4	"come in and out compete the local providers." Many of these providers "use federal funds" to deliver broadband services across rural areas, and there was concern that if they had were forced or had to	2 3 4	affect other utilities. "The result of the rulemaking process for broadband accommodation" doesn't "does indirectly affect" all other utilities because the space of the
2 3 4 5	"come in and out compete the local providers." Many of these providers "use federal funds" to deliver broadband services across rural areas, and there was concern that if they had were forced or had to install additional conduits, it would force them to	2 3 4 5	affect other utilities. "The result of the rulemaking process for broadband accommodation" doesn't "does indirectly affect" all other utilities because the space of the right-of-way "is not limitless." And the "failure to
2 3 4 5 6	"come in and out compete the local providers." Many of these providers "use federal funds" to deliver broadband services across rural areas, and there was concern that if they had were forced or had to install additional conduits, it would force them to sell to their competition.	2 3 4 5 6	affect other utilities. "The result of the rulemaking process for broadband accommodation" doesn't "does indirectly affect" all other utilities because the space of the right-of-way "is not limitless." And the "failure to adequately manage any utility sector" broadband,
2 3 4 5 6 7	"come in and out compete the local providers." Many of these providers "use federal funds" to deliver broadband services across rural areas, and there was concern that if they had were forced or had to install additional conduits, it would force them to sell to their competition. In regards to competition, we received	2 3 4 5 6 7	affect other utilities. "The result of the rulemaking process for broadband accommodation" doesn't "does indirectly affect" all other utilities because the space of the right-of-way "is not limitless." And the "failure to adequately manage any utility sector" broadband, electrical, water, sewer, all those utilities could
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	"come in and out compete the local providers." Many of these providers "use federal funds" to deliver broadband services across rural areas, and there was concern that if they had were forced or had to install additional conduits, it would force them to sell to their competition. In regards to competition, we received some questions on "whether there would be competition	2 3 4 5 6 7	affect other utilities. "The result of the rulemaking process for broadband accommodation" doesn't "does indirectly affect" all other utilities because the space of the right-of-way "is not limitless." And the "failure to adequately manage any utility sector" broadband, electrical, water, sewer, all those utilities could "create significant hardships" for other sectors.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	"come in and out compete the local providers." Many of these providers "use federal funds" to deliver broadband services across rural areas, and there was concern that if they had were forced or had to install additional conduits, it would force them to sell to their competition. In regards to competition, we received some questions on "whether there would be competition for conduits." One provider noted that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	affect other utilities. "The result of the rulemaking process for broadband accommodation" doesn't "does indirectly affect" all other utilities because the space of the right-of-way "is not limitless." And the "failure to adequately manage any utility sector" broadband, electrical, water, sewer, all those utilities could "create significant hardships" for other sectors. We did receive some comments in support of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	"come in and out compete the local providers." Many of these providers "use federal funds" to deliver broadband services across rural areas, and there was concern that if they had were forced or had to install additional conduits, it would force them to sell to their competition. In regards to competition, we received some questions on "whether there would be competition for conduits." One provider noted that it's typically a "first provider into a new market"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	affect other utilities. "The result of the rulemaking process for broadband accommodation" doesn't "does indirectly affect" all other utilities because the space of the right-of-way "is not limitless." And the "failure to adequately manage any utility sector" broadband, electrical, water, sewer, all those utilities could "create significant hardships" for other sectors. We did receive some comments in support of ITD aligning with proposed rules proposed federal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	"come in and out compete the local providers." Many of these providers "use federal funds" to deliver broadband services across rural areas, and there was concern that if they had were forced or had to install additional conduits, it would force them to sell to their competition. In regards to competition, we received some questions on "whether there would be competition for conduits." One provider noted that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	affect other utilities. "The result of the rulemaking process for broadband accommodation" doesn't "does indirectly affect" all other utilities because the space of the right-of-way "is not limitless." And the "failure to adequately manage any utility sector" broadband, electrical, water, sewer, all those utilities could "create significant hardships" for other sectors. We did receive some comments in support of ITD aligning with proposed rules proposed federal rules and regulations, most specifically, I think, was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	"come in and out compete the local providers." Many of these providers "use federal funds" to deliver broadband services across rural areas, and there was concern that if they had were forced or had to install additional conduits, it would force them to sell to their competition. In regards to competition, we received some questions on "whether there would be competition for conduits." One provider noted that it's typically a "first provider into a new market" or an underserved area "wins or captures" that market	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	affect other utilities. "The result of the rulemaking process for broadband accommodation" doesn't "does indirectly affect" all other utilities because the space of the right-of-way "is not limitless." And the "failure to adequately manage any utility sector" broadband, electrical, water, sewer, all those utilities could "create significant hardships" for other sectors. We did receive some comments in support of ITD aligning with proposed rules proposed federal rules and regulations, most specifically, I think, was in accordance with some FCC guidance regarding the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12	"come in and out compete the local providers." Many of these providers "use federal funds" to deliver broadband services across rural areas, and there was concern that if they had were forced or had to install additional conduits, it would force them to sell to their competition. In regards to competition, we received some questions on "whether there would be competition for conduits." One provider noted that it's typically a "first provider into a new market" or an underserved area "wins or captures" that market share.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	affect other utilities. "The result of the rulemaking process for broadband accommodation" doesn't "does indirectly affect" all other utilities because the space of the right-of-way "is not limitless." And the "failure to adequately manage any utility sector" broadband, electrical, water, sewer, all those utilities could "create significant hardships" for other sectors. We did receive some comments in support of ITD aligning with proposed rules proposed federal rules and regulations, most specifically, I think, was in accordance with some FCC guidance regarding the deployment of small wireless facilities. We received
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	"come in and out compete the local providers." Many of these providers "use federal funds" to deliver broadband services across rural areas, and there was concern that if they had were forced or had to install additional conduits, it would force them to sell to their competition. In regards to competition, we received some questions on "whether there would be competition for conduits." One provider noted that it's typically a "first provider into a new market" or an underserved area "wins or captures" that market share. ITD our staff wanted to note that the Department is not in the business of competing for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	affect other utilities. "The result of the rulemaking process for broadband accommodation" doesn't "does indirectly affect" all other utilities because the space of the right-of-way "is not limitless." And the "failure to adequately manage any utility sector" broadband, electrical, water, sewer, all those utilities could "create significant hardships" for other sectors. We did receive some comments in support of ITD aligning with proposed rules proposed federal rules and regulations, most specifically, I think, was in accordance with some FCC guidance regarding the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	"come in and out compete the local providers." Many of these providers "use federal funds" to deliver broadband services across rural areas, and there was concern that if they had were forced or had to install additional conduits, it would force them to sell to their competition. In regards to competition, we received some questions on "whether there would be competition for conduits." One provider noted that it's typically a "first provider into a new market" or an underserved area "wins or captures" that market share. ITD our staff wanted to note that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	affect other utilities. "The result of the rulemaking process for broadband accommodation" doesn't "does indirectly affect" all other utilities because the space of the right-of-way "is not limitless." And the "failure to adequately manage any utility sector" broadband, electrical, water, sewer, all those utilities could "create significant hardships" for other sectors. We did receive some comments in support of ITD aligning with proposed rules proposed federal rules and regulations, most specifically, I think, was in accordance with some FCC guidance regarding the deployment of small wireless facilities. We received some comments in support of us following those guidelines from the FCC.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	"come in and out compete the local providers." Many of these providers "use federal funds" to deliver broadband services across rural areas, and there was concern that if they had were forced or had to install additional conduits, it would force them to sell to their competition. In regards to competition, we received some questions on "whether there would be competition for conduits." One provider noted that it's typically a "first provider into a new market" or an underserved area "wins or captures" that market share. ITD our staff wanted to note that the Department is not in the business of competing for providing any kind of services, but is you know,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	affect other utilities. "The result of the rulemaking process for broadband accommodation" doesn't "does indirectly affect" all other utilities because the space of the right-of-way "is not limitless." And the "failure to adequately manage any utility sector" broadband, electrical, water, sewer, all those utilities could "create significant hardships" for other sectors. We did receive some comments in support of ITD aligning with proposed rules proposed federal rules and regulations, most specifically, I think, was in accordance with some FCC guidance regarding the deployment of small wireless facilities. We received some comments in support of us following those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	"come in and out compete the local providers." Many of these providers "use federal funds" to deliver broadband services across rural areas, and there was concern that if they had were forced or had to install additional conduits, it would force them to sell to their competition. In regards to competition, we received some questions on "whether there would be competition for conduits." One provider noted that it's typically a "first provider into a new market" or an underserved area "wins or captures" that market share. ITD our staff wanted to note that the Department is not in the business of competing for providing any kind of services, but is you know, rather we're interested in accommodating interested	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	affect other utilities. "The result of the rulemaking process for broadband accommodation" doesn't "does indirectly affect" all other utilities because the space of the right-of-way "is not limitless." And the "failure to adequately manage any utility sector" broadband, electrical, water, sewer, all those utilities could "create significant hardships" for other sectors. We did receive some comments in support of ITD aligning with proposed rules proposed federal rules and regulations, most specifically, I think, was in accordance with some FCC guidance regarding the deployment of small wireless facilities. We received some comments in support of us following those guidelines from the FCC. Again, getting back to some of our rural
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	"come in and out compete the local providers." Many of these providers "use federal funds" to deliver broadband services across rural areas, and there was concern that if they had were forced or had to install additional conduits, it would force them to sell to their competition. In regards to competition, we received some questions on "whether there would be competition for conduits." One provider noted that it's typically a "first provider into a new market" or an underserved area "wins or captures" that market share. ITD our staff wanted to note that the Department is not in the business of competing for providing any kind of services, but is you know, rather we're interested in accommodating interested providers who want to utilize the right-of-way in an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	affect other utilities. "The result of the rulemaking process for broadband accommodation" doesn't "does indirectly affect" all other utilities because the space of the right-of-way "is not limitless." And the "failure to adequately manage any utility sector" broadband, electrical, water, sewer, all those utilities could "create significant hardships" for other sectors. We did receive some comments in support of ITD aligning with proposed rules proposed federal rules and regulations, most specifically, I think, was in accordance with some FCC guidance regarding the deployment of small wireless facilities. We received some comments in support of us following those guidelines from the FCC. Again, getting back to some of our rural providers. We had some questions regarding "Incumbent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	"come in and out compete the local providers." Many of these providers "use federal funds" to deliver broadband services across rural areas, and there was concern that if they had were forced or had to install additional conduits, it would force them to sell to their competition. In regards to competition, we received some questions on "whether there would be competition for conduits." One provider noted that it's typically a "first provider into a new market" or an underserved area "wins or captures" that market share. ITD our staff wanted to note that the Department is not in the business of competing for providing any kind of services, but is you know, rather we're interested in accommodating interested providers who want to utilize the right-of-way in an orderly manner to effectively use the space and reduce	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	affect other utilities. "The result of the rulemaking process for broadband accommodation" doesn't "does indirectly affect" all other utilities because the space of the right-of-way "is not limitless." And the "failure to adequately manage any utility sector" broadband, electrical, water, sewer, all those utilities could "create significant hardships" for other sectors. We did receive some comments in support of ITD aligning with proposed rules proposed federal rules and regulations, most specifically, I think, was in accordance with some FCC guidance regarding the deployment of small wireless facilities. We received some comments in support of us following those guidelines from the FCC. Again, getting back to some of our rural providers. We had some questions regarding "Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers." There was a question
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	"come in and out compete the local providers." Many of these providers "use federal funds" to deliver broadband services across rural areas, and there was concern that if they had were forced or had to install additional conduits, it would force them to sell to their competition. In regards to competition, we received some questions on "whether there would be competition for conduits." One provider noted that it's typically a "first provider into a new market" or an underserved area "wins or captures" that market share. ITD our staff wanted to note that the Department is not in the business of competing for providing any kind of services, but is you know, rather we're interested in accommodating interested providers who want to utilize the right-of-way in an orderly manner to effectively use the space and reduce ground disturbances.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	affect other utilities. "The result of the rulemaking process for broadband accommodation" doesn't "does indirectly affect" all other utilities because the space of the right-of-way "is not limitless." And the "failure to adequately manage any utility sector" broadband, electrical, water, sewer, all those utilities could "create significant hardships" for other sectors. We did receive some comments in support of ITD aligning with proposed rules proposed federal rules and regulations, most specifically, I think, was in accordance with some FCC guidance regarding the deployment of small wireless facilities. We received some comments in support of us following those guidelines from the FCC. Again, getting back to some of our rural providers. We had some questions regarding "Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers." There was a question regarding, if an ILEC does not want to place conduits
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	"come in and out compete the local providers." Many of these providers "use federal funds" to deliver broadband services across rural areas, and there was concern that if they had were forced or had to install additional conduits, it would force them to sell to their competition. In regards to competition, we received some questions on "whether there would be competition for conduits." One provider noted that it's typically a "first provider into a new market" or an underserved area "wins or captures" that market share. ITD our staff wanted to note that the Department is not in the business of competing for providing any kind of services, but is you know, rather we're interested in accommodating interested providers who want to utilize the right-of-way in an orderly manner to effectively use the space and reduce ground disturbances. Our next follow-on topic right after that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	affect other utilities. "The result of the rulemaking process for broadband accommodation" doesn't "does indirectly affect" all other utilities because the space of the right-of-way "is not limitless." And the "failure to adequately manage any utility sector" broadband, electrical, water, sewer, all those utilities could "create significant hardships" for other sectors. We did receive some comments in support of ITD aligning with proposed rules proposed federal rules and regulations, most specifically, I think, was in accordance with some FCC guidance regarding the deployment of small wireless facilities. We received some comments in support of us following those guidelines from the FCC. Again, getting back to some of our rural providers. We had some questions regarding "Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers." There was a question regarding, if an ILEC does not want to place conduits "when an ITD project is happening in their area, will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	"come in and out compete the local providers." Many of these providers "use federal funds" to deliver broadband services across rural areas, and there was concern that if they had were forced or had to install additional conduits, it would force them to sell to their competition. In regards to competition, we received some questions on "whether there would be competition for conduits." One provider noted that it's typically a "first provider into a new market" or an underserved area "wins or captures" that market share. ITD our staff wanted to note that the Department is not in the business of competing for providing any kind of services, but is you know, rather we're interested in accommodating interested providers who want to utilize the right-of-way in an orderly manner to effectively use the space and reduce ground disturbances. Our next follow-on topic right after that was, how can we do cost-saving opportunities with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	affect other utilities. "The result of the rulemaking process for broadband accommodation" doesn't "does indirectly affect" all other utilities because the space of the right-of-way "is not limitless." And the "failure to adequately manage any utility sector" broadband, electrical, water, sewer, all those utilities could "create significant hardships" for other sectors. We did receive some comments in support of ITD aligning with proposed rules proposed federal rules and regulations, most specifically, I think, was in accordance with some FCC guidance regarding the deployment of small wireless facilities. We received some comments in support of us following those guidelines from the FCC. Again, getting back to some of our rural providers. We had some questions regarding "Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers." There was a question regarding, if an ILEC does not want to place conduits "when an ITD project is happening in their area, will ITD reach out to other carriers who want to be a carrier for that area." We responded that, you know, as these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	"come in and out compete the local providers." Many of these providers "use federal funds" to deliver broadband services across rural areas, and there was concern that if they had were forced or had to install additional conduits, it would force them to sell to their competition. In regards to competition, we received some questions on "whether there would be competition for conduits." One provider noted that it's typically a "first provider into a new market" or an underserved area "wins or captures" that market share. ITD our staff wanted to note that the Department is not in the business of competing for providing any kind of services, but is you know, rather we're interested in accommodating interested providers who want to utilize the right-of-way in an orderly manner to effectively use the space and reduce ground disturbances. Our next follow-on topic right after that was, how can we do cost-saving opportunities with the installations of broadband facilities and how can we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	affect other utilities. "The result of the rulemaking process for broadband accommodation" doesn't "does indirectly affect" all other utilities because the space of the right-of-way "is not limitless." And the "failure to adequately manage any utility sector" broadband, electrical, water, sewer, all those utilities could "create significant hardships" for other sectors. We did receive some comments in support of ITD aligning with proposed rules proposed federal rules and regulations, most specifically, I think, was in accordance with some FCC guidance regarding the deployment of small wireless facilities. We received some comments in support of us following those guidelines from the FCC. Again, getting back to some of our rural providers. We had some questions regarding "Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers." There was a question regarding, if an ILEC does not want to place conduits "when an ITD project is happening in their area, will ITD reach out to other carriers who want to be a carrier for that area."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	"come in and out compete the local providers." Many of these providers "use federal funds" to deliver broadband services across rural areas, and there was concern that if they had were forced or had to install additional conduits, it would force them to sell to their competition. In regards to competition, we received some questions on "whether there would be competition for conduits." One provider noted that it's typically a "first provider into a new market" or an underserved area "wins or captures" that market share. ITD our staff wanted to note that the Department is not in the business of competing for providing any kind of services, but is you know, rather we're interested in accommodating interested providers who want to utilize the right-of-way in an orderly manner to effectively use the space and reduce ground disturbances. Our next follow-on topic right after that was, how can we do cost-saving opportunities with the installations of broadband facilities and how can we do that in a cheaper way with a "greater emphasis on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	affect other utilities. "The result of the rulemaking process for broadband accommodation" doesn't "does indirectly affect" all other utilities because the space of the right-of-way "is not limitless." And the "failure to adequately manage any utility sector" broadband, electrical, water, sewer, all those utilities could "create significant hardships" for other sectors. We did receive some comments in support of ITD aligning with proposed rules proposed federal rules and regulations, most specifically, I think, was in accordance with some FCC guidance regarding the deployment of small wireless facilities. We received some comments in support of us following those guidelines from the FCC. Again, getting back to some of our rural providers. We had some questions regarding "Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers." There was a question regarding, if an ILEC does not want to place conduits "when an ITD project is happening in their area, will ITD reach out to other carriers who want to be a carrier for that area." We responded that, you know, as these

Pub	lic Meeting		July 20, 2021
	Page 14		Page 16
1	again continue to coordinate with providers seeking	1	of what is a "utility," and we made that distinction.
	access during these construction projects.		So we are duly noted that some comments we've
3	Next slide, please.		received to be considered a "utility."
4	In regards to wireless technologies, we	4	So an Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier
5	did receive some comments requesting "access for macro	5	versus a Non-ILEC Provider. So ITD was asked how we
	towers" to be considered "in addition to small	6	would deal with a
7	wireless facilities."	7	Public Public-Utilities-Commission-regulated ILEC
8	Our initial work in regards to wireless		provider versus a non-ILEC provider. And we wanted to
9	facilities were very focused on the deployment of	9	note that "ILEC telephone exchange providers are
10	small wireless facilities. This is the 5G-type	10	public utilities" regulated by the Idaho Public
	technology, where we've had active inquiries into		Utilities Commission, and as such, those providers
	access to the State highway right-of-way for those		"can continue to permit" their facilities through
13	types of equipment.		ITD's existing "utility encroachment permitting
14	But they wanted to note that larger macro		process." And it'd be important to note whether you
	towers would be asked to be considered in this		are building it as as an ILEC for your local
	process, especially in rural areas, where they would	16	exchange services.
	need longer-range-type technologies to distribute the	17	We on our second I think this was in
	broadband information.		our second meeting, we started we received a
19	"Accommodating New Providers." A		comment regarding return on investment for first
	"question was raised about accommodating new		provider into new areas. So if a new provider enters
	providers" in the right-of-way once ground has been broken and conduits installed and have been dedicated.		a new or underserved area and "installs additional
	And we acknowledged that because there is		future conduit capacity," supporting our "Dig Once" concept, to provide both current and future capacity,
23	a competition for the right-of-way, ITD is interested		they requested to have some type of "Non-Compete type
	in "building more conduit capacity than we may need at		clause for a few years" for that provider to "recover"
23	in building more conduct cupacity than we may need at	23	ended for a few years for that provider to feedver
	Page 15		Page 17
1		1	
	the time of construction to accommodate future		their "capital investment."
2	the time of construction to accommodate future technologies and installations." This is a key	2	their "capital investment." They were "seeking assurances" that the
2 3	the time of construction to accommodate future technologies and installations." This is a key consideration. Our primary goal in this rulemaking is	2 3	their "capital investment." They were "seeking assurances" that the first provider is able to "recoup their investment
2 3	the time of construction to accommodate future technologies and installations." This is a key consideration. Our primary goal in this rulemaking is the orderly use of the right-of-way space.	2 3 4	their "capital investment." They were "seeking assurances" that the first provider is able to "recoup their investment before another provider is allowed to purchase or
2 3 4 5	the time of construction to accommodate future technologies and installations." This is a key consideration. Our primary goal in this rulemaking is the orderly use of the right-of-way space. Then we got to there was some	2 3 4 5	their "capital investment." They were "seeking assurances" that the first provider is able to "recoup their investment before another provider is allowed to purchase or lease" additional conduit capacity. And again, this
2 3 4 5 6	the time of construction to accommodate future technologies and installations." This is a key consideration. Our primary goal in this rulemaking is the orderly use of the right-of-way space.	2 3 4 5 6	their "capital investment." They were "seeking assurances" that the first provider is able to "recoup their investment before another provider is allowed to purchase or
2 3 4 5 6 7	the time of construction to accommodate future technologies and installations." This is a key consideration. Our primary goal in this rulemaking is the orderly use of the right-of-way space. Then we got to there was some discussion in regards to what is a "utility." So in	2 3 4 5 6 7	their "capital investment." They were "seeking assurances" that the first provider is able to "recoup their investment before another provider is allowed to purchase or lease" additional conduit capacity. And again, this allows those providers an opportunity to capitalize on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the time of construction to accommodate future technologies and installations." This is a key consideration. Our primary goal in this rulemaking is the orderly use of the right-of-way space. Then we got to there was some discussion in regards to what is a "utility." So in our presentations we had different utility definitions	2 3 4 5 6 7	their "capital investment." They were "seeking assurances" that the first provider is able to "recoup their investment before another provider is allowed to purchase or lease" additional conduit capacity. And again, this allows those providers an opportunity to capitalize on the market before they make their conduits available
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	the time of construction to accommodate future technologies and installations." This is a key consideration. Our primary goal in this rulemaking is the orderly use of the right-of-way space. Then we got to there was some discussion in regards to what is a "utility." So in our presentations we had different utility definitions from different sections of Idaho Code that we discussed. One of the providers noted that they were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	their "capital investment." They were "seeking assurances" that the first provider is able to "recoup their investment before another provider is allowed to purchase or lease" additional conduit capacity. And again, this allows those providers an opportunity to capitalize on the market before they make their conduits available for other competitors. We had a really good discussion on additional conduit capacity, both current and future,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the time of construction to accommodate future technologies and installations." This is a key consideration. Our primary goal in this rulemaking is the orderly use of the right-of-way space. Then we got to there was some discussion in regards to what is a "utility." So in our presentations we had different utility definitions from different sections of Idaho Code that we discussed. One of the providers noted that they were not a "utility" but were a "broadband provider," so	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10	their "capital investment." They were "seeking assurances" that the first provider is able to "recoup their investment before another provider is allowed to purchase or lease" additional conduit capacity. And again, this allows those providers an opportunity to capitalize on the market before they make their conduits available for other competitors. We had a really good discussion on additional conduit capacity, both current and future, and we had discussions regarding "inner-ducts" and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the time of construction to accommodate future technologies and installations." This is a key consideration. Our primary goal in this rulemaking is the orderly use of the right-of-way space. Then we got to there was some discussion in regards to what is a "utility." So in our presentations we had different utility definitions from different sections of Idaho Code that we discussed. One of the providers noted that they were not a "utility" but were a "broadband provider," so there was some discussion around the definition of	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	their "capital investment." They were "seeking assurances" that the first provider is able to "recoup their investment before another provider is allowed to purchase or lease" additional conduit capacity. And again, this allows those providers an opportunity to capitalize on the market before they make their conduits available for other competitors. We had a really good discussion on additional conduit capacity, both current and future, and we had discussions regarding "inner-ducts" and "vaults." It's important to note that "the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the time of construction to accommodate future technologies and installations." This is a key consideration. Our primary goal in this rulemaking is the orderly use of the right-of-way space. Then we got to there was some discussion in regards to what is a "utility." So in our presentations we had different utility definitions from different sections of Idaho Code that we discussed. One of the providers noted that they were not a "utility" but were a "broadband provider," so there was some discussion around the definition of what is a "utility" and a "broadband provider." Now,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	their "capital investment." They were "seeking assurances" that the first provider is able to "recoup their investment before another provider is allowed to purchase or lease" additional conduit capacity. And again, this allows those providers an opportunity to capitalize on the market before they make their conduits available for other competitors. We had a really good discussion on additional conduit capacity, both current and future, and we had discussions regarding "inner-ducts" and "vaults." It's important to note that "the installation of inner-ducts within existing or newly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the time of construction to accommodate future technologies and installations." This is a key consideration. Our primary goal in this rulemaking is the orderly use of the right-of-way space. Then we got to there was some discussion in regards to what is a "utility." So in our presentations we had different utility definitions from different sections of Idaho Code that we discussed. One of the providers noted that they were not a "utility" but were a "broadband provider," so there was some discussion around the definition of what is a "utility" and a "broadband provider." Now, "broadband is not regulated by Idaho Code or defined	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	their "capital investment." They were "seeking assurances" that the first provider is able to "recoup their investment before another provider is allowed to purchase or lease" additional conduit capacity. And again, this allows those providers an opportunity to capitalize on the market before they make their conduits available for other competitors. We had a really good discussion on additional conduit capacity, both current and future, and we had discussions regarding "inner-ducts" and "vaults." It's important to note that "the installation of inner-ducts within existing or newly installed conduits" provides "allows providers to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13 14	the time of construction to accommodate future technologies and installations." This is a key consideration. Our primary goal in this rulemaking is the orderly use of the right-of-way space. Then we got to there was some discussion in regards to what is a "utility." So in our presentations we had different utility definitions from different sections of Idaho Code that we discussed. One of the providers noted that they were not a "utility" but were a "broadband provider," so there was some discussion around the definition of what is a "utility" and a "broadband provider." Now, "broadband is not regulated by Idaho Code or defined as a utility under Title 61" of the Idaho Statutes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	their "capital investment." They were "seeking assurances" that the first provider is able to "recoup their investment before another provider is allowed to purchase or lease" additional conduit capacity. And again, this allows those providers an opportunity to capitalize on the market before they make their conduits available for other competitors. We had a really good discussion on additional conduit capacity, both current and future, and we had discussions regarding "inner-ducts" and "vaults." It's important to note that "the installation of inner-ducts within existing or newly installed conduits" provides "allows providers to keep separation between" their "different cables." It
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the time of construction to accommodate future technologies and installations." This is a key consideration. Our primary goal in this rulemaking is the orderly use of the right-of-way space. Then we got to there was some discussion in regards to what is a "utility." So in our presentations we had different utility definitions from different sections of Idaho Code that we discussed. One of the providers noted that they were not a "utility" but were a "broadband provider," so there was some discussion around the definition of what is a "utility" and a "broadband provider." Now, "broadband is not regulated by Idaho Code or defined as a utility under Title 61" of the Idaho Statutes regarding public utilities. So we just wanted to note	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	their "capital investment." They were "seeking assurances" that the first provider is able to "recoup their investment before another provider is allowed to purchase or lease" additional conduit capacity. And again, this allows those providers an opportunity to capitalize on the market before they make their conduits available for other competitors. We had a really good discussion on additional conduit capacity, both current and future, and we had discussions regarding "inner-ducts" and "vaults." It's important to note that "the installation of inner-ducts within existing or newly installed conduits" provides "allows providers to keep separation between" their "different cables." It allows "for easier installation of additional cables
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the time of construction to accommodate future technologies and installations." This is a key consideration. Our primary goal in this rulemaking is the orderly use of the right-of-way space. Then we got to there was some discussion in regards to what is a "utility." So in our presentations we had different utility definitions from different sections of Idaho Code that we discussed. One of the providers noted that they were not a "utility" but were a "broadband provider," so there was some discussion around the definition of what is a "utility" and a "broadband provider." Now, "broadband is not regulated by Idaho Code or defined as a utility under Title 61" of the Idaho Statutes regarding public utilities. So we just wanted to note that we took that into consideration.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	their "capital investment." They were "seeking assurances" that the first provider is able to "recoup their investment before another provider is allowed to purchase or lease" additional conduit capacity. And again, this allows those providers an opportunity to capitalize on the market before they make their conduits available for other competitors. We had a really good discussion on additional conduit capacity, both current and future, and we had discussions regarding "inner-ducts" and "vaults." It's important to note that "the installation of inner-ducts within existing or newly installed conduits" provides "allows providers to keep separation between" their "different cables." It allows "for easier installation of additional cables by different providers."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the time of construction to accommodate future technologies and installations." This is a key consideration. Our primary goal in this rulemaking is the orderly use of the right-of-way space. Then we got to there was some discussion in regards to what is a "utility." So in our presentations we had different utility definitions from different sections of Idaho Code that we discussed. One of the providers noted that they were not a "utility" but were a "broadband provider," so there was some discussion around the definition of what is a "utility" and a "broadband provider." Now, "broadband is not regulated by Idaho Code or defined as a utility under Title 61" of the Idaho Statutes regarding public utilities. So we just wanted to note that we took that into consideration. And it led to a larger discussion of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	their "capital investment." They were "seeking assurances" that the first provider is able to "recoup their investment before another provider is allowed to purchase or lease" additional conduit capacity. And again, this allows those providers an opportunity to capitalize on the market before they make their conduits available for other competitors. We had a really good discussion on additional conduit capacity, both current and future, and we had discussions regarding "inner-ducts" and "vaults." It's important to note that "the installation of inner-ducts within existing or newly installed conduits" provides "allows providers to keep separation between" their "different cables." It allows "for easier installation of additional cables by different providers." So it's important to note that these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the time of construction to accommodate future technologies and installations." This is a key consideration. Our primary goal in this rulemaking is the orderly use of the right-of-way space. Then we got to there was some discussion in regards to what is a "utility." So in our presentations we had different utility definitions from different sections of Idaho Code that we discussed. One of the providers noted that they were not a "utility" but were a "broadband provider," so there was some discussion around the definition of what is a "utility" and a "broadband provider." Now, "broadband is not regulated by Idaho Code or defined as a utility under Title 61" of the Idaho Statutes regarding public utilities. So we just wanted to note that we took that into consideration. And it led to a larger discussion of "Broadband as a Utility" and that we received, I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	their "capital investment." They were "seeking assurances" that the first provider is able to "recoup their investment before another provider is allowed to purchase or lease" additional conduit capacity. And again, this allows those providers an opportunity to capitalize on the market before they make their conduits available for other competitors. We had a really good discussion on additional conduit capacity, both current and future, and we had discussions regarding "inner-ducts" and "vaults." It's important to note that "the installation of inner-ducts within existing or newly installed conduits" provides "allows providers to keep separation between" their "different cables." It allows "for easier installation of additional cables by different providers." So it's important to note that these inner-ducts would be "placed in conduits" before the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the time of construction to accommodate future technologies and installations." This is a key consideration. Our primary goal in this rulemaking is the orderly use of the right-of-way space. Then we got to there was some discussion in regards to what is a "utility." So in our presentations we had different utility definitions from different sections of Idaho Code that we discussed. One of the providers noted that they were not a "utility" but were a "broadband provider," so there was some discussion around the definition of what is a "utility" and a "broadband provider." Now, "broadband is not regulated by Idaho Code or defined as a utility under Title 61" of the Idaho Statutes regarding public utilities. So we just wanted to note that we took that into consideration. And it led to a larger discussion of "Broadband as a Utility" and that we received, I think, two comments regarding broadband service should	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	their "capital investment." They were "seeking assurances" that the first provider is able to "recoup their investment before another provider is allowed to purchase or lease" additional conduit capacity. And again, this allows those providers an opportunity to capitalize on the market before they make their conduits available for other competitors. We had a really good discussion on additional conduit capacity, both current and future, and we had discussions regarding "inner-ducts" and "vaults." It's important to note that "the installation of inner-ducts within existing or newly installed conduits" provides "allows providers to keep separation between" their "different cables." It allows "for easier installation of additional cables by different providers." So it's important to note that these inner-ducts would be "placed in conduits" before the cable is installed. So we noted that. Very important
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the time of construction to accommodate future technologies and installations." This is a key consideration. Our primary goal in this rulemaking is the orderly use of the right-of-way space. Then we got to there was some discussion in regards to what is a "utility." So in our presentations we had different utility definitions from different sections of Idaho Code that we discussed. One of the providers noted that they were not a "utility" but were a "broadband provider," so there was some discussion around the definition of what is a "utility" and a "broadband provider." Now, "broadband is not regulated by Idaho Code or defined as a utility under Title 61" of the Idaho Statutes regarding public utilities. So we just wanted to note that we took that into consideration. And it led to a larger discussion of "Broadband as a Utility" and that we received, I think, two comments regarding broadband service should be should be "considered a 'Utility' in order to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	their "capital investment." They were "seeking assurances" that the first provider is able to "recoup their investment before another provider is allowed to purchase or lease" additional conduit capacity. And again, this allows those providers an opportunity to capitalize on the market before they make their conduits available for other competitors. We had a really good discussion on additional conduit capacity, both current and future, and we had discussions regarding "inner-ducts" and "vaults." It's important to note that "the installation of inner-ducts within existing or newly installed conduits" provides "allows providers to keep separation between" their "different cables." It allows "for easier installation of additional cables by different providers." So it's important to note that these inner-ducts would be "placed in conduits" before the cable is installed. So we noted that. Very important in the overall installation of cables.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the time of construction to accommodate future technologies and installations." This is a key consideration. Our primary goal in this rulemaking is the orderly use of the right-of-way space. Then we got to there was some discussion in regards to what is a "utility." So in our presentations we had different utility definitions from different sections of Idaho Code that we discussed. One of the providers noted that they were not a "utility" but were a "broadband provider," so there was some discussion around the definition of what is a "utility" and a "broadband provider." Now, "broadband is not regulated by Idaho Code or defined as a utility under Title 61" of the Idaho Statutes regarding public utilities. So we just wanted to note that we took that into consideration. And it led to a larger discussion of "Broadband as a Utility" and that we received, I think, two comments regarding broadband service should be should be "considered a 'Utility' in order to receive a 'public interest'" exemption from "Fair	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	their "capital investment." They were "seeking assurances" that the first provider is able to "recoup their investment before another provider is allowed to purchase or lease" additional conduit capacity. And again, this allows those providers an opportunity to capitalize on the market before they make their conduits available for other competitors. We had a really good discussion on additional conduit capacity, both current and future, and we had discussions regarding "inner-ducts" and "vaults." It's important to note that "the installation of inner-ducts within existing or newly installed conduits" provides "allows providers to keep separation between" their "different cables." It allows "for easier installation of additional cables by different providers." So it's important to note that these inner-ducts would be "placed in conduits" before the cable is installed. So we noted that. Very important in the overall installation of cables. And we also it was noted that "multiple
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the time of construction to accommodate future technologies and installations." This is a key consideration. Our primary goal in this rulemaking is the orderly use of the right-of-way space. Then we got to there was some discussion in regards to what is a "utility." So in our presentations we had different utility definitions from different sections of Idaho Code that we discussed. One of the providers noted that they were not a "utility" but were a "broadband provider," so there was some discussion around the definition of what is a "utility" and a "broadband provider." Now, "broadband is not regulated by Idaho Code or defined as a utility under Title 61" of the Idaho Statutes regarding public utilities. So we just wanted to note that we took that into consideration. And it led to a larger discussion of "Broadband as a Utility" and that we received, I think, two comments regarding broadband service should be should be "considered a 'Utility' in order to receive a 'public interest" exemption from "Fair Market Value" requirements. So we noted that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	their "capital investment." They were "seeking assurances" that the first provider is able to "recoup their investment before another provider is allowed to purchase or lease" additional conduit capacity. And again, this allows those providers an opportunity to capitalize on the market before they make their conduits available for other competitors. We had a really good discussion on additional conduit capacity, both current and future, and we had discussions regarding "inner-ducts" and "vaults." It's important to note that "the installation of inner-ducts within existing or newly installed conduits" provides "allows providers to keep separation between" their "different cables." It allows "for easier installation of additional cables by different providers." So it's important to note that these inner-ducts would be "placed in conduits" before the cable is installed. So we noted that. Very important in the overall installation of cables. And we also it was noted that "multiple vaults" are preferred to "separate" the different
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the time of construction to accommodate future technologies and installations." This is a key consideration. Our primary goal in this rulemaking is the orderly use of the right-of-way space. Then we got to there was some discussion in regards to what is a "utility." So in our presentations we had different utility definitions from different sections of Idaho Code that we discussed. One of the providers noted that they were not a "utility" but were a "broadband provider," so there was some discussion around the definition of what is a "utility" and a "broadband provider." Now, "broadband is not regulated by Idaho Code or defined as a utility under Title 61" of the Idaho Statutes regarding public utilities. So we just wanted to note that we took that into consideration. And it led to a larger discussion of "Broadband as a Utility" and that we received, I think, two comments regarding broadband service should be should be "considered a 'Utility' in order to receive a 'public interest'" exemption from "Fair	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	their "capital investment." They were "seeking assurances" that the first provider is able to "recoup their investment before another provider is allowed to purchase or lease" additional conduit capacity. And again, this allows those providers an opportunity to capitalize on the market before they make their conduits available for other competitors. We had a really good discussion on additional conduit capacity, both current and future, and we had discussions regarding "inner-ducts" and "vaults." It's important to note that "the installation of inner-ducts within existing or newly installed conduits" provides "allows providers to keep separation between" their "different cables." It allows "for easier installation of additional cables by different providers." So it's important to note that these inner-ducts would be "placed in conduits" before the cable is installed. So we noted that. Very important in the overall installation of cables. And we also it was noted that "multiple

1 U	file with the		July 20, 2021
	Page 18		Page 20
1	So if there's a duct of conduit banks as	1	construction costs to provide that cost per foot for a
	we get to a splice point, we would those conduits		provider to sell any additional capacity in support of
	would be taken separated and put in multiple vaults		that "Dig Once" policy. That was duly noted.
	to allow those different providers to maintain their	4	
	different cables. Good to note.		kind of come back to some of these Shared Resource
6	Then we had a really interesting	6	Agreement examples that we've done in the past, where
	discussion regarding "Micro-Trenching." So	7	we requested additional conduits to be placed in order
8			to allow for a "Dig Once" policy.
	narrow channel is cut into existing pavement or a	9	And a couple of them I want to highlight
	base, and then rigid conduits are placed within the		here. The first one we had was on I-84 here, and it
	trench.		was constructed between the Oregon border and Bliss,
12			Idaho. And in that Shared Resource Agreement, one of
	installation method" that we will look at, especially		stipulations was that the providers were granted
	in areas where it's difficult to construct, where we		access to the right-of-way and "installed additional
	may have limited right-of-way space. It may be		spare conduits for use by ITD and other users." And
	difficult to trench or bore as a traditional conduit		in there the "specified rate per foot" was identified,
	placement. So we will be looking at those types of		and then those other users could purchase those
	requirements for this alternative installation method.		conduits at that rate.
	So we appreciate those methods alternative methods	19	—
	we haven't done.		stipulations in the Shared Resource Agreement was that
20	Regarding "As-Built Requirements." So in		the "company agreed" to "sell" and/or "sublease excess
	our Draft Guide for Utility Management, we request		capacity to other users."
	that these broadband facilities provide as-built	22	Second, while we want to highlight Shared
	drawings for their projects. And in our Draft Guide		Resource examples Shared Resource Agreement
	we stipulated a 30-day [unintelligible] to receive		examples was on Interstate I-90 in north Idaho,
25	we supulated a 50-day [unintenigible] to receive	25	examples was on interstate 1-90 in north idano,
	Page 19		Page 21
	Page 19		Page 21
	those as-builts.		where a provider was granted access to ITD conduits
2	those as-builts. And one of our commenters requested that	2	where a provider was granted access to ITD conduits and vaults "in exchange for dark fiber on
2 3	those as-builts. And one of our commenters requested that they be given 60 days to submit those as-built	2 3	where a provider was granted access to ITD conduits and vaults "in exchange for dark fiber on providers" on a the providers-installed cable.
2 3 4	those as-builts. And one of our commenters requested that they be given 60 days to submit those as-built drawings instead of 30. And this allows the	2 3 4	where a provider was granted access to ITD conduits and vaults "in exchange for dark fiber on providers" on a the providers-installed cable. Now this "enabled new services to state
2 3 4 5	those as-builts. And one of our commenters requested that they be given 60 days to submit those as-built drawings instead of 30. And this allows the contractors who are doing the work for the providers,	2 3 4 5	where a provider was granted access to ITD conduits and vaults "in exchange for dark fiber on providers" on a the providers-installed cable. Now this "enabled new services to state facilities," it also "expanded" the providers'
2 3 4 5 6	those as-builts. And one of our commenters requested that they be given 60 days to submit those as-built drawings instead of 30. And this allows the contractors who are doing the work for the providers, they typically have about 30 days to provide	2 3 4 5 6	where a provider was granted access to ITD conduits and vaults "in exchange for dark fiber on providers" on a the providers-installed cable. Now this "enabled new services to state facilities," it also "expanded" the providers' "network" in the region, and it also "increased" the
2 3 4 5 6 7	those as-builts. And one of our commenters requested that they be given 60 days to submit those as-built drawings instead of 30. And this allows the contractors who are doing the work for the providers, they typically have about 30 days to provide that those as-builts to the providers. And then	2 3 4 5 6 7	where a provider was granted access to ITD conduits and vaults "in exchange for dark fiber on providers" on a the providers-installed cable. Now this "enabled new services to state facilities," it also "expanded" the providers' "network" in the region, and it also "increased" the "regional capacity." So that large cable was taken
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	those as-builts. And one of our commenters requested that they be given 60 days to submit those as-built drawings instead of 30. And this allows the contractors who are doing the work for the providers, they typically have about 30 days to provide that those as-builts to the providers. And then the broadband providers would need to review that and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	where a provider was granted access to ITD conduits and vaults "in exchange for dark fiber on providers" on a the providers-installed cable. Now this "enabled new services to state facilities," it also "expanded" the providers' "network" in the region, and it also "increased" the "regional capacity." So that large cable was taken into other points of presence in Washington, so it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	those as-builts. And one of our commenters requested that they be given 60 days to submit those as-built drawings instead of 30. And this allows the contractors who are doing the work for the providers, they typically have about 30 days to provide that those as-builts to the providers. And then the broadband providers would need to review that and then provide that on to ITD. So they requested a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	where a provider was granted access to ITD conduits and vaults "in exchange for dark fiber on providers" on a the providers-installed cable. Now this "enabled new services to state facilities," it also "expanded" the providers' "network" in the region, and it also "increased" the "regional capacity." So that large cable was taken into other points of presence in Washington, so it increased the regional capacity.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	those as-builts. And one of our commenters requested that they be given 60 days to submit those as-built drawings instead of 30. And this allows the contractors who are doing the work for the providers, they typically have about 30 days to provide that those as-builts to the providers. And then the broadband providers would need to review that and then provide that on to ITD. So they requested a 60-days as-built requirement.	2 3 5 6 7 8 9	where a provider was granted access to ITD conduits and vaults "in exchange for dark fiber on providers" on a the providers-installed cable. Now this "enabled new services to state facilities," it also "expanded" the providers' "network" in the region, and it also "increased" the "regional capacity." So that large cable was taken into other points of presence in Washington, so it increased the regional capacity. So that's that was really important for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	those as-builts. And one of our commenters requested that they be given 60 days to submit those as-built drawings instead of 30. And this allows the contractors who are doing the work for the providers, they typically have about 30 days to provide that those as-builts to the providers. And then the broadband providers would need to review that and then provide that on to ITD. So they requested a 60-days as-built requirement. All right. I wanted to briefly touch on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	where a provider was granted access to ITD conduits and vaults "in exchange for dark fiber on providers" on a the providers-installed cable. Now this "enabled new services to state facilities," it also "expanded" the providers' "network" in the region, and it also "increased" the "regional capacity." So that large cable was taken into other points of presence in Washington, so it increased the regional capacity. So that's that was really important for us. We wanted to note all those high-level or not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	those as-builts. And one of our commenters requested that they be given 60 days to submit those as-built drawings instead of 30. And this allows the contractors who are doing the work for the providers, they typically have about 30 days to provide that those as-builts to the providers. And then the broadband providers would need to review that and then provide that on to ITD. So they requested a 60-days as-built requirement. All right. I wanted to briefly touch on "Shared Resource Agreement" examples. These were	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	where a provider was granted access to ITD conduits and vaults "in exchange for dark fiber on providers" on a the providers-installed cable. Now this "enabled new services to state facilities," it also "expanded" the providers' "network" in the region, and it also "increased" the "regional capacity." So that large cable was taken into other points of presence in Washington, so it increased the regional capacity. So that's that was really important for us. We wanted to note all those high-level or not high-level but just comments we received from the two
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	those as-builts. And one of our commenters requested that they be given 60 days to submit those as-built drawings instead of 30. And this allows the contractors who are doing the work for the providers, they typically have about 30 days to provide that those as-builts to the providers. And then the broadband providers would need to review that and then provide that on to ITD. So they requested a 60-days as-built requirement. All right. I wanted to briefly touch on "Shared Resource Agreement" examples. These were presented in our presentation. We and I wanted to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	where a provider was granted access to ITD conduits and vaults "in exchange for dark fiber on providers" on a the providers-installed cable. Now this "enabled new services to state facilities," it also "expanded" the providers' "network" in the region, and it also "increased" the "regional capacity." So that large cable was taken into other points of presence in Washington, so it increased the regional capacity. So that's that was really important for us. We wanted to note all those high-level or not high-level but just comments we received from the two meetings, summarize those, present those at this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	those as-builts. And one of our commenters requested that they be given 60 days to submit those as-built drawings instead of 30. And this allows the contractors who are doing the work for the providers, they typically have about 30 days to provide that those as-builts to the providers. And then the broadband providers would need to review that and then provide that on to ITD. So they requested a 60-days as-built requirement. All right. I wanted to briefly touch on "Shared Resource Agreement" examples. These were presented in our presentation. We and I wanted to just kind of we had one more comment in regards to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	where a provider was granted access to ITD conduits and vaults "in exchange for dark fiber on providers" on a the providers-installed cable. Now this "enabled new services to state facilities," it also "expanded" the providers' "network" in the region, and it also "increased" the "regional capacity." So that large cable was taken into other points of presence in Washington, so it increased the regional capacity. So that's that was really important for us. We wanted to note all those high-level or not high-level but just comments we received from the two meetings, summarize those, present those at this meeting to note that we heard those comments.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	those as-builts. And one of our commenters requested that they be given 60 days to submit those as-built drawings instead of 30. And this allows the contractors who are doing the work for the providers, they typically have about 30 days to provide that those as-builts to the providers. And then the broadband providers would need to review that and then provide that on to ITD. So they requested a 60-days as-built requirement. All right. I wanted to briefly touch on "Shared Resource Agreement" examples. These were presented in our presentation. We and I wanted to just kind of we had one more comment in regards to that, and then we'll touch on a couple of examples.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	where a provider was granted access to ITD conduits and vaults "in exchange for dark fiber on providers" on a the providers-installed cable. Now this "enabled new services to state facilities," it also "expanded" the providers' "network" in the region, and it also "increased" the "regional capacity." So that large cable was taken into other points of presence in Washington, so it increased the regional capacity. So that's that was really important for us. We wanted to note all those high-level or not high-level but just comments we received from the two meetings, summarize those, present those at this meeting to note that we heard those comments. And if those providers those folks who
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	those as-builts. And one of our commenters requested that they be given 60 days to submit those as-built drawings instead of 30. And this allows the contractors who are doing the work for the providers, they typically have about 30 days to provide that those as-builts to the providers. And then the broadband providers would need to review that and then provide that on to ITD. So they requested a 60-days as-built requirement. All right. I wanted to briefly touch on "Shared Resource Agreement" examples. These were presented in our presentation. We and I wanted to just kind of we had one more comment in regards to that, and then we'll touch on a couple of examples. So under some of the discussion under	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 where a provider was granted access to ITD conduits and vaults "in exchange for dark fiber on providers" on a the providers-installed cable. Now this "enabled new services to state facilities," it also "expanded" the providers' "network" in the region, and it also "increased" the "regional capacity." So that large cable was taken into other points of presence in Washington, so it increased the regional capacity. So that's that was really important for us. We wanted to note all those high-level or not high-level but just comments we received from the two meetings, summarize those, present those at this meeting to note that we heard those comments. And if those providers those folks who provided those comments want to provide any additional
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	those as-builts. And one of our commenters requested that they be given 60 days to submit those as-built drawings instead of 30. And this allows the contractors who are doing the work for the providers, they typically have about 30 days to provide that those as-builts to the providers. And then the broadband providers would need to review that and then provide that on to ITD. So they requested a 60-days as-built requirement. All right. I wanted to briefly touch on "Shared Resource Agreement" examples. These were presented in our presentation. We and I wanted to just kind of we had one more comment in regards to that, and then we'll touch on a couple of examples. So under some of the discussion under Shared Resource Agreements between ITD and the Shared	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 where a provider was granted access to ITD conduits and vaults "in exchange for dark fiber on providers" on a the providers-installed cable. Now this "enabled new services to state facilities," it also "expanded" the providers' "network" in the region, and it also "increased" the "regional capacity." So that large cable was taken into other points of presence in Washington, so it increased the regional capacity. So that's that was really important for us. We wanted to note all those high-level or not high-level but just comments we received from the two meetings, summarize those, present those at this meeting to note that we heard those comments. And if those providers those folks who provided those comments want to provide any additional clarification or have any additional questions,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	those as-builts. And one of our commenters requested that they be given 60 days to submit those as-built drawings instead of 30. And this allows the contractors who are doing the work for the providers, they typically have about 30 days to provide that those as-builts to the providers. And then the broadband providers would need to review that and then provide that on to ITD. So they requested a 60-days as-built requirement. All right. I wanted to briefly touch on "Shared Resource Agreement" examples. These were presented in our presentation. We and I wanted to just kind of we had one more comment in regards to that, and then we'll touch on a couple of examples. So under some of the discussion under Shared Resource Agreements between ITD and the Shared Resource or excuse me and the providers, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 where a provider was granted access to ITD conduits and vaults "in exchange for dark fiber on providers" on a the providers-installed cable. Now this "enabled new services to state facilities," it also "expanded" the providers' "network" in the region, and it also "increased" the "regional capacity." So that large cable was taken into other points of presence in Washington, so it increased the regional capacity. So that's that was really important for us. We wanted to note all those high-level or not high-level but just comments we received from the two meetings, summarize those, present those at this meeting to note that we heard those comments. And if those providers those folks who provided those comments want to provide any additional clarification or have any additional questions, regarding those summaries of comments from the first
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9	those as-builts. And one of our commenters requested that they be given 60 days to submit those as-built drawings instead of 30. And this allows the contractors who are doing the work for the providers, they typically have about 30 days to provide that those as-builts to the providers. And then the broadband providers would need to review that and then provide that on to ITD. So they requested a 60-days as-built requirement. All right. I wanted to briefly touch on "Shared Resource Agreement" examples. These were presented in our presentation. We and I wanted to just kind of we had one more comment in regards to that, and then we'll touch on a couple of examples. So under some of the discussion under Shared Resource Agreements between ITD and the Shared Resource or excuse me and the providers, the Shared Resource Agreement would stipulate the cost	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 where a provider was granted access to ITD conduits and vaults "in exchange for dark fiber on providers" on a the providers-installed cable. Now this "enabled new services to state facilities," it also "expanded" the providers' "network" in the region, and it also "increased" the "regional capacity." So that large cable was taken into other points of presence in Washington, so it increased the regional capacity. So that's that was really important for us. We wanted to note all those high-level or not high-level but just comments we received from the two meetings, summarize those, present those at this meeting to note that we heard those comments. And if those providers those folks who provided those comments want to provide any additional clarification or have any additional questions, regarding those summaries of comments from the first two meetings, we'd like to take this opportunity to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	those as-builts. And one of our commenters requested that they be given 60 days to submit those as-built drawings instead of 30. And this allows the contractors who are doing the work for the providers, they typically have about 30 days to provide that those as-builts to the providers. And then the broadband providers would need to review that and then provide that on to ITD. So they requested a 60-days as-built requirement. All right. I wanted to briefly touch on "Shared Resource Agreement" examples. These were presented in our presentation. We and I wanted to just kind of we had one more comment in regards to that, and then we'll touch on a couple of examples. So under some of the discussion under Shared Resource Agreements between ITD and the Shared Resource or excuse me and the providers, the Shared Resource Agreement would stipulate the cost for if the provider was to sell the spare capacity.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 where a provider was granted access to ITD conduits and vaults "in exchange for dark fiber on providers" on a the providers-installed cable. Now this "enabled new services to state facilities," it also "expanded" the providers' "network" in the region, and it also "increased" the "regional capacity." So that large cable was taken into other points of presence in Washington, so it increased the regional capacity. So that's that was really important for us. We wanted to note all those high-level or not high-level but just comments we received from the two meetings, summarize those, present those at this meeting to note that we heard those comments. And if those providers those folks who provided those comments want to provide any additional clarification or have any additional questions, regarding those summaries of comments from the first two meetings, we'd like to take this opportunity to hear from you, ask more questions of staff. But we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	those as-builts. And one of our commenters requested that they be given 60 days to submit those as-built drawings instead of 30. And this allows the contractors who are doing the work for the providers, they typically have about 30 days to provide that those as-builts to the providers. And then the broadband providers would need to review that and then provide that on to ITD. So they requested a 60-days as-built requirement. All right. I wanted to briefly touch on "Shared Resource Agreement" examples. These were presented in our presentation. We and I wanted to just kind of we had one more comment in regards to that, and then we'll touch on a couple of examples. So under some of the discussion under Shared Resource Agreements between ITD and the Shared Resource or excuse me and the providers, the Shared Resource Agreement would stipulate the cost for if the provider was to sell the spare capacity. The comment was received that the cost to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 where a provider was granted access to ITD conduits and vaults "in exchange for dark fiber on providers" on a the providers-installed cable. Now this "enabled new services to state facilities," it also "expanded" the providers' "network" in the region, and it also "increased" the "regional capacity." So that large cable was taken into other points of presence in Washington, so it increased the regional capacity. So that's that was really important for us. We wanted to note all those high-level or not high-level but just comments we received from the two meetings, summarize those, present those at this meeting to note that we heard those comments. And if those providers those folks who provided those summaries of comments from the first two meetings, we'd like to take this opportunity to hear from you, ask more questions of staff. But we really wanted to make sure that this meeting that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	those as-builts. And one of our commenters requested that they be given 60 days to submit those as-built drawings instead of 30. And this allows the contractors who are doing the work for the providers, they typically have about 30 days to provide that those as-builts to the providers. And then the broadband providers would need to review that and then provide that on to ITD. So they requested a 60-days as-built requirement. All right. I wanted to briefly touch on "Shared Resource Agreement" examples. These were presented in our presentation. We and I wanted to just kind of we had one more comment in regards to that, and then we'll touch on a couple of examples. So under some of the discussion under Shared Resource Agreements between ITD and the Shared Resource or excuse me and the providers, the Shared Resource Agreement would stipulate the cost for if the provider was to sell the spare capacity. The comment was received that the cost to purchase the excess capacity conduits would be based	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	where a provider was granted access to ITD conduits and vaults "in exchange for dark fiber on providers" on a the providers-installed cable. Now this "enabled new services to state facilities," it also "expanded" the providers' "network" in the region, and it also "increased" the "regional capacity." So that large cable was taken into other points of presence in Washington, so it increased the regional capacity. So that's that was really important for us. We wanted to note all those high-level or not high-level but just comments we received from the two meetings, summarize those, present those at this meeting to note that we heard those comments. And if those providers those folks who provided those comments want to provide any additional clarification or have any additional questions, regarding those summaries of comments from the first two meetings, we'd like to take this opportunity to hear from you, ask more questions of staff. But we really wanted to make sure that this meeting that we noted your comments, concerns, and inputs, and we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	those as-builts. And one of our commenters requested that they be given 60 days to submit those as-built drawings instead of 30. And this allows the contractors who are doing the work for the providers, they typically have about 30 days to provide that those as-builts to the providers. And then the broadband providers would need to review that and then provide that on to ITD. So they requested a 60-days as-built requirement. All right. I wanted to briefly touch on "Shared Resource Agreement" examples. These were presented in our presentation. We and I wanted to just kind of we had one more comment in regards to that, and then we'll touch on a couple of examples. So under some of the discussion under Shared Resource Agreements between ITD and the Shared Resource or excuse me and the providers, the Shared Resource Agreement would stipulate the cost for if the provider was to sell the spare capacity. The comment was received that the cost to purchase the excess capacity conduits would be based on the final, actual cost of construction. So the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	where a provider was granted access to ITD conduits and vaults "in exchange for dark fiber on providers" on a the providers-installed cable. Now this "enabled new services to state facilities," it also "expanded" the providers' "network" in the region, and it also "increased" the "regional capacity." So that large cable was taken into other points of presence in Washington, so it increased the regional capacity. So that's that was really important for us. We wanted to note all those high-level or not high-level but just comments we received from the two meetings, summarize those, present those at this meeting to note that we heard those comments. And if those providers those folks who provided those comments want to provide any additional clarification or have any additional questions, regarding those summaries of comments from the first two meetings, we'd like to take this opportunity to hear from you, ask more questions of staff. But we really wanted to make sure that this meeting that we noted your comments, concerns, and inputs, and we value those.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	those as-builts. And one of our commenters requested that they be given 60 days to submit those as-built drawings instead of 30. And this allows the contractors who are doing the work for the providers, they typically have about 30 days to provide that those as-builts to the providers. And then the broadband providers would need to review that and then provide that on to ITD. So they requested a 60-days as-built requirement. All right. I wanted to briefly touch on "Shared Resource Agreement" examples. These were presented in our presentation. We and I wanted to just kind of we had one more comment in regards to that, and then we'll touch on a couple of examples. So under some of the discussion under Shared Resource Agreements between ITD and the Shared Resource or excuse me and the providers, the Shared Resource Agreement would stipulate the cost for if the provider was to sell the spare capacity. The comment was received that the cost to purchase the excess capacity conduits would be based	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	where a provider was granted access to ITD conduits and vaults "in exchange for dark fiber on providers" on a the providers-installed cable. Now this "enabled new services to state facilities," it also "expanded" the providers' "network" in the region, and it also "increased" the "regional capacity." So that large cable was taken into other points of presence in Washington, so it increased the regional capacity. So that's that was really important for us. We wanted to note all those high-level or not high-level but just comments we received from the two meetings, summarize those, present those at this meeting to note that we heard those comments. And if those providers those folks who provided those comments want to provide any additional clarification or have any additional questions, regarding those summaries of comments from the first two meetings, we'd like to take this opportunity to hear from you, ask more questions of staff. But we really wanted to make sure that this meeting that we noted your comments, concerns, and inputs, and we value those.

	Page 22		Page 24
1	materials we presented this afternoon or any of the	1	we're, you know, placing your current and future
	documents we have online, we're available to field		capacity requirements and serving these areas. So
	those questions and comments.	3	
4	Yes.	_	obviously, we would like to work with ITD and help
5	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I had one question about		accommodate any way we can.
_	the [unintelligible]	6	
7	THE MODERATOR: Ma'am, would you mind stepping	-	for a more of a non-compete, would that kind of be
	to the podium for us?		more considered because it's an ILEC versus the areas
9	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Unintelligible].		that are not? Does that make sense?
10	THE MODERATOR: And thank you, Rob. Really	10	
	appreciate that description and that high-level	-	probably something we've probably got to do a little
	summary.		more homework on. We're not
13	I think for those that have been working	13	
	on this project, we're familiar with the subject	14	· · · · · · · · · ·
	matter. You can see the complexities that are at		what those service areas are and what restrictions for
	play. He hit on a lot of policy issues.		other providers are.
17	Meeting Number 2 really got into the nuts	17	
	and bolts when we're talking about vaults and conduit	18	
	and ducts and installation, and so you can just kind		little more homework.
	of see the vast spectrum here. And so we really are	20	
	excited to continue the conversation.		you have
22	Just for those that may may be curious,	22	•
	we've got about a half-dozen here that are at	23	
	Headquarters, a half-dozen on the phone, and about		would help formulate a better position
	two-dozen that are virtual.	25	
	Page 23		Page 25
1		1	
1	So, yeah, as Rob alluded to, we'll go	1	MR. BEACHLER: for us. We would appreciate
2	So, yeah, as Rob alluded to, we'll go ahead and start here in the Headquarters.	2	MR. BEACHLER: for us. We would appreciate that.
2 3	So, yeah, as Rob alluded to, we'll go ahead and start here in the Headquarters. So, yeah. If you could please just let us	2 3	MR. BEACHLER: for us. We would appreciate that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay.
2 3 4	So, yeah, as Rob alluded to, we'll go ahead and start here in the Headquarters. So, yeah. If you could please just let us know your name for the record and who you represent,	2 3 4	MR. BEACHLER: for us. We would appreciate that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: We're just not familiar with
2 3 4 5	So, yeah, as Rob alluded to, we'll go ahead and start here in the Headquarters. So, yeah. If you could please just let us know your name for the record and who you represent, we'd be happy to hear from you.	2 3 4 5	MR. BEACHLER: for us. We would appreciate that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: We're just not familiar with those exchange carrier rules and regulations.
2 3 4 5 6	So, yeah, as Rob alluded to, we'll go ahead and start here in the Headquarters. So, yeah. If you could please just let us know your name for the record and who you represent, we'd be happy to hear from you. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: My name's Adrian, and I	2 3 4 5 6	MR. BEACHLER: for us. We would appreciate that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: We're just not familiar with those exchange carrier rules and regulations. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: That makes sense.
2 3 4 5 6 7	So, yeah, as Rob alluded to, we'll go ahead and start here in the Headquarters. So, yeah. If you could please just let us know your name for the record and who you represent, we'd be happy to hear from you. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: My name's Adrian, and I represent Direct Communications out of eastern Idaho.	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. BEACHLER: for us. We would appreciate that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: We're just not familiar with those exchange carrier rules and regulations. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: That makes sense. And we are going to give you more of that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So, yeah, as Rob alluded to, we'll go ahead and start here in the Headquarters. So, yeah. If you could please just let us know your name for the record and who you represent, we'd be happy to hear from you. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: My name's Adrian, and I represent Direct Communications out of eastern Idaho. I just had a question about the ILEC versus non-ILEC	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. BEACHLER: for us. We would appreciate that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: We're just not familiar with those exchange carrier rules and regulations. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: That makes sense. And we are going to give you more of that in our formal comments in writing versus
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So, yeah, as Rob alluded to, we'll go ahead and start here in the Headquarters. So, yeah. If you could please just let us know your name for the record and who you represent, we'd be happy to hear from you. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: My name's Adrian, and I represent Direct Communications out of eastern Idaho. I just had a question about the ILEC versus non-ILEC providers and the clarification on how the permitting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. BEACHLER: for us. We would appreciate that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: We're just not familiar with those exchange carrier rules and regulations. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: That makes sense. And we are going to give you more of that in our formal comments in writing versus over instead of today if that's all right.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10	So, yeah, as Rob alluded to, we'll go ahead and start here in the Headquarters. So, yeah. If you could please just let us know your name for the record and who you represent, we'd be happy to hear from you. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: My name's Adrian, and I represent Direct Communications out of eastern Idaho. I just had a question about the ILEC versus non-ILEC providers and the clarification on how the permitting will work.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. BEACHLER: for us. We would appreciate that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: We're just not familiar with those exchange carrier rules and regulations. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: That makes sense. And we are going to give you more of that in our formal comments in writing versus over instead of today if that's all right. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. And as you at the last
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	So, yeah, as Rob alluded to, we'll go ahead and start here in the Headquarters. So, yeah. If you could please just let us know your name for the record and who you represent, we'd be happy to hear from you. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: My name's Adrian, and I represent Direct Communications out of eastern Idaho. I just had a question about the ILEC versus non-ILEC providers and the clarification on how the permitting will work. So what in those areas, you stated that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. BEACHLER: for us. We would appreciate that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: We're just not familiar with those exchange carrier rules and regulations. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: That makes sense. And we are going to give you more of that in our formal comments in writing versus over instead of today if that's all right. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. And as you at the last meeting, I remember you were, you know, really helpful
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	So, yeah, as Rob alluded to, we'll go ahead and start here in the Headquarters. So, yeah. If you could please just let us know your name for the record and who you represent, we'd be happy to hear from you. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: My name's Adrian, and I represent Direct Communications out of eastern Idaho. I just had a question about the ILEC versus non-ILEC providers and the clarification on how the permitting will work. So what in those areas, you stated that we would be able to continue to permit as we currently	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. BEACHLER: for us. We would appreciate that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: We're just not familiar with those exchange carrier rules and regulations. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: That makes sense. And we are going to give you more of that in our formal comments in writing versus over instead of today if that's all right. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. And as you at the last meeting, I remember you were, you know, really helpful in presenting information for us on inner-ducts, where
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So, yeah, as Rob alluded to, we'll go ahead and start here in the Headquarters. So, yeah. If you could please just let us know your name for the record and who you represent, we'd be happy to hear from you. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: My name's Adrian, and I represent Direct Communications out of eastern Idaho. I just had a question about the ILEC versus non-ILEC providers and the clarification on how the permitting will work. So what in those areas, you stated that we would be able to continue to permit as we currently do. Does that mean the "Dig Once" rule does not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. BEACHLER: for us. We would appreciate that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: We're just not familiar with those exchange carrier rules and regulations. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: That makes sense. And we are going to give you more of that in our formal comments in writing versus over instead of today if that's all right. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. And as you at the last meeting, I remember you were, you know, really helpful in presenting information for us on inner-ducts, where those could be placed at that time, you know,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So, yeah, as Rob alluded to, we'll go ahead and start here in the Headquarters. So, yeah. If you could please just let us know your name for the record and who you represent, we'd be happy to hear from you. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: My name's Adrian, and I represent Direct Communications out of eastern Idaho. I just had a question about the ILEC versus non-ILEC providers and the clarification on how the permitting will work. So what in those areas, you stated that we would be able to continue to permit as we currently do. Does that mean the "Dig Once" rule does not apply? Can you give us just some clarification on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. BEACHLER: for us. We would appreciate that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: We're just not familiar with those exchange carrier rules and regulations. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: That makes sense. And we are going to give you more of that in our formal comments in writing versus over instead of today if that's all right. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. And as you at the last meeting, I remember you were, you know, really helpful in presenting information for us on inner-ducts, where those could be placed at that time, you know, facilitating, and meeting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So, yeah, as Rob alluded to, we'll go ahead and start here in the Headquarters. So, yeah. If you could please just let us know your name for the record and who you represent, we'd be happy to hear from you. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: My name's Adrian, and I represent Direct Communications out of eastern Idaho. I just had a question about the ILEC versus non-ILEC providers and the clarification on how the permitting will work. So what in those areas, you stated that we would be able to continue to permit as we currently do. Does that mean the "Dig Once" rule does not apply? Can you give us just some clarification on that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. BEACHLER: for us. We would appreciate that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: We're just not familiar with those exchange carrier rules and regulations. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: That makes sense. And we are going to give you more of that in our formal comments in writing versus over instead of today if that's all right. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. And as you at the last meeting, I remember you were, you know, really helpful in presenting information for us on inner-ducts, where those could be placed at that time, you know, facilitating, and meeting ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So, yeah, as Rob alluded to, we'll go ahead and start here in the Headquarters. So, yeah. If you could please just let us know your name for the record and who you represent, we'd be happy to hear from you. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: My name's Adrian, and I represent Direct Communications out of eastern Idaho. I just had a question about the ILEC versus non-ILEC providers and the clarification on how the permitting will work. So what in those areas, you stated that we would be able to continue to permit as we currently do. Does that mean the "Dig Once" rule does not apply? Can you give us just some clarification on that? MR. BEACHLER: So "Dig Once," again, is one of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. BEACHLER: for us. We would appreciate that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: We're just not familiar with those exchange carrier rules and regulations. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: That makes sense. And we are going to give you more of that in our formal comments in writing versus over instead of today if that's all right. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. And as you at the last meeting, I remember you were, you know, really helpful in presenting information for us on inner-ducts, where those could be placed at that time, you know, facilitating, and meeting ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Right. MR. BEACHLER: our goal of "Dig Once" by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So, yeah, as Rob alluded to, we'll go ahead and start here in the Headquarters. So, yeah. If you could please just let us know your name for the record and who you represent, we'd be happy to hear from you. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: My name's Adrian, and I represent Direct Communications out of eastern Idaho. I just had a question about the ILEC versus non-ILEC providers and the clarification on how the permitting will work. So what in those areas, you stated that we would be able to continue to permit as we currently do. Does that mean the "Dig Once" rule does not apply? Can you give us just some clarification on that? MR. BEACHLER: So "Dig Once," again, is one of our primary goals and objectives of this. So we would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. BEACHLER: for us. We would appreciate that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: We're just not familiar with those exchange carrier rules and regulations. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: That makes sense. And we are going to give you more of that in our formal comments in writing versus over instead of today if that's all right. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. And as you at the last meeting, I remember you were, you know, really helpful in presenting information for us on inner-ducts, where those could be placed at that time, you know, facilitating, and meeting ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Right. MR. BEACHLER: our goal of "Dig Once" by having additional you know, standard conduit, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So, yeah, as Rob alluded to, we'll go ahead and start here in the Headquarters. So, yeah. If you could please just let us know your name for the record and who you represent, we'd be happy to hear from you. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: My name's Adrian, and I represent Direct Communications out of eastern Idaho. I just had a question about the ILEC versus non-ILEC providers and the clarification on how the permitting will work. So what in those areas, you stated that we would be able to continue to permit as we currently do. Does that mean the "Dig Once" rule does not apply? Can you give us just some clarification on that? MR. BEACHLER: So "Dig Once," again, is one of our primary goals and objectives of this. So we would continue we would still like to request	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. BEACHLER: for us. We would appreciate that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: We're just not familiar with those exchange carrier rules and regulations. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: That makes sense. And we are going to give you more of that in our formal comments in writing versus over instead of today if that's all right. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. And as you at the last meeting, I remember you were, you know, really helpful in presenting information for us on inner-ducts, where those could be placed at that time, you know, facilitating, and meeting ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Right. MR. BEACHLER: our goal of "Dig Once" by having additional you know, standard conduit, but having additional cable capacity, and what would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So, yeah, as Rob alluded to, we'll go ahead and start here in the Headquarters. So, yeah. If you could please just let us know your name for the record and who you represent, we'd be happy to hear from you. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: My name's Adrian, and I represent Direct Communications out of eastern Idaho. I just had a question about the ILEC versus non-ILEC providers and the clarification on how the permitting will work. So what in those areas, you stated that we would be able to continue to permit as we currently do. Does that mean the "Dig Once" rule does not apply? Can you give us just some clarification on that? MR. BEACHLER: So "Dig Once," again, is one of our primary goals and objectives of this. So we would continue we would still like to request coordination with the providers on your installation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. BEACHLER: for us. We would appreciate that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: We're just not familiar with those exchange carrier rules and regulations. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: That makes sense. And we are going to give you more of that in our formal comments in writing versus over instead of today if that's all right. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. And as you at the last meeting, I remember you were, you know, really helpful in presenting information for us on inner-ducts, where those could be placed at that time, you know, facilitating, and meeting ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Right. MR. BEACHLER: our goal of "Dig Once" by having additional you know, standard conduit, but having additional cable capacity, and what would ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So, yeah, as Rob alluded to, we'll go ahead and start here in the Headquarters. So, yeah. If you could please just let us know your name for the record and who you represent, we'd be happy to hear from you. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: My name's Adrian, and I represent Direct Communications out of eastern Idaho. I just had a question about the ILEC versus non-ILEC providers and the clarification on how the permitting will work. So what in those areas, you stated that we would be able to continue to permit as we currently do. Does that mean the "Dig Once" rule does not apply? Can you give us just some clarification on that? MR. BEACHLER: So "Dig Once," again, is one of our primary goals and objectives of this. So we would continue we would still like to request coordination with the providers on your installation. If you're doing a significant, long, longitudinal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. BEACHLER: for us. We would appreciate that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: We're just not familiar with those exchange carrier rules and regulations. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: That makes sense. And we are going to give you more of that in our formal comments in writing versus over instead of today if that's all right. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. And as you at the last meeting, I remember you were, you know, really helpful in presenting information for us on inner-ducts, where those could be placed at that time, you know, facilitating, and meeting ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Right. MR. BEACHLER: our goal of "Dig Once" by having additional you know, standard conduit, but having additional cable capacity, and what would ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Yes. MR. BEACHLER: really help facilitate that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So, yeah, as Rob alluded to, we'll go ahead and start here in the Headquarters. So, yeah. If you could please just let us know your name for the record and who you represent, we'd be happy to hear from you. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: My name's Adrian, and I represent Direct Communications out of eastern Idaho. I just had a question about the ILEC versus non-ILEC providers and the clarification on how the permitting will work. So what in those areas, you stated that we would be able to continue to permit as we currently do. Does that mean the "Dig Once" rule does not apply? Can you give us just some clarification on that? MR. BEACHLER: So "Dig Once," again, is one of our primary goals and objectives of this. So we would continue we would still like to request coordination with the providers on your installation. If you're doing a significant, long, longitudinal build along the State Highway System, we'd want to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. BEACHLER: for us. We would appreciate that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: We're just not familiar with those exchange carrier rules and regulations. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: That makes sense. And we are going to give you more of that in our formal comments in writing versus over instead of today if that's all right. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. And as you at the last meeting, I remember you were, you know, really helpful in presenting information for us on inner-ducts, where those could be placed at that time, you know, facilitating, and meeting ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Right. MR. BEACHLER: our goal of "Dig Once" by having additional you know, standard conduit, but having additional cable capacity, and what would ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Yes. MR. BEACHLER: really help facilitate that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Well, we would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So, yeah, as Rob alluded to, we'll go ahead and start here in the Headquarters. So, yeah. If you could please just let us know your name for the record and who you represent, we'd be happy to hear from you. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: My name's Adrian, and I represent Direct Communications out of eastern Idaho. I just had a question about the ILEC versus non-ILEC providers and the clarification on how the permitting will work. So what in those areas, you stated that we would be able to continue to permit as we currently do. Does that mean the "Dig Once" rule does not apply? Can you give us just some clarification on that? MR. BEACHLER: So "Dig Once," again, is one of our primary goals and objectives of this. So we would continue we would still like to request coordination with the providers on your installation. If you're doing a significant, long, longitudinal build along the State Highway System, we'd want to know that so we can coordinate with you. And not so	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. BEACHLER: for us. We would appreciate that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: We're just not familiar with those exchange carrier rules and regulations. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: That makes sense. And we are going to give you more of that in our formal comments in writing versus over instead of today if that's all right. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. And as you at the last meeting, I remember you were, you know, really helpful in presenting information for us on inner-ducts, where those could be placed at that time, you know, facilitating, and meeting ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Right. MR. BEACHLER: our goal of "Dig Once" by having additional you know, standard conduit, but having additional cable capacity, and what would ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Yes. MR. BEACHLER: really help facilitate that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Well, we would MR. BEACHLER: So thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So, yeah, as Rob alluded to, we'll go ahead and start here in the Headquarters. So, yeah. If you could please just let us know your name for the record and who you represent, we'd be happy to hear from you. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: My name's Adrian, and I represent Direct Communications out of eastern Idaho. I just had a question about the ILEC versus non-ILEC providers and the clarification on how the permitting will work. So what in those areas, you stated that we would be able to continue to permit as we currently do. Does that mean the "Dig Once" rule does not apply? Can you give us just some clarification on that? MR. BEACHLER: So "Dig Once," again, is one of our primary goals and objectives of this. So we would continue we would still like to request coordination with the providers on your installation. If you're doing a significant, long, longitudinal build along the State Highway System, we'd want to know that so we can coordinate with you. And not so much to be exempt, but, you know	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. BEACHLER: for us. We would appreciate that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: We're just not familiar with those exchange carrier rules and regulations. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: That makes sense. And we are going to give you more of that in our formal comments in writing versus over instead of today if that's all right. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. And as you at the last meeting, I remember you were, you know, really helpful in presenting information for us on inner-ducts, where those could be placed at that time, you know, facilitating, and meeting ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Right. MR. BEACHLER: our goal of "Dig Once" by having additional you know, standard conduit, but having additional cable capacity, and what would ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Yes. MR. BEACHLER: really help facilitate that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Well, we would MR. BEACHLER: So thank you. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: We would like to help you guys
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So, yeah, as Rob alluded to, we'll go ahead and start here in the Headquarters. So, yeah. If you could please just let us know your name for the record and who you represent, we'd be happy to hear from you. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: My name's Adrian, and I represent Direct Communications out of eastern Idaho. I just had a question about the ILEC versus non-ILEC providers and the clarification on how the permitting will work. So what in those areas, you stated that we would be able to continue to permit as we currently do. Does that mean the "Dig Once" rule does not apply? Can you give us just some clarification on that? MR. BEACHLER: So "Dig Once," again, is one of our primary goals and objectives of this. So we would continue we would still like to request coordination with the providers on your installation. If you're doing a significant, long, longitudinal build along the State Highway System, we'd want to know that so we can coordinate with you. And not so	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. BEACHLER: for us. We would appreciate that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: We're just not familiar with those exchange carrier rules and regulations. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: That makes sense. And we are going to give you more of that in our formal comments in writing versus over instead of today if that's all right. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. And as you at the last meeting, I remember you were, you know, really helpful in presenting information for us on inner-ducts, where those could be placed at that time, you know, facilitating, and meeting ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Right. MR. BEACHLER: our goal of "Dig Once" by having additional you know, standard conduit, but having additional cable capacity, and what would ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Yes. MR. BEACHLER: really help facilitate that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Well, we would MR. BEACHLER: So thank you. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: We would like to help you guys continue that as well and more research on that.

	Page 26		Page 28
-	in eastern Idaho to help you guys learn more about	-	ITD and broadband providers and how I believe that is
	that. So we'll continue to work with them if that's		likely a violation of Federal and State law, at least
	all right.		as it pertains to cable companies.
4	MR. BEACHLER: Yes, please.	4	And third, it would seem that a push for
5	ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. Thank you.	_	ITD to extract fair market value from broadband
6	THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. Appreciate		providers is primarily driven by the Federal Highway
	that.		Administration rules, and all this could be resolved
8	And then also just wanted to mention we		in the best interest of the State if the State were to
-	have also a couple of special guests from the		declare broadband in the public interest.
	Governor's office. We have the deputy chief of staff,	10	And and, Robert, you and I might need
	Bobbi-Jo Meuleman, and DFM's administrator Alex Adams.		to talk a little bit about the definition of a
12	So in addition to our participants,		"utility" and how this applies to highway definitions,
	stakeholders, interested vendors, there's the		because I I don't know anything about that. So
	Governor's office, the Department, executive agency		I what I could be saying about that could be muted
	staff. The Legislature's interested in this topic.		by additional understanding on my part.
	So you can really see the impacts and the high level	16	So my first point: Broadband providers
	of interest.		are not and have never been "utilities" in Idaho law
18	So, yeah, if they if we'll still go		and under Federal law. We have never been regulated
	ahead and stick here in the auditorium.		by the Idaho PUC. And I've practiced before the PUC
20	And, yeah, please step to the mic and let		for the last 30 years.
	us know your name and who you represent.	21	We're not regulated, either, under
22	RON WILLIAMS: Thank you very much. My name is		Title 61, which provides for the regulation of public
	Ron Williams, and I'm here representing the Idaho		utilities in the construct of price regulation or
	Cable Broadband Association.		we'll call that "full-on utility regulation" or in
25	I did bring a bit of water with me. And		the context of Title 62, which provides for some
			L
	Page 27		Page 29
1	-		
	unfortunately, I didn't realize it was sparkling	1	Page 29 non-price regulation, certain types of telecommunication services.
2	unfortunately, I didn't realize it was sparkling water, and when I opened it, it sprayed all over me.	1	non-price regulation, certain types of telecommunication services.
2 3	unfortunately, I didn't realize it was sparkling	1 2 3	non-price regulation, certain types of
2 3	unfortunately, I didn't realize it was sparkling water, and when I opened it, it sprayed all over me. And I hope that's not representative of how things are	1 2 3 4	non-price regulation, certain types of telecommunication services. And that Title 62 regulation in the PUC is
2 3 4 5	unfortunately, I didn't realize it was sparkling water, and when I opened it, it sprayed all over me. And I hope that's not representative of how things are going to go. So the Idaho Cable Broadband Association	1 2 3 4 5	non-price regulation, certain types of telecommunication services. And that Title 62 regulation in the PUC is primarily for telecommunications companies and
2 3 4 5 6	unfortunately, I didn't realize it was sparkling water, and when I opened it, it sprayed all over me. And I hope that's not representative of how things are going to go.	1 2 3 4 5 6	non-price regulation, certain types of telecommunication services. And that Title 62 regulation in the PUC is primarily for telecommunications companies and telecommunications services and for ILECs that elect
2 3 4 5 6 7	unfortunately, I didn't realize it was sparkling water, and when I opened it, it sprayed all over me. And I hope that's not representative of how things are going to go. So the Idaho Cable Broadband Association is my client. It's comprised of the cable companies	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	non-price regulation, certain types of telecommunication services. And that Title 62 regulation in the PUC is primarily for telecommunications companies and telecommunications services and for ILECs that elect out of Title 61 regulation. So I'd be happy to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	unfortunately, I didn't realize it was sparkling water, and when I opened it, it sprayed all over me. And I hope that's not representative of how things are going to go. So the Idaho Cable Broadband Association is my client. It's comprised of the cable companies that are in the broadband business. In your vernacular, it's primarily Sparklight in south southern Idaho and Lewiston, Cox	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	non-price regulation, certain types of telecommunication services. And that Title 62 regulation in the PUC is primarily for telecommunications companies and telecommunications services and for ILECs that elect out of Title 61 regulation. So I'd be happy to explain that further if we need to go down that rabbit hole. But in essence, broadband is explicitly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	unfortunately, I didn't realize it was sparkling water, and when I opened it, it sprayed all over me. And I hope that's not representative of how things are going to go. So the Idaho Cable Broadband Association is my client. It's comprised of the cable companies that are in the broadband business. In your vernacular, it's primarily Sparklight in south southern Idaho and Lewiston, Cox Communications in the Wood River Valley, and Charter	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	non-price regulation, certain types of telecommunication services. And that Title 62 regulation in the PUC is primarily for telecommunications companies and telecommunications services and for ILECs that elect out of Title 61 regulation. So I'd be happy to explain that further if we need to go down that rabbit hole.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	unfortunately, I didn't realize it was sparkling water, and when I opened it, it sprayed all over me. And I hope that's not representative of how things are going to go. So the Idaho Cable Broadband Association is my client. It's comprised of the cable companies that are in the broadband business. In your vernacular, it's primarily Sparklight in south southern Idaho and Lewiston, Cox Communications in the Wood River Valley, and Charter Communications in north Idaho.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	non-price regulation, certain types of telecommunication services. And that Title 62 regulation in the PUC is primarily for telecommunications companies and telecommunications services and for ILECs that elect out of Title 61 regulation. So I'd be happy to explain that further if we need to go down that rabbit hole. But in essence, broadband is explicitly classified as an "information service" under Federal law, and it is not a telecommunication service. And
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	unfortunately, I didn't realize it was sparkling water, and when I opened it, it sprayed all over me. And I hope that's not representative of how things are going to go. So the Idaho Cable Broadband Association is my client. It's comprised of the cable companies that are in the broadband business. In your vernacular, it's primarily Sparklight in south southern Idaho and Lewiston, Cox Communications in the Wood River Valley, and Charter Communications in north Idaho. So I have three comments today, and we're	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	non-price regulation, certain types of telecommunication services. And that Title 62 regulation in the PUC is primarily for telecommunications companies and telecommunications services and for ILECs that elect out of Title 61 regulation. So I'd be happy to explain that further if we need to go down that rabbit hole. But in essence, broadband is explicitly classified as an "information service" under Federal law, and it is not a telecommunication service. And those definitions are very important.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	unfortunately, I didn't realize it was sparkling water, and when I opened it, it sprayed all over me. And I hope that's not representative of how things are going to go. So the Idaho Cable Broadband Association is my client. It's comprised of the cable companies that are in the broadband business. In your vernacular, it's primarily Sparklight in south southern Idaho and Lewiston, Cox Communications in the Wood River Valley, and Charter Communications in north Idaho. So I have three comments today, and we're going to be following up with much more	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	non-price regulation, certain types of telecommunication services. And that Title 62 regulation in the PUC is primarily for telecommunications companies and telecommunications services and for ILECs that elect out of Title 61 regulation. So I'd be happy to explain that further if we need to go down that rabbit hole. But in essence, broadband is explicitly classified as an "information service" under Federal law, and it is not a telecommunication service. And those definitions are very important. So I believe you need to rethink your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	unfortunately, I didn't realize it was sparkling water, and when I opened it, it sprayed all over me. And I hope that's not representative of how things are going to go. So the Idaho Cable Broadband Association is my client. It's comprised of the cable companies that are in the broadband business. In your vernacular, it's primarily Sparklight in south southern Idaho and Lewiston, Cox Communications in the Wood River Valley, and Charter Communications in north Idaho. So I have three comments today, and we're going to be following up with much more detail written comments, because I think some of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	non-price regulation, certain types of telecommunication services. And that Title 62 regulation in the PUC is primarily for telecommunications companies and telecommunications services and for ILECs that elect out of Title 61 regulation. So I'd be happy to explain that further if we need to go down that rabbit hole. But in essence, broadband is explicitly classified as an "information service" under Federal law, and it is not a telecommunication service. And those definitions are very important. So I believe you need to rethink your whole construct of putting broadband under a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	unfortunately, I didn't realize it was sparkling water, and when I opened it, it sprayed all over me. And I hope that's not representative of how things are going to go. So the Idaho Cable Broadband Association is my client. It's comprised of the cable companies that are in the broadband business. In your vernacular, it's primarily Sparklight in south southern Idaho and Lewiston, Cox Communications in the Wood River Valley, and Charter Communications in north Idaho. So I have three comments today, and we're going to be following up with much more detail written comments, because I think some of the things I'm going to say are going to get a little	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	non-price regulation, certain types of telecommunication services. And that Title 62 regulation in the PUC is primarily for telecommunications companies and telecommunications services and for ILECs that elect out of Title 61 regulation. So I'd be happy to explain that further if we need to go down that rabbit hole. But in essence, broadband is explicitly classified as an "information service" under Federal law, and it is not a telecommunication service. And those definitions are very important. So I believe you need to rethink your whole construct of putting broadband under a utility-type of regulation because those words mean a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	unfortunately, I didn't realize it was sparkling water, and when I opened it, it sprayed all over me. And I hope that's not representative of how things are going to go. So the Idaho Cable Broadband Association is my client. It's comprised of the cable companies that are in the broadband business. In your vernacular, it's primarily Sparklight in south southern Idaho and Lewiston, Cox Communications in the Wood River Valley, and Charter Communications in north Idaho. So I have three comments today, and we're going to be following up with much more detail written comments, because I think some of the things I'm going to say are going to get a little wonky, so we'll we'll provide additional details to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	non-price regulation, certain types of telecommunication services. And that Title 62 regulation in the PUC is primarily for telecommunications companies and telecommunications services and for ILECs that elect out of Title 61 regulation. So I'd be happy to explain that further if we need to go down that rabbit hole. But in essence, broadband is explicitly classified as an "information service" under Federal law, and it is not a telecommunication service. And those definitions are very important. So I believe you need to rethink your whole construct of putting broadband under a utility-type of regulation because those words mean a lot to us, not only in this context, but they have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	unfortunately, I didn't realize it was sparkling water, and when I opened it, it sprayed all over me. And I hope that's not representative of how things are going to go. So the Idaho Cable Broadband Association is my client. It's comprised of the cable companies that are in the broadband business. In your vernacular, it's primarily Sparklight in south southern Idaho and Lewiston, Cox Communications in the Wood River Valley, and Charter Communications in north Idaho. So I have three comments today, and we're going to be following up with much more detail written comments, because I think some of the things I'm going to say are going to get a little wonky, so we'll we'll provide additional details to you.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	non-price regulation, certain types of telecommunication services. And that Title 62 regulation in the PUC is primarily for telecommunications companies and telecommunications services and for ILECs that elect out of Title 61 regulation. So I'd be happy to explain that further if we need to go down that rabbit hole. But in essence, broadband is explicitly classified as an "information service" under Federal law, and it is not a telecommunication service. And those definitions are very important. So I believe you need to rethink your whole construct of putting broadband under a utility-type of regulation because those words mean a lot to us, not only in this context, but they have some very adverse meanings to broadband providers in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	unfortunately, I didn't realize it was sparkling water, and when I opened it, it sprayed all over me. And I hope that's not representative of how things are going to go. So the Idaho Cable Broadband Association is my client. It's comprised of the cable companies that are in the broadband business. In your vernacular, it's primarily Sparklight in south southern Idaho and Lewiston, Cox Communications in the Wood River Valley, and Charter Communications in north Idaho. So I have three comments today, and we're going to be following up with much more detail written comments, because I think some of the things I'm going to say are going to get a little wonky, so we'll we'll provide additional details to you. But the three points I want to talk	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	non-price regulation, certain types of telecommunication services. And that Title 62 regulation in the PUC is primarily for telecommunications companies and telecommunications services and for ILECs that elect out of Title 61 regulation. So I'd be happy to explain that further if we need to go down that rabbit hole. But in essence, broadband is explicitly classified as an "information service" under Federal law, and it is not a telecommunication service. And those definitions are very important. So I believe you need to rethink your whole construct of putting broadband under a utility-type of regulation because those words mean a lot to us, not only in this context, but they have some very adverse meanings to broadband providers in other contexts. I think of things like Internet or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	unfortunately, I didn't realize it was sparkling water, and when I opened it, it sprayed all over me. And I hope that's not representative of how things are going to go. So the Idaho Cable Broadband Association is my client. It's comprised of the cable companies that are in the broadband business. In your vernacular, it's primarily Sparklight in south southern Idaho and Lewiston, Cox Communications in the Wood River Valley, and Charter Communications in north Idaho. So I have three comments today, and we're going to be following up with much more detail written comments, because I think some of the things I'm going to say are going to get a little wonky, so we'll we'll provide additional details to you. But the three points I want to talk about first is the definitions that of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	non-price regulation, certain types of telecommunication services. And that Title 62 regulation in the PUC is primarily for telecommunications companies and telecommunications services and for ILECs that elect out of Title 61 regulation. So I'd be happy to explain that further if we need to go down that rabbit hole. But in essence, broadband is explicitly classified as an "information service" under Federal law, and it is not a telecommunication service. And those definitions are very important. So I believe you need to rethink your whole construct of putting broadband under a utility-type of regulation because those words mean a lot to us, not only in this context, but they have some very adverse meanings to broadband providers in other contexts. I think of things like Internet or broadband service providers, ISPs, information service
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	unfortunately, I didn't realize it was sparkling water, and when I opened it, it sprayed all over me. And I hope that's not representative of how things are going to go. So the Idaho Cable Broadband Association is my client. It's comprised of the cable companies that are in the broadband business. In your vernacular, it's primarily Sparklight in south southern Idaho and Lewiston, Cox Communications in the Wood River Valley, and Charter Communications in north Idaho. So I have three comments today, and we're going to be following up with much more detail written comments, because I think some of the things I'm going to say are going to get a little wonky, so we'll we'll provide additional details to you. But the three points I want to talk about first is the definitions that of "utility." And, Robert, I'd be happy to work with you	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	non-price regulation, certain types of telecommunication services. And that Title 62 regulation in the PUC is primarily for telecommunications companies and telecommunications services and for ILECs that elect out of Title 61 regulation. So I'd be happy to explain that further if we need to go down that rabbit hole. But in essence, broadband is explicitly classified as an "information service" under Federal law, and it is not a telecommunication service. And those definitions are very important. So I believe you need to rethink your whole construct of putting broadband under a utility-type of regulation because those words mean a lot to us, not only in this context, but they have some very adverse meanings to broadband providers in other contexts. I think of things like Internet or broadband service providers, ISPs, information service providers, and I think we can come up with some words
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	unfortunately, I didn't realize it was sparkling water, and when I opened it, it sprayed all over me. And I hope that's not representative of how things are going to go. So the Idaho Cable Broadband Association is my client. It's comprised of the cable companies that are in the broadband business. In your vernacular, it's primarily Sparklight in south southern Idaho and Lewiston, Cox Communications in the Wood River Valley, and Charter Communications in north Idaho. So I have three comments today, and we're going to be following up with much more detail written comments, because I think some of the things I'm going to say are going to get a little wonky, so we'll we'll provide additional details to you. But the three points I want to talk about first is the definitions that of "utility." And, Robert, I'd be happy to work with you on this. But it just seems very awkward in attempting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	non-price regulation, certain types of telecommunication services. And that Title 62 regulation in the PUC is primarily for telecommunications companies and telecommunications services and for ILECs that elect out of Title 61 regulation. So I'd be happy to explain that further if we need to go down that rabbit hole. But in essence, broadband is explicitly classified as an "information service" under Federal law, and it is not a telecommunication service. And those definitions are very important. So I believe you need to rethink your whole construct of putting broadband under a utility-type of regulation because those words mean a lot to us, not only in this context, but they have some very adverse meanings to broadband providers in other contexts. I think of things like Internet or broadband service providers, ISPs, information service providers, and I think we can come up with some words that maybe solve that issue. I'd be happy to work
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	unfortunately, I didn't realize it was sparkling water, and when I opened it, it sprayed all over me. And I hope that's not representative of how things are going to go. So the Idaho Cable Broadband Association is my client. It's comprised of the cable companies that are in the broadband business. In your vernacular, it's primarily Sparklight in south southern Idaho and Lewiston, Cox Communications in the Wood River Valley, and Charter Communications in north Idaho. So I have three comments today, and we're going to be following up with much more detail written comments, because I think some of the things I'm going to say are going to get a little wonky, so we'll we'll provide additional details to you. But the three points I want to talk about first is the definitions that of "utility." And, Robert, I'd be happy to work with you on this. But it just seems very awkward in attempting to classify broadband providers as some lesser form of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	non-price regulation, certain types of telecommunication services. And that Title 62 regulation in the PUC is primarily for telecommunications companies and telecommunications services and for ILECs that elect out of Title 61 regulation. So I'd be happy to explain that further if we need to go down that rabbit hole. But in essence, broadband is explicitly classified as an "information service" under Federal law, and it is not a telecommunication service. And those definitions are very important. So I believe you need to rethink your whole construct of putting broadband under a utility-type of regulation because those words mean a lot to us, not only in this context, but they have some very adverse meanings to broadband providers in other contexts. I think of things like Internet or broadband service providers, ISPs, information service providers, and I think we can come up with some words that maybe solve that issue. I'd be happy to work with you on that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	unfortunately, I didn't realize it was sparkling water, and when I opened it, it sprayed all over me. And I hope that's not representative of how things are going to go. So the Idaho Cable Broadband Association is my client. It's comprised of the cable companies that are in the broadband business. In your vernacular, it's primarily Sparklight in south southern Idaho and Lewiston, Cox Communications in the Wood River Valley, and Charter Communications in north Idaho. So I have three comments today, and we're going to be following up with much more detail written comments, because I think some of the things I'm going to say are going to get a little wonky, so we'll we'll provide additional details to you. But the three points I want to talk about first is the definitions that of "utility." And, Robert, I'd be happy to work with you on this. But it just seems very awkward in attempting to classify broadband providers as some lesser form of "utility" or "non-public utility."	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	non-price regulation, certain types of telecommunication services. And that Title 62 regulation in the PUC is primarily for telecommunications companies and telecommunications services and for ILECs that elect out of Title 61 regulation. So I'd be happy to explain that further if we need to go down that rabbit hole. But in essence, broadband is explicitly classified as an "information service" under Federal law, and it is not a telecommunication service. And those definitions are very important. So I believe you need to rethink your whole construct of putting broadband under a utility-type of regulation because those words mean a lot to us, not only in this context, but they have some very adverse meanings to broadband providers in other contexts. I think of things like Internet or broadband service providers, ISPs, information service providers, and I think we can come up with some words that maybe solve that issue. I'd be happy to work with you on that. But specifically on the Broadband Rule
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	unfortunately, I didn't realize it was sparkling water, and when I opened it, it sprayed all over me. And I hope that's not representative of how things are going to go. So the Idaho Cable Broadband Association is my client. It's comprised of the cable companies that are in the broadband business. In your vernacular, it's primarily Sparklight in south southern Idaho and Lewiston, Cox Communications in the Wood River Valley, and Charter Communications in north Idaho. So I have three comments today, and we're going to be following up with much more detail written comments, because I think some of the things I'm going to say are going to get a little wonky, so we'll we'll provide additional details to you. But the three points I want to talk about first is the definitions that of "utility." And, Robert, I'd be happy to work with you on this. But it just seems very awkward in attempting to classify broadband providers as some lesser form of "utility" or "non-public utility." The second point I want to talk about is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	non-price regulation, certain types of telecommunication services. And that Title 62 regulation in the PUC is primarily for telecommunications companies and telecommunications services and for ILECs that elect out of Title 61 regulation. So I'd be happy to explain that further if we need to go down that rabbit hole. But in essence, broadband is explicitly classified as an "information service" under Federal law, and it is not a telecommunication service. And those definitions are very important. So I believe you need to rethink your whole construct of putting broadband under a utility-type of regulation because those words mean a lot to us, not only in this context, but they have some very adverse meanings to broadband providers in other contexts. I think of things like Internet or broadband service providers, ISPs, information service providers, and I think we can come up with some words that maybe solve that issue. I'd be happy to work with you on that. But specifically on the Broadband Rule under Section 615.01 the second paragraph references
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	unfortunately, I didn't realize it was sparkling water, and when I opened it, it sprayed all over me. And I hope that's not representative of how things are going to go. So the Idaho Cable Broadband Association is my client. It's comprised of the cable companies that are in the broadband business. In your vernacular, it's primarily Sparklight in south southern Idaho and Lewiston, Cox Communications in the Wood River Valley, and Charter Communications in north Idaho. So I have three comments today, and we're going to be following up with much more detail written comments, because I think some of the things I'm going to say are going to get a little wonky, so we'll we'll provide additional details to you. But the three points I want to talk about first is the definitions that of "utility." And, Robert, I'd be happy to work with you on this. But it just seems very awkward in attempting to classify broadband providers as some lesser form of "utility" or "non-public utility."	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	non-price regulation, certain types of telecommunication services. And that Title 62 regulation in the PUC is primarily for telecommunications companies and telecommunications services and for ILECs that elect out of Title 61 regulation. So I'd be happy to explain that further if we need to go down that rabbit hole. But in essence, broadband is explicitly classified as an "information service" under Federal law, and it is not a telecommunication service. And those definitions are very important. So I believe you need to rethink your whole construct of putting broadband under a utility-type of regulation because those words mean a lot to us, not only in this context, but they have some very adverse meanings to broadband providers in other contexts. I think of things like Internet or broadband service providers, ISPs, information service providers, and I think we can come up with some words that maybe solve that issue. I'd be happy to work with you on that. But specifically on the Broadband Rule

Pub	nc meeting		July 20, 2021
	Page 30		Page 32
1	utility," that has no relevance to broadband	1	not charging cable companies more than a 5 percent
	providers.		franchise fee for the public for access to the
3	And secondly, the following paragraph, it		public right-of-way. In essence, a Shared Resource
	starts out "Utilities" and we're not utilities, but		Agreement is a mandatory extraction of value above and
	it says "Utilities that have not received" CPCNs [sic]		beyond the 5 percent cash payment already being
	"from the" PUC, and, gosh, that could apply to farmers		collected from cable companies.
	or anything else because it just those so those	7	
	two sections just are not relevant to the broadband		on this. There's been numerous court cases, but most
9	world.		compelling was a very recent court case of May of this
10	I think they're on the next page, when it		year where a Federal Appeals Court decision in the
	talks about the United States Code. You have some		case of the City of Eugene versus the FCC held that
	references to the Telecommunications Act, but my next		non-cash, cable-related extractions from a franchising
13	point we'll we'll talk about some other laws I	13	authority that are merely permissive impose a
14	think you need to take into account.	14	franchise fee that is subject to the 5 percent cap.
15	So on to Point Number 2. The Federal	15	In other words, this and they call this
16	Cable Act or the 1984 Cable Act, which is part of the	16	the "In-Kind Rule," the FCC's "In-Kind Rule," and it's
17	Federal Communications Act, establishes a	17	been through three different iterations over the last
18	comprehensive scheme for the Federal, State, and local	18	20 years. But in essence, the "In-Kind Rule"
19	regulation of the cable industry. And that regulation	19	classifies mandatory extractions like shared services
20	includes granting of franchises, the use of the public		as a franchise fee.
	rights-of-way, and the payment of franchise fees.	21	In addition to the FCC's "In-Kind Rule" is
22	In 2012 the Idaho Legislature passed the	22	another FCC rule called the "Mixed-Use Rule," and that
	Idaho Video Service Act, which provided for the State		prohibits the franchising authority, again, the State
	of Idaho to become the cable or the video franchising		of Idaho, from regulating a non-cable service as a
	authority, or in our world, the LFA, the local		cable from a cable provider that is not a common
	······································		F
	Page 31		Page 33
1		1	
	franchising authority, with a twist where the cable		carrier.
2	franchising authority, with a twist where the cable companies still pay state, cities, and counties the	2	carrier. So those are words right out of the City
2 3	franchising authority, with a twist where the cable companies still pay state, cities, and counties the franchise fee, but the state is the franchising	2 3	carrier. So those are words right out of the City of Eugene court decision, but stated differently, what
2 3 4	franchising authority, with a twist where the cable companies still pay state, cities, and counties the franchise fee, but the state is the franchising authority.	2 3 4	carrier. So those are words right out of the City of Eugene court decision, but stated differently, what it says is the franchising authority cannot separate a
2 3 4 5	franchising authority, with a twist where the cable companies still pay state, cities, and counties the franchise fee, but the state is the franchising authority. So what's important there are two things:	2 3 4 5	carrier. So those are words right out of the City of Eugene court decision, but stated differently, what it says is the franchising authority cannot separate a cable service from a broadband information service for
2 3 4 5 6	franchising authority, with a twist where the cable companies still pay state, cities, and counties the franchise fee, but the state is the franchising authority. So what's important there are two things: First of all, the Idaho Video Services Act, which is	2 3 4 5 6	carrier. So those are words right out of the City of Eugene court decision, but stated differently, what it says is the franchising authority cannot separate a cable service from a broadband information service for purposes of calculating the extraction.
2 3 4 5 6 7	franchising authority, with a twist where the cable companies still pay state, cities, and counties the franchise fee, but the state is the franchising authority. So what's important there are two things: First of all, the Idaho Video Services Act, which is Idaho Code Section 50-3001, it gives cable companies	2 3 4 5 6 7	carrier. So those are words right out of the City of Eugene court decision, but stated differently, what it says is the franchising authority cannot separate a cable service from a broadband information service for purposes of calculating the extraction. So it is likely, in my opinion, that ITD's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	franchising authority, with a twist where the cable companies still pay state, cities, and counties the franchise fee, but the state is the franchising authority. So what's important there are two things: First of all, the Idaho Video Services Act, which is Idaho Code Section 50-3001, it gives cable companies the right to occupy the public rights-of-way. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	carrier. So those are words right out of the City of Eugene court decision, but stated differently, what it says is the franchising authority cannot separate a cable service from a broadband information service for purposes of calculating the extraction. So it is likely, in my opinion, that ITD's mandated Shared Resource Agreement rule, at least as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	franchising authority, with a twist where the cable companies still pay state, cities, and counties the franchise fee, but the state is the franchising authority. So what's important there are two things: First of all, the Idaho Video Services Act, which is Idaho Code Section 50-3001, it gives cable companies the right to occupy the public rights-of-way. And then you have to you have to also read the Idaho	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	carrier. So those are words right out of the City of Eugene court decision, but stated differently, what it says is the franchising authority cannot separate a cable service from a broadband information service for purposes of calculating the extraction. So it is likely, in my opinion, that ITD's mandated Shared Resource Agreement rule, at least as it applies to cable companies, would be would run
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	franchising authority, with a twist where the cable companies still pay state, cities, and counties the franchise fee, but the state is the franchising authority. So what's important there are two things: First of all, the Idaho Video Services Act, which is Idaho Code Section 50-3001, it gives cable companies the right to occupy the public rights-of-way. And then you have to you have to also read the Idaho act in the Federal law in conjunction with each other.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	carrier. So those are words right out of the City of Eugene court decision, but stated differently, what it says is the franchising authority cannot separate a cable service from a broadband information service for purposes of calculating the extraction. So it is likely, in my opinion, that ITD's mandated Shared Resource Agreement rule, at least as it applies to cable companies, would be would run afoul of the FCC's In-Kind and Mixed-Use Rules and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	franchising authority, with a twist where the cable companies still pay state, cities, and counties the franchise fee, but the state is the franchising authority. So what's important there are two things: First of all, the Idaho Video Services Act, which is Idaho Code Section 50-3001, it gives cable companies the right to occupy the public rights-of-way. And then you have to you have to also read the Idaho act in the Federal law in conjunction with each other. But a limitation of the Federal Cable Act	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	carrier. So those are words right out of the City of Eugene court decision, but stated differently, what it says is the franchising authority cannot separate a cable service from a broadband information service for purposes of calculating the extraction. So it is likely, in my opinion, that ITD's mandated Shared Resource Agreement rule, at least as it applies to cable companies, would be would run afoul of the FCC's In-Kind and Mixed-Use Rules and found illegal. If the rule was found to be legal,
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	franchising authority, with a twist where the cable companies still pay state, cities, and counties the franchise fee, but the state is the franchising authority. So what's important there are two things: First of all, the Idaho Video Services Act, which is Idaho Code Section 50-3001, it gives cable companies the right to occupy the public rights-of-way. And then you have to you have to also read the Idaho act in the Federal law in conjunction with each other. But a limitation of the Federal Cable Act is that franchise fees charged to cable companies	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	carrier. So those are words right out of the City of Eugene court decision, but stated differently, what it says is the franchising authority cannot separate a cable service from a broadband information service for purposes of calculating the extraction. So it is likely, in my opinion, that ITD's mandated Shared Resource Agreement rule, at least as it applies to cable companies, would be would run afoul of the FCC's In-Kind and Mixed-Use Rules and found illegal. If the rule was found to be legal, then it would almost certainly trigger a reduction in
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	franchising authority, with a twist where the cable companies still pay state, cities, and counties the franchise fee, but the state is the franchising authority. So what's important there are two things: First of all, the Idaho Video Services Act, which is Idaho Code Section 50-3001, it gives cable companies the right to occupy the public rights-of-way. And then you have to you have to also read the Idaho act in the Federal law in conjunction with each other. But a limitation of the Federal Cable Act is that franchise fees charged to cable companies cannot exceed 5 percent. And this limitation applies	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	carrier. So those are words right out of the City of Eugene court decision, but stated differently, what it says is the franchising authority cannot separate a cable service from a broadband information service for purposes of calculating the extraction. So it is likely, in my opinion, that ITD's mandated Shared Resource Agreement rule, at least as it applies to cable companies, would be would run afoul of the FCC's In-Kind and Mixed-Use Rules and found illegal. If the rule was found to be legal, then it would almost certainly trigger a reduction in the 5 percent franchise fees that cable companies are
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	franchising authority, with a twist where the cable companies still pay state, cities, and counties the franchise fee, but the state is the franchising authority. So what's important there are two things: First of all, the Idaho Video Services Act, which is Idaho Code Section 50-3001, it gives cable companies the right to occupy the public rights-of-way. And then you have to you have to also read the Idaho act in the Federal law in conjunction with each other. But a limitation of the Federal Cable Act is that franchise fees charged to cable companies cannot exceed 5 percent. And this limitation applies to the local franchising authority, which is the State	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	carrier. So those are words right out of the City of Eugene court decision, but stated differently, what it says is the franchising authority cannot separate a cable service from a broadband information service for purposes of calculating the extraction. So it is likely, in my opinion, that ITD's mandated Shared Resource Agreement rule, at least as it applies to cable companies, would be would run afoul of the FCC's In-Kind and Mixed-Use Rules and found illegal. If the rule was found to be legal, then it would almost certainly trigger a reduction in the 5 percent franchise fees that cable companies are paying to local cities and counties.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	franchising authority, with a twist where the cable companies still pay state, cities, and counties the franchise fee, but the state is the franchising authority. So what's important there are two things: First of all, the Idaho Video Services Act, which is Idaho Code Section 50-3001, it gives cable companies the right to occupy the public rights-of-way. And then you have to you have to also read the Idaho act in the Federal law in conjunction with each other. But a limitation of the Federal Cable Act is that franchise fees charged to cable companies cannot exceed 5 percent. And this limitation applies to the local franchising authority, which is the State and, by imputation, to Idaho ITD.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	carrier. So those are words right out of the City of Eugene court decision, but stated differently, what it says is the franchising authority cannot separate a cable service from a broadband information service for purposes of calculating the extraction. So it is likely, in my opinion, that ITD's mandated Shared Resource Agreement rule, at least as it applies to cable companies, would be would run afoul of the FCC's In-Kind and Mixed-Use Rules and found illegal. If the rule was found to be legal, then it would almost certainly trigger a reduction in the 5 percent franchise fees that cable companies are paying to local cities and counties. So we'll be providing much more detailed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	franchising authority, with a twist where the cable companies still pay state, cities, and counties the franchise fee, but the state is the franchising authority. So what's important there are two things: First of all, the Idaho Video Services Act, which is Idaho Code Section 50-3001, it gives cable companies the right to occupy the public rights-of-way. And then you have to you have to also read the Idaho act in the Federal law in conjunction with each other. But a limitation of the Federal Cable Act is that franchise fees charged to cable companies cannot exceed 5 percent. And this limitation applies to the local franchising authority, which is the State and, by imputation, to Idaho ITD. So franchise fees paid to local	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	carrier. So those are words right out of the City of Eugene court decision, but stated differently, what it says is the franchising authority cannot separate a cable service from a broadband information service for purposes of calculating the extraction. So it is likely, in my opinion, that ITD's mandated Shared Resource Agreement rule, at least as it applies to cable companies, would be would run afoul of the FCC's In-Kind and Mixed-Use Rules and found illegal. If the rule was found to be legal, then it would almost certainly trigger a reduction in the 5 percent franchise fees that cable companies are paying to local cities and counties. So we'll be providing much more detailed comments and citations on all of this on the 28th, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	franchising authority, with a twist where the cable companies still pay state, cities, and counties the franchise fee, but the state is the franchising authority. So what's important there are two things: First of all, the Idaho Video Services Act, which is Idaho Code Section 50-3001, it gives cable companies the right to occupy the public rights-of-way. And then you have to you have to also read the Idaho act in the Federal law in conjunction with each other. But a limitation of the Federal Cable Act is that franchise fees charged to cable companies cannot exceed 5 percent. And this limitation applies to the local franchising authority, which is the State and, by imputation, to Idaho ITD. So franchise fees paid to local governments are 5 percent of the cable company's gross	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	carrier. So those are words right out of the City of Eugene court decision, but stated differently, what it says is the franchising authority cannot separate a cable service from a broadband information service for purposes of calculating the extraction. So it is likely, in my opinion, that ITD's mandated Shared Resource Agreement rule, at least as it applies to cable companies, would be would run afoul of the FCC's In-Kind and Mixed-Use Rules and found illegal. If the rule was found to be legal, then it would almost certainly trigger a reduction in the 5 percent franchise fees that cable companies are paying to local cities and counties. So we'll be providing much more detailed comments and citations on all of this on the 28th, but wanted to to at least introduce you to what you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	franchising authority, with a twist where the cable companies still pay state, cities, and counties the franchise fee, but the state is the franchising authority. So what's important there are two things: First of all, the Idaho Video Services Act, which is Idaho Code Section 50-3001, it gives cable companies the right to occupy the public rights-of-way. And then you have to you have to also read the Idaho act in the Federal law in conjunction with each other. But a limitation of the Federal Cable Act is that franchise fees charged to cable companies cannot exceed 5 percent. And this limitation applies to the local franchising authority, which is the State and, by imputation, to Idaho ITD. So franchise fees paid to local governments are 5 percent of the cable company's gross revenues, and the 5 percent fee paid far exceeds the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	carrier. So those are words right out of the City of Eugene court decision, but stated differently, what it says is the franchising authority cannot separate a cable service from a broadband information service for purposes of calculating the extraction. So it is likely, in my opinion, that ITD's mandated Shared Resource Agreement rule, at least as it applies to cable companies, would be would run afoul of the FCC's In-Kind and Mixed-Use Rules and found illegal. If the rule was found to be legal, then it would almost certainly trigger a reduction in the 5 percent franchise fees that cable companies are paying to local cities and counties. So we'll be providing much more detailed comments and citations on all of this on the 28th, but wanted to to at least introduce you to what you're going to be seeing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	franchising authority, with a twist where the cable companies still pay state, cities, and counties the franchise fee, but the state is the franchising authority. So what's important there are two things: First of all, the Idaho Video Services Act, which is Idaho Code Section 50-3001, it gives cable companies the right to occupy the public rights-of-way. And then you have to you have to also read the Idaho act in the Federal law in conjunction with each other. But a limitation of the Federal Cable Act is that franchise fees charged to cable companies cannot exceed 5 percent. And this limitation applies to the local franchising authority, which is the State and, by imputation, to Idaho ITD. So franchise fees paid to local governments are 5 percent of the cable company's gross revenues, and the 5 percent fee paid far exceeds the fair market value of the public right-of-way. But	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	carrier. So those are words right out of the City of Eugene court decision, but stated differently, what it says is the franchising authority cannot separate a cable service from a broadband information service for purposes of calculating the extraction. So it is likely, in my opinion, that ITD's mandated Shared Resource Agreement rule, at least as it applies to cable companies, would be would run afoul of the FCC's In-Kind and Mixed-Use Rules and found illegal. If the rule was found to be legal, then it would almost certainly trigger a reduction in the 5 percent franchise fees that cable companies are paying to local cities and counties. So we'll be providing much more detailed comments and citations on all of this on the 28th, but wanted to to at least introduce you to what you're going to be seeing. The third the third topic I wanted to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	franchising authority, with a twist where the cable companies still pay state, cities, and counties the franchise fee, but the state is the franchising authority. So what's important there are two things: First of all, the Idaho Video Services Act, which is Idaho Code Section 50-3001, it gives cable companies the right to occupy the public rights-of-way. And then you have to you have to also read the Idaho act in the Federal law in conjunction with each other. But a limitation of the Federal Cable Act is that franchise fees charged to cable companies cannot exceed 5 percent. And this limitation applies to the local franchising authority, which is the State and, by imputation, to Idaho ITD. So franchise fees paid to local governments are 5 percent of the cable company's gross revenues, and the 5 percent fee paid far exceeds the fair market value of the public right-of-way. But more importantly, the 5 percent fee paid is the quid	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	carrier. So those are words right out of the City of Eugene court decision, but stated differently, what it says is the franchising authority cannot separate a cable service from a broadband information service for purposes of calculating the extraction. So it is likely, in my opinion, that ITD's mandated Shared Resource Agreement rule, at least as it applies to cable companies, would be would run afoul of the FCC's In-Kind and Mixed-Use Rules and found illegal. If the rule was found to be legal, then it would almost certainly trigger a reduction in the 5 percent franchise fees that cable companies are paying to local cities and counties. So we'll be providing much more detailed comments and citations on all of this on the 28th, but wanted to to at least introduce you to what you're going to be seeing. The third the third topic I wanted to mention and we could we could dialogue on this a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	franchising authority, with a twist where the cable companies still pay state, cities, and counties the franchise fee, but the state is the franchising authority. So what's important there are two things: First of all, the Idaho Video Services Act, which is Idaho Code Section 50-3001, it gives cable companies the right to occupy the public rights-of-way. And then you have to you have to also read the Idaho act in the Federal law in conjunction with each other. But a limitation of the Federal Cable Act is that franchise fees charged to cable companies cannot exceed 5 percent. And this limitation applies to the local franchising authority, which is the State and, by imputation, to Idaho ITD. So franchise fees paid to local governments are 5 percent of the cable company's gross revenues, and the 5 percent fee paid far exceeds the fair market value of the public right-of-way. But more importantly, the 5 percent fee paid is the quid pro quo for cable companies using the public rights of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	carrier. So those are words right out of the City of Eugene court decision, but stated differently, what it says is the franchising authority cannot separate a cable service from a broadband information service for purposes of calculating the extraction. So it is likely, in my opinion, that ITD's mandated Shared Resource Agreement rule, at least as it applies to cable companies, would be would run afoul of the FCC's In-Kind and Mixed-Use Rules and found illegal. If the rule was found to be legal, then it would almost certainly trigger a reduction in the 5 percent franchise fees that cable companies are paying to local cities and counties. So we'll be providing much more detailed comments and citations on all of this on the 28th, but wanted to to at least introduce you to what you're going to be seeing. The third the third topic I wanted to mention and we could we could dialogue on this a little bit, Robert is that the you note in your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	franchising authority, with a twist where the cable companies still pay state, cities, and counties the franchise fee, but the state is the franchising authority. So what's important there are two things: First of all, the Idaho Video Services Act, which is Idaho Code Section 50-3001, it gives cable companies the right to occupy the public rights-of-way. And then you have to you have to also read the Idaho act in the Federal law in conjunction with each other. But a limitation of the Federal Cable Act is that franchise fees charged to cable companies cannot exceed 5 percent. And this limitation applies to the local franchising authority, which is the State and, by imputation, to Idaho ITD. So franchise fees paid to local governments are 5 percent of the cable company's gross revenues, and the 5 percent fee paid far exceeds the fair market value of the public right-of-way. But more importantly, the 5 percent fee paid is the quid pro quo for cable companies using the public rights of way.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	carrier. So those are words right out of the City of Eugene court decision, but stated differently, what it says is the franchising authority cannot separate a cable service from a broadband information service for purposes of calculating the extraction. So it is likely, in my opinion, that ITD's mandated Shared Resource Agreement rule, at least as it applies to cable companies, would be would run afoul of the FCC's In-Kind and Mixed-Use Rules and found illegal. If the rule was found to be legal, then it would almost certainly trigger a reduction in the 5 percent franchise fees that cable companies are paying to local cities and counties. So we'll be providing much more detailed comments and citations on all of this on the 28th, but wanted to to at least introduce you to what you're going to be seeing. The third the third topic I wanted to mention and we could we could dialogue on this a little bit, Robert is that the you note in your proposed Rule 615.15 [sic] that ITD it states that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	franchising authority, with a twist where the cable companies still pay state, cities, and counties the franchise fee, but the state is the franchising authority. So what's important there are two things: First of all, the Idaho Video Services Act, which is Idaho Code Section 50-3001, it gives cable companies the right to occupy the public rights-of-way. And then you have to you have to also read the Idaho act in the Federal law in conjunction with each other. But a limitation of the Federal Cable Act is that franchise fees charged to cable companies cannot exceed 5 percent. And this limitation applies to the local franchising authority, which is the State and, by imputation, to Idaho ITD. So franchise fees paid to local governments are 5 percent of the cable company's gross revenues, and the 5 percent fee paid far exceeds the fair market value of the public right-of-way. But more importantly, the 5 percent fee paid is the quid pro quo for cable companies using the public rights of way. So ITD's proposed rule 620.01 mandating	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	carrier. So those are words right out of the City of Eugene court decision, but stated differently, what it says is the franchising authority cannot separate a cable service from a broadband information service for purposes of calculating the extraction. So it is likely, in my opinion, that ITD's mandated Shared Resource Agreement rule, at least as it applies to cable companies, would be would run afoul of the FCC's In-Kind and Mixed-Use Rules and found illegal. If the rule was found to be legal, then it would almost certainly trigger a reduction in the 5 percent franchise fees that cable companies are paying to local cities and counties. So we'll be providing much more detailed comments and citations on all of this on the 28th, but wanted to to at least introduce you to what you're going to be seeing. The third the third topic I wanted to mention and we could we could dialogue on this a little bit, Robert is that the you note in your proposed Rule 615.15 [sic] that ITD it states that you can approve exceptions to the requirement for fair
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	franchising authority, with a twist where the cable companies still pay state, cities, and counties the franchise fee, but the state is the franchising authority. So what's important there are two things: First of all, the Idaho Video Services Act, which is Idaho Code Section 50-3001, it gives cable companies the right to occupy the public rights-of-way. And then you have to you have to also read the Idaho act in the Federal law in conjunction with each other. But a limitation of the Federal Cable Act is that franchise fees charged to cable companies cannot exceed 5 percent. And this limitation applies to the local franchising authority, which is the State and, by imputation, to Idaho ITD. So franchise fees paid to local governments are 5 percent of the cable company's gross revenues, and the 5 percent fee paid far exceeds the fair market value of the public right-of-way. But more importantly, the 5 percent fee paid is the quid pro quo for cable companies using the public rights of way. So ITD's proposed rule 620.01 mandating shared resource agreements is likely a violation of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	carrier. So those are words right out of the City of Eugene court decision, but stated differently, what it says is the franchising authority cannot separate a cable service from a broadband information service for purposes of calculating the extraction. So it is likely, in my opinion, that ITD's mandated Shared Resource Agreement rule, at least as it applies to cable companies, would be would run afoul of the FCC's In-Kind and Mixed-Use Rules and found illegal. If the rule was found to be legal, then it would almost certainly trigger a reduction in the 5 percent franchise fees that cable companies are paying to local cities and counties. So we'll be providing much more detailed comments and citations on all of this on the 28th, but wanted to to at least introduce you to what you're going to be seeing. The third the third topic I wanted to mention and we could we could dialogue on this a little bit, Robert is that the you note in your proposed Rule 615.15 [sic] that ITD it states that you can approve exceptions to the requirement for fair market value payments if there is a determination, a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	franchising authority, with a twist where the cable companies still pay state, cities, and counties the franchise fee, but the state is the franchising authority. So what's important there are two things: First of all, the Idaho Video Services Act, which is Idaho Code Section 50-3001, it gives cable companies the right to occupy the public rights-of-way. And then you have to you have to also read the Idaho act in the Federal law in conjunction with each other. But a limitation of the Federal Cable Act is that franchise fees charged to cable companies cannot exceed 5 percent. And this limitation applies to the local franchising authority, which is the State and, by imputation, to Idaho ITD. So franchise fees paid to local governments are 5 percent of the cable company's gross revenues, and the 5 percent fee paid far exceeds the fair market value of the public right-of-way. But more importantly, the 5 percent fee paid is the quid pro quo for cable companies using the public rights of way. So ITD's proposed rule 620.01 mandating	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	carrier. So those are words right out of the City of Eugene court decision, but stated differently, what it says is the franchising authority cannot separate a cable service from a broadband information service for purposes of calculating the extraction. So it is likely, in my opinion, that ITD's mandated Shared Resource Agreement rule, at least as it applies to cable companies, would be would run afoul of the FCC's In-Kind and Mixed-Use Rules and found illegal. If the rule was found to be legal, then it would almost certainly trigger a reduction in the 5 percent franchise fees that cable companies are paying to local cities and counties. So we'll be providing much more detailed comments and citations on all of this on the 28th, but wanted to to at least introduce you to what you're going to be seeing. The third the third topic I wanted to mention and we could we could dialogue on this a little bit, Robert is that the you note in your proposed Rule 615.15 [sic] that ITD it states that you can approve exceptions to the requirement for fair

	inc wreeting		July 20, 2021
	Page 34		Page 36
1	the State's right-of-way are "in the public interest."	1	So appreciate your comments on that.
2	So I believe, and I believe most of the	2	RON WILLIAMS: All right. Thank you, and I look
	policymakers in Idaho believe, that this point that		forward
	broadband is in the public interest. I believe the	4	
	Idaho Broadband Advisory council or the Governor's	5	RON WILLIAMS: to hearing from you.
	office in conjunction with ITD would be motivated to	6	MR. BEACHLER: Thank you.
	consider and resolve the question of whether broadband	7	THE MODERATOR: Before we go ahead and jump
	installed in Idaho's right-of-way is in the overall		online, are is there anyone else here at the
	public interest of the state based on social,		auditorium that would like to make any comments?
	economic, health, and safety benefits that it would	10	Okay. We'll go ahead and like I
	bring that broadband would bring to the citizens of		mentioned, just as far as logistics and how we move
	the state of Idaho.		forward with this, everyone's automatically put on
13	And on a more on a more practical note,		mute, and we're controlling that here at Headquarters.
	I just observed the hundreds of millions of dollars	14	So if you are using the WebEx application,
	that are flowing into the state from the CARES Act		please use the raise-your-hand function. As we cycle
	from ARPA and being discussed in the infrastructure		through that, then we'll I'll also open up the
	legislation and, again, the announcement from the		lines for those that are simply dialing in.
	Governor that Idaho had a \$900 million surplus. And I	18	So the first one we have here is Ben.
	don't believe that ITD is motivated financially to	19	Ben, you're live. Go ahead.
	charge broadband providers access to the right-of-way.	20	BEN ARON: Hi. Thanks for once again hosting us
21	There's plenty of money for that. And a		to talk about right-of-way access. We really
	lot you know, hundreds of millions are going to be		appreciate it.
	spent on broadband, and I think it would be consistent	23	I'll start off by staying that we we
	with with where you're going with this and what		sort of we thought we were going to have comments
	your policies are to to not be using fair market		filed in time for the next meeting, but of course,
	Page 35		Page 37
1		1	
	value as a tool to impede broadband but instead find a		originally we thought the next meeting would be the
2	value as a tool to impede broadband but instead find a way to make broadband a declared public public	2	originally we thought the next meeting would be the 26th. So we will get them filed shortly.
2 3	value as a tool to impede broadband but instead find a way to make broadband a declared public public interest and remove this impediment.	2 3	originally we thought the next meeting would be the 26th. So we will get them filed shortly. At this point, we're going to try to
2 3 4	value as a tool to impede broadband but instead find a way to make broadband a declared public public interest and remove this impediment. And with that, I'd be happy to answer any	2 3 4	originally we thought the next meeting would be the 26th. So we will get them filed shortly. At this point, we're going to try to digest what we hear today and see if we want to add
2 3 4 5	value as a tool to impede broadband but instead find a way to make broadband a declared public public interest and remove this impediment. And with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions.	2 3 4 5	originally we thought the next meeting would be the 26th. So we will get them filed shortly. At this point, we're going to try to digest what we hear today and see if we want to add anything into the comments, but we will file them
2 3 4 5 6	value as a tool to impede broadband but instead find a way to make broadband a declared public public interest and remove this impediment. And with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. I	2 3 4 5 6	originally we thought the next meeting would be the 26th. So we will get them filed shortly. At this point, we're going to try to digest what we hear today and see if we want to add anything into the comments, but we will file them shortly. So the points I'm going to make now, we'll
2 3 4 5 6 7	value as a tool to impede broadband but instead find a way to make broadband a declared public public interest and remove this impediment. And with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. I appreciate that.	2 3 4 5 6 7	originally we thought the next meeting would be the 26th. So we will get them filed shortly. At this point, we're going to try to digest what we hear today and see if we want to add anything into the comments, but we will file them shortly. So the points I'm going to make now, we'll make at much greater length in the written comments.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	value as a tool to impede broadband but instead find a way to make broadband a declared public public interest and remove this impediment. And with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. Rob or Blake, any questions?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	originally we thought the next meeting would be the 26th. So we will get them filed shortly. At this point, we're going to try to digest what we hear today and see if we want to add anything into the comments, but we will file them shortly. So the points I'm going to make now, we'll make at much greater length in the written comments. I just wanted to make a few quick points
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	value as a tool to impede broadband but instead find a way to make broadband a declared public public interest and remove this impediment. And with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. Rob or Blake, any questions? MR. BEACHLER: No, sir. Thank you for your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	originally we thought the next meeting would be the 26th. So we will get them filed shortly. At this point, we're going to try to digest what we hear today and see if we want to add anything into the comments, but we will file them shortly. So the points I'm going to make now, we'll make at much greater length in the written comments. I just wanted to make a few quick points on the slides that you had. In one of the you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	value as a tool to impede broadband but instead find a way to make broadband a declared public public interest and remove this impediment. And with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. Rob or Blake, any questions? MR. BEACHLER: No, sir. Thank you for your comments and all that background information.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	originally we thought the next meeting would be the 26th. So we will get them filed shortly. At this point, we're going to try to digest what we hear today and see if we want to add anything into the comments, but we will file them shortly. So the points I'm going to make now, we'll make at much greater length in the written comments. I just wanted to make a few quick points on the slides that you had. In one of the you mentioned and this is true, we have asked that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	value as a tool to impede broadband but instead find a way to make broadband a declared public public interest and remove this impediment. And with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. Rob or Blake, any questions? MR. BEACHLER: No, sir. Thank you for your comments and all that background information. You know, as a transportation agency,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	originally we thought the next meeting would be the 26th. So we will get them filed shortly. At this point, we're going to try to digest what we hear today and see if we want to add anything into the comments, but we will file them shortly. So the points I'm going to make now, we'll make at much greater length in the written comments. I just wanted to make a few quick points on the slides that you had. In one of the you mentioned and this is true, we have asked that the right-of-way access rules not only address small
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	value as a tool to impede broadband but instead find a way to make broadband a declared public public interest and remove this impediment. And with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. Rob or Blake, any questions? MR. BEACHLER: No, sir. Thank you for your comments and all that background information. You know, as a transportation agency, we're not, you know, a telecommunications provider.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	originally we thought the next meeting would be the 26th. So we will get them filed shortly. At this point, we're going to try to digest what we hear today and see if we want to add anything into the comments, but we will file them shortly. So the points I'm going to make now, we'll make at much greater length in the written comments. I just wanted to make a few quick points on the slides that you had. In one of the you mentioned and this is true, we have asked that the right-of-way access rules not only address small wireless facilities, but that they also address what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	value as a tool to impede broadband but instead find a way to make broadband a declared public public interest and remove this impediment. And with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. Rob or Blake, any questions? MR. BEACHLER: No, sir. Thank you for your comments and all that background information. You know, as a transportation agency, we're not, you know, a telecommunications provider. We've been trying to get up to speed on all these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	originally we thought the next meeting would be the 26th. So we will get them filed shortly. At this point, we're going to try to digest what we hear today and see if we want to add anything into the comments, but we will file them shortly. So the points I'm going to make now, we'll make at much greater length in the written comments. I just wanted to make a few quick points on the slides that you had. In one of the you mentioned and this is true, we have asked that the right-of-way access rules not only address small wireless facilities, but that they also address what we typically call "macro towers."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	value as a tool to impede broadband but instead find a way to make broadband a declared public public interest and remove this impediment. And with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. Rob or Blake, any questions? MR. BEACHLER: No, sir. Thank you for your comments and all that background information. You know, as a transportation agency, we're not, you know, a telecommunications provider. We've been trying to get up to speed on all these overlapping	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	originally we thought the next meeting would be the 26th. So we will get them filed shortly. At this point, we're going to try to digest what we hear today and see if we want to add anything into the comments, but we will file them shortly. So the points I'm going to make now, we'll make at much greater length in the written comments. I just wanted to make a few quick points on the slides that you had. In one of the you mentioned and this is true, we have asked that the right-of-way access rules not only address small wireless facilities, but that they also address what we typically call "macro towers." I just wanted to make the very minor point
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 value as a tool to impede broadband but instead find a way to make broadband a declared public public interest and remove this impediment. And with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. Rob or Blake, any questions? MR. BEACHLER: No, sir. Thank you for your comments and all that background information. You know, as a transportation agency, we're not, you know, a telecommunications provider. We've been trying to get up to speed on all these overlapping RON WILLIAMS: Sure. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	originally we thought the next meeting would be the 26th. So we will get them filed shortly. At this point, we're going to try to digest what we hear today and see if we want to add anything into the comments, but we will file them shortly. So the points I'm going to make now, we'll make at much greater length in the written comments. I just wanted to make a few quick points on the slides that you had. In one of the you mentioned and this is true, we have asked that the right-of-way access rules not only address small wireless facilities, but that they also address what we typically call "macro towers." I just wanted to make the very minor point that the difference between a small wireless facility
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 value as a tool to impede broadband but instead find a way to make broadband a declared public public interest and remove this impediment. And with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. Rob or Blake, any questions? MR. BEACHLER: No, sir. Thank you for your comments and all that background information. You know, as a transportation agency, we're not, you know, a telecommunications provider. We've been trying to get up to speed on all these overlapping RON WILLIAMS: Sure. MR. BEACHLER: jurisdictions State, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	originally we thought the next meeting would be the 26th. So we will get them filed shortly. At this point, we're going to try to digest what we hear today and see if we want to add anything into the comments, but we will file them shortly. So the points I'm going to make now, we'll make at much greater length in the written comments. I just wanted to make a few quick points on the slides that you had. In one of the you mentioned and this is true, we have asked that the right-of-way access rules not only address small wireless facilities, but that they also address what we typically call "macro towers." I just wanted to make the very minor point that the difference between a small wireless facility and a a macro tower could be literally 1
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 value as a tool to impede broadband but instead find a way to make broadband a declared public public interest and remove this impediment. And with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. Rob or Blake, any questions? MR. BEACHLER: No, sir. Thank you for your comments and all that background information. You know, as a transportation agency, we're not, you know, a telecommunications provider. We've been trying to get up to speed on all these overlapping RON WILLIAMS: Sure. MR. BEACHLER: jurisdictions State, Federal, Federal Highway, FCC. So all this stuff is 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	originally we thought the next meeting would be the 26th. So we will get them filed shortly. At this point, we're going to try to digest what we hear today and see if we want to add anything into the comments, but we will file them shortly. So the points I'm going to make now, we'll make at much greater length in the written comments. I just wanted to make a few quick points on the slides that you had. In one of the you mentioned and this is true, we have asked that the right-of-way access rules not only address small wireless facilities, but that they also address what we typically call "macro towers." I just wanted to make the very minor point that the difference between a small wireless facility and a a macro tower could be literally 1 inch right? so that there are very, very finite
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 value as a tool to impede broadband but instead find a way to make broadband a declared public public interest and remove this impediment. And with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. Rob or Blake, any questions? MR. BEACHLER: No, sir. Thank you for your comments and all that background information. You know, as a transportation agency, we're not, you know, a telecommunications provider. We've been trying to get up to speed on all these overlapping RON WILLIAMS: Sure. MR. BEACHLER: jurisdictions State, Federal, Federal Highway, FCC. So all this stuff is new to us. We're trying to get a handle on it. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	originally we thought the next meeting would be the 26th. So we will get them filed shortly. At this point, we're going to try to digest what we hear today and see if we want to add anything into the comments, but we will file them shortly. So the points I'm going to make now, we'll make at much greater length in the written comments. I just wanted to make a few quick points on the slides that you had. In one of the you mentioned and this is true, we have asked that the right-of-way access rules not only address small wireless facilities, but that they also address what we typically call "macro towers." I just wanted to make the very minor point that the difference between a small wireless facility and a a macro tower could be literally 1 inch right? so that there are very, very finite definitions of what a small wireless facility is. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 value as a tool to impede broadband but instead find a way to make broadband a declared public public interest and remove this impediment. And with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. Rob or Blake, any questions? MR. BEACHLER: No, sir. Thank you for your comments and all that background information. You know, as a transportation agency, we're not, you know, a telecommunications provider. We've been trying to get up to speed on all these overlapping RON WILLIAMS: Sure. MR. BEACHLER: jurisdictions State, Federal, Federal Highway, FCC. So all this stuff is new to us. We're trying to get a handle on it. Trying to be in compliance with all these different 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	originally we thought the next meeting would be the 26th. So we will get them filed shortly. At this point, we're going to try to digest what we hear today and see if we want to add anything into the comments, but we will file them shortly. So the points I'm going to make now, we'll make at much greater length in the written comments. I just wanted to make a few quick points on the slides that you had. In one of the you mentioned and this is true, we have asked that the right-of-way access rules not only address small wireless facilities, but that they also address what we typically call "macro towers." I just wanted to make the very minor point that the difference between a small wireless facility and a a macro tower could be literally 1 inch right? so that there are very, very finite definitions of what a small wireless facility is. And if you exceed the dimension by literally 1 inch, then
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 value as a tool to impede broadband but instead find a way to make broadband a declared public public interest and remove this impediment. And with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. Rob or Blake, any questions? MR. BEACHLER: No, sir. Thank you for your comments and all that background information. You know, as a transportation agency, we're not, you know, a telecommunications provider. We've been trying to get up to speed on all these overlapping RON WILLIAMS: Sure. MR. BEACHLER: jurisdictions State, Federal, Federal Highway, FCC. So all this stuff is new to us. We're trying to get a handle on it. Trying to be in compliance with all these different guidance measures. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	originally we thought the next meeting would be the 26th. So we will get them filed shortly. At this point, we're going to try to digest what we hear today and see if we want to add anything into the comments, but we will file them shortly. So the points I'm going to make now, we'll make at much greater length in the written comments. I just wanted to make a few quick points on the slides that you had. In one of the you mentioned and this is true, we have asked that the right-of-way access rules not only address small wireless facilities, but that they also address what we typically call "macro towers." I just wanted to make the very minor point that the difference between a small wireless facility and a a macro tower could be literally 1 inch right? so that there are very, very finite definitions of what a small wireless facility is. And if you exceed the dimension by literally 1 inch, then that would be considered a macro facility.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 value as a tool to impede broadband but instead find a way to make broadband a declared public public interest and remove this impediment. And with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. Rob or Blake, any questions? MR. BEACHLER: No, sir. Thank you for your comments and all that background information. You know, as a transportation agency, we're not, you know, a telecommunications provider. We've been trying to get up to speed on all these overlapping RON WILLIAMS: Sure. MR. BEACHLER: jurisdictions State, Federal, Federal Highway, FCC. So all this stuff is new to us. We're trying to get a handle on it. Trying to be in compliance with all these different guidance measures. So we look forward to your written 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	originally we thought the next meeting would be the 26th. So we will get them filed shortly. At this point, we're going to try to digest what we hear today and see if we want to add anything into the comments, but we will file them shortly. So the points I'm going to make now, we'll make at much greater length in the written comments. I just wanted to make a few quick points on the slides that you had. In one of the you mentioned and this is true, we have asked that the right-of-way access rules not only address small wireless facilities, but that they also address what we typically call "macro towers." I just wanted to make the very minor point that the difference between a small wireless facility and a a macro tower could be literally 1 inch right? so that there are very, very finite definitions of what a small wireless facility is. And if you exceed the dimension by literally 1 inch, then that would be considered a macro facility. So I just want to make sure that it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 value as a tool to impede broadband but instead find a way to make broadband a declared public public interest and remove this impediment. And with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. Rob or Blake, any questions? MR. BEACHLER: No, sir. Thank you for your comments and all that background information. You know, as a transportation agency, we're not, you know, a telecommunications provider. We've been trying to get up to speed on all these overlapping RON WILLIAMS: Sure. MR. BEACHLER: jurisdictions State, Federal, Federal Highway, FCC. So all this stuff is new to us. We're trying to get a handle on it. Trying to be in compliance with all these different guidance measures. So we look forward to your written comments with those citations. That'll really help us 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	originally we thought the next meeting would be the 26th. So we will get them filed shortly. At this point, we're going to try to digest what we hear today and see if we want to add anything into the comments, but we will file them shortly. So the points I'm going to make now, we'll make at much greater length in the written comments. I just wanted to make a few quick points on the slides that you had. In one of the you mentioned and this is true, we have asked that the right-of-way access rules not only address small wireless facilities, but that they also address what we typically call "macro towers." I just wanted to make the very minor point that the difference between a small wireless facility and a a macro tower could be literally 1 inch right? so that there are very, very finite definitions of what a small wireless facility is. And if you exceed the dimension by literally 1 inch, then that would be considered a macro facility. So I just want to make sure that it's clear for the folks at the Department that we're not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 value as a tool to impede broadband but instead find a way to make broadband a declared public public interest and remove this impediment. And with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. Rob or Blake, any questions? MR. BEACHLER: No, sir. Thank you for your comments and all that background information. You know, as a transportation agency, we're not, you know, a telecommunications provider. We've been trying to get up to speed on all these overlapping RON WILLIAMS: Sure. MR. BEACHLER: jurisdictions State, Federal, Federal Highway, FCC. So all this stuff is new to us. We're trying to get a handle on it. Trying to be in compliance with all these different guidance measures. So we look forward to your written comments with those citations. That'll really help us look at our document, adjust some of the language to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	originally we thought the next meeting would be the 26th. So we will get them filed shortly. At this point, we're going to try to digest what we hear today and see if we want to add anything into the comments, but we will file them shortly. So the points I'm going to make now, we'll make at much greater length in the written comments. I just wanted to make a few quick points on the slides that you had. In one of the you mentioned and this is true, we have asked that the right-of-way access rules not only address small wireless facilities, but that they also address what we typically call "macro towers." I just wanted to make the very minor point that the difference between a small wireless facility and a a macro tower could be literally 1 inch right? so that there are very, very finite definitions of what a small wireless facility is. And if you exceed the dimension by literally 1 inch, then that would be considered a macro facility. So I just want to make sure that it's clear for the folks at the Department that we're not saying that a 300-foot tower, necessarily, needs to go
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 value as a tool to impede broadband but instead find a way to make broadband a declared public public interest and remove this impediment. And with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. Rob or Blake, any questions? MR. BEACHLER: No, sir. Thank you for your comments and all that background information. You know, as a transportation agency, we're not, you know, a telecommunications provider. We've been trying to get up to speed on all these overlapping RON WILLIAMS: Sure. MR. BEACHLER: jurisdictions State, Federal, Federal Highway, FCC. So all this stuff is new to us. We're trying to get a handle on it. Trying to be in compliance with all these different guidance measures. So we look forward to your written comments with those citations. That'll really help us 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	originally we thought the next meeting would be the 26th. So we will get them filed shortly. At this point, we're going to try to digest what we hear today and see if we want to add anything into the comments, but we will file them shortly. So the points I'm going to make now, we'll make at much greater length in the written comments. I just wanted to make a few quick points on the slides that you had. In one of the you mentioned and this is true, we have asked that the right-of-way access rules not only address small wireless facilities, but that they also address what we typically call "macro towers." I just wanted to make the very minor point that the difference between a small wireless facility and a a macro tower could be literally 1 inch right? so that there are very, very finite definitions of what a small wireless facility is. And if you exceed the dimension by literally 1 inch, then that would be considered a macro facility. So I just want to make sure that it's clear for the folks at the Department that we're not

1 40	inc meeting		July 20, 202
	Page 38		Page 40
1	which generally would exceed the "small wireless	1	aside for a minute, we're not actually addressing
	facility" definition.		Federal law, and we're not dealing with
3	So just take with a grain of salt the		telecommunications regulations. The only thing that
	wording. It's not always as indicative of the size as		the ITD needs to pay attention to is access to the
	you might imagine. So that's macro towers.		right-of-way and who fits the definition under Idaho
6	There was another slide that had indicated		Law of a "utility."
-	a relationship between utility status and	7	Now, in California a wireless carrier is a
	public the public interest exemption. And I	-	utility, in Pennsylvania a wireless carrier is
	just I want to make sure that we're on the same		absolutely not a utility, in New Mexico we're not a
	page, on one hand, and then I also want to respond a		utility, and, you know, in other states you get the
	little bit to our friends from the cable industry,		point. State law differs dramatically regarding how
	some of the things that they had said.		they define "utilities," how they define the services
13	In the slide you seem to indicate that		that utilities offer.
	utility status would make you eligible for the public	14	We've reviewed Idaho Law, and from what we
			can tell, a wireless carrier is defined under Idaho
	interest exemption, but I as I understand it, those are two standalone exemptions from the fair market		Law as a "utility." So we're comfortable that we
	-		· ·
	value requirement under the Federal Highway Administration's rules.		would qualify for the exemption under on those
	So if you are accommodated as a utility,		grounds. And I would also ask folks to take a look
19	•	19	
	then you are eligible for an exemption from the fair		at Section it's 61-121, and that's the definition
	market value requirement. Similarly, if it is a use		of "telecommunications" under Idaho Law, and it's very
	in the public interest, you would separately qualify		broad, and it includes data. And I would sort of
	for the public interest exemption.		submit for everybody to consider that I'm not so sure
24	In the Federal Highway		that you should rush to judgement about not being a
25	Administration's I guess I'll just call it the	25	"utility."
	Page 30		Page 41
	Page 39		Page 41
	"Guidance Document," the memo that they issued they	1	And I'm I'd like to talk with the cable
2	"Guidance Document," the memo that they issued they treat both of those, but express a strong preference		
2	"Guidance Document," the memo that they issued they treat both of those, but express a strong preference for utility status, it seems.	2	And I'm I'd like to talk with the cable
2 3 4	"Guidance Document," the memo that they issued they treat both of those, but express a strong preference for utility status, it seems. And I you know, I I don't know if	2 3	And I'm I'd like to talk with the cable folks offline, and we'll see what you know, what we can what we can see eye-to-eye on, on that in that regard.
2 3 4	"Guidance Document," the memo that they issued they treat both of those, but express a strong preference for utility status, it seems.	2 3 4 5	And I'm I'd like to talk with the cable folks offline, and we'll see what you know, what we can what we can see eye-to-eye on, on that in that regard. The one word of caution I would offer,
2 3 4 5 6	"Guidance Document," the memo that they issued they treat both of those, but express a strong preference for utility status, it seems. And I you know, I I don't know if it's an application-by-application approval process with FHWA or the public interest exemption or if there	2 3 4 5 6	And I'm I'd like to talk with the cable folks offline, and we'll see what you know, what we can what we can see eye-to-eye on, on that in that regard. The one word of caution I would offer, though, is and this will be covered very squarely
2 3 4 5 6 7	"Guidance Document," the memo that they issued they treat both of those, but express a strong preference for utility status, it seems. And I you know, I I don't know if it's an application-by-application approval process with FHWA or the public interest exemption or if there can be umbrella coverage for that, but, I guess, you	2 3 4 5 6 7	And I'm I'd like to talk with the cable folks offline, and we'll see what you know, what we can what we can see eye-to-eye on, on that in that regard. The one word of caution I would offer, though, is and this will be covered very squarely in my comments. There's the definition of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	"Guidance Document," the memo that they issued they treat both of those, but express a strong preference for utility status, it seems. And I you know, I I don't know if it's an application-by-application approval process with FHWA or the public interest exemption or if there can be umbrella coverage for that, but, I guess, you know, the way that we've read it, it seems to imply	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	And I'm I'd like to talk with the cable folks offline, and we'll see what you know, what we can what we can see eye-to-eye on, on that in that regard. The one word of caution I would offer, though, is and this will be covered very squarely in my comments. There's the definition of "utility" that you guys are using sets up the two
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	"Guidance Document," the memo that they issued they treat both of those, but express a strong preference for utility status, it seems. And I you know, I I don't know if it's an application-by-application approval process with FHWA or the public interest exemption or if there can be umbrella coverage for that, but, I guess, you know, the way that we've read it, it seems to imply that utility status is the preferred FHWA path. It	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	And I'm I'd like to talk with the cable folks offline, and we'll see what you know, what we can what we can see eye-to-eye on, on that in that regard. The one word of caution I would offer, though, is and this will be covered very squarely in my comments. There's the definition of "utility" that you guys are using sets up the two different categories. So it is a "utility" and it is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	"Guidance Document," the memo that they issued they treat both of those, but express a strong preference for utility status, it seems. And I you know, I I don't know if it's an application-by-application approval process with FHWA or the public interest exemption or if there can be umbrella coverage for that, but, I guess, you know, the way that we've read it, it seems to imply	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	And I'm I'd like to talk with the cable folks offline, and we'll see what you know, what we can what we can see eye-to-eye on, on that in that regard. The one word of caution I would offer, though, is and this will be covered very squarely in my comments. There's the definition of "utility" that you guys are using sets up the two different categories. So it is a "utility" and it is a "non-public utility."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	"Guidance Document," the memo that they issued they treat both of those, but express a strong preference for utility status, it seems. And I you know, I I don't know if it's an application-by-application approval process with FHWA or the public interest exemption or if there can be umbrella coverage for that, but, I guess, you know, the way that we've read it, it seems to imply that utility status is the preferred FHWA path. It	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	And I'm I'd like to talk with the cable folks offline, and we'll see what you know, what we can what we can see eye-to-eye on, on that in that regard. The one word of caution I would offer, though, is and this will be covered very squarely in my comments. There's the definition of "utility" that you guys are using sets up the two different categories. So it is a "utility" and it is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	"Guidance Document," the memo that they issued they treat both of those, but express a strong preference for utility status, it seems. And I you know, I I don't know if it's an application-by-application approval process with FHWA or the public interest exemption or if there can be umbrella coverage for that, but, I guess, you know, the way that we've read it, it seems to imply that utility status is the preferred FHWA path. It seems to be the preferred path under ITD's proposed changes to the GUM. And assuming that everyone fits	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	And I'm I'd like to talk with the cable folks offline, and we'll see what you know, what we can what we can see eye-to-eye on, on that in that regard. The one word of caution I would offer, though, is and this will be covered very squarely in my comments. There's the definition of "utility" that you guys are using sets up the two different categories. So it is a "utility" and it is a "non-public utility."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	"Guidance Document," the memo that they issued they treat both of those, but express a strong preference for utility status, it seems. And I you know, I I don't know if it's an application-by-application approval process with FHWA or the public interest exemption or if there can be umbrella coverage for that, but, I guess, you know, the way that we've read it, it seems to imply that utility status is the preferred FHWA path. It seems to be the preferred path under ITD's proposed changes to the GUM.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	And I'm I'd like to talk with the cable folks offline, and we'll see what you know, what we can what we can see eye-to-eye on, on that in that regard. The one word of caution I would offer, though, is and this will be covered very squarely in my comments. There's the definition of "utility" that you guys are using sets up the two different categories. So it is a "utility" and it is a "non-public utility." One of the problems with the proposed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	"Guidance Document," the memo that they issued they treat both of those, but express a strong preference for utility status, it seems. And I you know, I I don't know if it's an application-by-application approval process with FHWA or the public interest exemption or if there can be umbrella coverage for that, but, I guess, you know, the way that we've read it, it seems to imply that utility status is the preferred FHWA path. It seems to be the preferred path under ITD's proposed changes to the GUM. And assuming that everyone fits	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And I'm I'd like to talk with the cable folks offline, and we'll see what you know, what we can what we can see eye-to-eye on, on that in that regard. The one word of caution I would offer, though, is and this will be covered very squarely in my comments. There's the definition of "utility" that you guys are using sets up the two different categories. So it is a "utility" and it is a "non-public utility." One of the problems with the proposed language is that the "non-public utility" is defined
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	"Guidance Document," the memo that they issued they treat both of those, but express a strong preference for utility status, it seems. And I you know, I I don't know if it's an application-by-application approval process with FHWA or the public interest exemption or if there can be umbrella coverage for that, but, I guess, you know, the way that we've read it, it seems to imply that utility status is the preferred FHWA path. It seems to be the preferred path under ITD's proposed changes to the GUM. And assuming that everyone fits under you know, that everyone that is offering	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	And I'm I'd like to talk with the cable folks offline, and we'll see what you know, what we can what we can see eye-to-eye on, on that in that regard. The one word of caution I would offer, though, is and this will be covered very squarely in my comments. There's the definition of "utility" that you guys are using sets up the two different categories. So it is a "utility" and it is a "non-public utility." One of the problems with the proposed language is that the "non-public utility" is defined as a utility that doesn't have a certificate from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13 14	"Guidance Document," the memo that they issued they treat both of those, but express a strong preference for utility status, it seems. And I you know, I I don't know if it's an application-by-application approval process with FHWA or the public interest exemption or if there can be umbrella coverage for that, but, I guess, you know, the way that we've read it, it seems to imply that utility status is the preferred FHWA path. It seems to be the preferred path under ITD's proposed changes to the GUM. And assuming that everyone fits under you know, that everyone that is offering broadband fits under the definition, I it may be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	And I'm I'd like to talk with the cable folks offline, and we'll see what you know, what we can what we can see eye-to-eye on, on that in that regard. The one word of caution I would offer, though, is and this will be covered very squarely in my comments. There's the definition of "utility" that you guys are using sets up the two different categories. So it is a "utility" and it is a "non-public utility." One of the problems with the proposed language is that the "non-public utility" is defined as a utility that doesn't have a certificate from the PUC. But the problem, of course, with that is you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	"Guidance Document," the memo that they issued they treat both of those, but express a strong preference for utility status, it seems. And I you know, I I don't know if it's an application-by-application approval process with FHWA or the public interest exemption or if there can be umbrella coverage for that, but, I guess, you know, the way that we've read it, it seems to imply that utility status is the preferred FHWA path. It seems to be the preferred path under ITD's proposed changes to the GUM. And assuming that everyone fits under you know, that everyone that is offering broadband fits under the definition, I it may be that the better path is the definition of "utility."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And I'm I'd like to talk with the cable folks offline, and we'll see what you know, what we can what we can see eye-to-eye on, on that in that regard. The one word of caution I would offer, though, is and this will be covered very squarely in my comments. There's the definition of "utility" that you guys are using sets up the two different categories. So it is a "utility" and it is a "non-public utility." One of the problems with the proposed language is that the "non-public utility" is defined as a utility that doesn't have a certificate from the PUC. But the problem, of course, with that is you have to be a utility in the first instance. So if you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	"Guidance Document," the memo that they issued they treat both of those, but express a strong preference for utility status, it seems. And I you know, I I don't know if it's an application-by-application approval process with FHWA or the public interest exemption or if there can be umbrella coverage for that, but, I guess, you know, the way that we've read it, it seems to imply that utility status is the preferred FHWA path. It seems to be the preferred path under ITD's proposed changes to the GUM. And assuming that everyone fits under you know, that everyone that is offering broadband fits under the definition, I it may be that the better path is the definition of "utility." It's certainly more compliant with the FHWA expressed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And I'm I'd like to talk with the cable folks offline, and we'll see what you know, what we can what we can see eye-to-eye on, on that in that regard. The one word of caution I would offer, though, is and this will be covered very squarely in my comments. There's the definition of "utility" that you guys are using sets up the two different categories. So it is a "utility" and it is a "non-public utility." One of the problems with the proposed language is that the "non-public utility" is defined as a utility that doesn't have a certificate from the PUC. But the problem, of course, with that is you have to be a utility in the first instance. So if you never qualified as a utility, it would be impossible to be a non-public utility. So the circularity in the definition is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	"Guidance Document," the memo that they issued they treat both of those, but express a strong preference for utility status, it seems. And I you know, I I don't know if it's an application-by-application approval process with FHWA or the public interest exemption or if there can be umbrella coverage for that, but, I guess, you know, the way that we've read it, it seems to imply that utility status is the preferred FHWA path. It seems to be the preferred path under ITD's proposed changes to the GUM. And assuming that everyone fits under you know, that everyone that is offering broadband fits under the definition, I it may be that the better path is the definition of "utility." It's certainly more compliant with the FHWA expressed preference.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And I'm I'd like to talk with the cable folks offline, and we'll see what you know, what we can what we can see eye-to-eye on, on that in that regard. The one word of caution I would offer, though, is and this will be covered very squarely in my comments. There's the definition of "utility" that you guys are using sets up the two different categories. So it is a "utility" and it is a "non-public utility." One of the problems with the proposed language is that the "non-public utility" is defined as a utility that doesn't have a certificate from the PUC. But the problem, of course, with that is you have to be a utility in the first instance. So if you never qualified as a utility, it would be impossible to be a non-public utility.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	"Guidance Document," the memo that they issued they treat both of those, but express a strong preference for utility status, it seems. And I you know, I I don't know if it's an application-by-application approval process with FHWA or the public interest exemption or if there can be umbrella coverage for that, but, I guess, you know, the way that we've read it, it seems to imply that utility status is the preferred FHWA path. It seems to be the preferred path under ITD's proposed changes to the GUM. And assuming that everyone fits under you know, that everyone that is offering broadband fits under the definition, I it may be that the better path is the definition of "utility." It's certainly more compliant with the FHWA expressed preference. One area that I might differ with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	And I'm I'd like to talk with the cable folks offline, and we'll see what you know, what we can what we can see eye-to-eye on, on that in that regard. The one word of caution I would offer, though, is and this will be covered very squarely in my comments. There's the definition of "utility" that you guys are using sets up the two different categories. So it is a "utility" and it is a "non-public utility." One of the problems with the proposed language is that the "non-public utility" is defined as a utility that doesn't have a certificate from the PUC. But the problem, of course, with that is you have to be a utility in the first instance. So if you never qualified as a utility, it would be impossible to be a non-public utility. So the circularity in the definition is
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	"Guidance Document," the memo that they issued they treat both of those, but express a strong preference for utility status, it seems. And I you know, I I don't know if it's an application-by-application approval process with FHWA or the public interest exemption or if there can be umbrella coverage for that, but, I guess, you know, the way that we've read it, it seems to imply that utility status is the preferred FHWA path. It seems to be the preferred path under ITD's proposed changes to the GUM. And assuming that everyone fits under you know, that everyone that is offering broadband fits under the definition, I it may be that the better path is the definition of "utility." It's certainly more compliant with the FHWA expressed preference. One area that I might differ with the gentleman from the cable association's thoughts	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	And I'm I'd like to talk with the cable folks offline, and we'll see what you know, what we can what we can see eye-to-eye on, on that in that regard. The one word of caution I would offer, though, is and this will be covered very squarely in my comments. There's the definition of "utility" that you guys are using sets up the two different categories. So it is a "utility" and it is a "non-public utility." One of the problems with the proposed language is that the "non-public utility" is defined as a utility that doesn't have a certificate from the PUC. But the problem, of course, with that is you have to be a utility in the first instance. So if you never qualified as a utility, it would be impossible to be a non-public utility. So the circularity in the definition is something that I I think we'll we'll include
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	"Guidance Document," the memo that they issued they treat both of those, but express a strong preference for utility status, it seems. And I you know, I I don't know if it's an application-by-application approval process with FHWA or the public interest exemption or if there can be umbrella coverage for that, but, I guess, you know, the way that we've read it, it seems to imply that utility status is the preferred FHWA path. It seems to be the preferred path under ITD's proposed changes to the GUM. And assuming that everyone fits under you know, that everyone that is offering broadband fits under the definition, I it may be that the better path is the definition of "utility." It's certainly more compliant with the FHWA expressed preference. One area that I might differ with the gentleman from the cable association's thoughts is I certainly appreciate all that he said about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	And I'm I'd like to talk with the cable folks offline, and we'll see what you know, what we can what we can see eye-to-eye on, on that in that regard. The one word of caution I would offer, though, is and this will be covered very squarely in my comments. There's the definition of "utility" that you guys are using sets up the two different categories. So it is a "utility" and it is a "non-public utility." One of the problems with the proposed language is that the "non-public utility" is defined as a utility that doesn't have a certificate from the PUC. But the problem, of course, with that is you have to be a utility in the first instance. So if you never qualified as a utility, it would be impossible to be a non-public utility. So the circularity in the definition is something that I I think we'll we'll include in our comments. But we do suggest to the Board that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	"Guidance Document," the memo that they issued they treat both of those, but express a strong preference for utility status, it seems. And I you know, I I don't know if it's an application-by-application approval process with FHWA or the public interest exemption or if there can be umbrella coverage for that, but, I guess, you know, the way that we've read it, it seems to imply that utility status is the preferred FHWA path. It seems to be the preferred path under ITD's proposed changes to the GUM. And assuming that everyone fits under you know, that everyone that is offering broadband fits under the definition, I it may be that the better path is the definition of "utility." It's certainly more compliant with the FHWA expressed preference. One area that I might differ with the gentleman from the cable association's thoughts is I certainly appreciate all that he said about utility status under Federal law, and generally	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	And I'm I'd like to talk with the cable folks offline, and we'll see what you know, what we can what we can see eye-to-eye on, on that in that regard. The one word of caution I would offer, though, is and this will be covered very squarely in my comments. There's the definition of "utility" that you guys are using sets up the two different categories. So it is a "utility" and it is a "non-public utility." One of the problems with the proposed language is that the "non-public utility" is defined as a utility that doesn't have a certificate from the PUC. But the problem, of course, with that is you have to be a utility in the first instance. So if you never qualified as a utility, it would be impossible to be a non-public utility. So the circularity in the definition is something that I I think we'll we'll include in our comments. But we do suggest to the Board that it consider that it consider different wording
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	"Guidance Document," the memo that they issued they treat both of those, but express a strong preference for utility status, it seems. And I you know, I I don't know if it's an application-by-application approval process with FHWA or the public interest exemption or if there can be umbrella coverage for that, but, I guess, you know, the way that we've read it, it seems to imply that utility status is the preferred FHWA path. It seems to be the preferred path under ITD's proposed changes to the GUM. And assuming that everyone fits under you know, that everyone that is offering broadband fits under the definition, I it may be that the better path is the definition of "utility." It's certainly more compliant with the FHWA expressed preference. One area that I might differ with the gentleman from the cable association's thoughts is I certainly appreciate all that he said about utility status under Federal law, and generally speaking, we are not utilities under Federal law. We	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And I'm I'd like to talk with the cable folks offline, and we'll see what you know, what we can what we can see eye-to-eye on, on that in that regard. The one word of caution I would offer, though, is and this will be covered very squarely in my comments. There's the definition of "utility" that you guys are using sets up the two different categories. So it is a "utility" and it is a "non-public utility." One of the problems with the proposed language is that the "non-public utility" is defined as a utility that doesn't have a certificate from the PUC. But the problem, of course, with that is you have to be a utility in the first instance. So if you never qualified as a utility, it would be impossible to be a non-public utility. So the circularity in the definition is something that I I think we'll we'll include in our comments. But we do suggest to the Board that it consider that it consider different wording there.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	"Guidance Document," the memo that they issued they treat both of those, but express a strong preference for utility status, it seems. And I you know, I I don't know if it's an application-by-application approval process with FHWA or the public interest exemption or if there can be umbrella coverage for that, but, I guess, you know, the way that we've read it, it seems to imply that utility status is the preferred FHWA path. It seems to be the preferred path under ITD's proposed changes to the GUM. And assuming that everyone fits under you know, that everyone that is offering broadband fits under the definition, I it may be that the better path is the definition of "utility." It's certainly more compliant with the FHWA expressed preference. One area that I might differ with the gentleman from the cable association's thoughts is I certainly appreciate all that he said about utility status under Federal law, and generally speaking, we are not utilities under Federal law. We have a very different treatment. There is a lot of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	And I'm I'd like to talk with the cable folks offline, and we'll see what you know, what we can what we can see eye-to-eye on, on that in that regard. The one word of caution I would offer, though, is and this will be covered very squarely in my comments. There's the definition of "utility" that you guys are using sets up the two different categories. So it is a "utility" and it is a "non-public utility." One of the problems with the proposed language is that the "non-public utility" is defined as a utility that doesn't have a certificate from the PUC. But the problem, of course, with that is you have to be a utility in the first instance. So if you never qualified as a utility, it would be impossible to be a non-public utility. So the circularity in the definition is something that I I think we'll we'll include in our comments. But we do suggest to the Board that it consider that it consider different wording there. As far as the concept of a second category

Put	nic Meeting		July 20, 2021
	Page 42		Page 44
1	category that FHWA expresses a preference for in the	1	references to identify this, and we you know, went
	Guidance Document, and that is utility status.		back and forth on what is a "public utility." we're
	And and this is, again, where I really		used to dealing with those folks all the time and how
3			they're covered under State Statute.
	do urge all of the stakeholders to take a good and		•
	hard look at the definitions under Idaho Law not	5	
	Federal law, under Idaho Law of		it is a guidance memo. It's not their statutes or
	"telecommunications," and that's 61-121, of		Code. So prior to that, we were going under these
	"utility" "public utility" at 61-129, and give a		initial drafts. We're referencing the need to have
	long and hard you know, think long and hard about		fair market value for non-transportation uses. So we
	whether those Idaho definitions capture broadband		were trying to be in compliance with that before
	providers for the purposes of inclusion in the		the this recent April Memo that you're citing to
12	right-of-way in those limited purposes only.	12	just call broadband a "utility," and therefore it's
13	And, you know, our review of that reaches	13	exempt.
14	the conclusion that we do believe that it is	14	So we'll note that and look forward to
15	satisfactory. If that's true, I'm not sure you need a	15	your additional comments and suggestions on that
16	second category, the "non-public utility," which is a	16	language.
17	non-certificated entity, but we'll include in our	17	So appreciate all your participation over
18	comments sort of a better path to maybe get to that	18	the last three meetings.
19	second category, qualifying other categories of	19	MR. RINDLISBACHER: Yeah. In addition to what
20	broadband providers for treatment as utilities.	20	Rob said this is Blake Rindlisbacher I would
21	And I'm going to that's a lot. We have	21	also indicate that if you'll back up from that just a
22	other granular comments that we're going to offer, and	22	little bit, one of the things we said when we started
	I don't know that we need to bog down, you know, the		this rulemaking process is, if you look at the current
	group with those.		rule for utilities in our 2003 Utility Accommodation
25	But I guess I would ask the Department		and our Guide for Utility Management, it doesn't tell
	Page 43		Page 45
-		1	-
	staff, am I right in my assumption that you're one		us how we should deal with broadband and small cell in
2	staff, am I right in my assumption that you're one of the things you're trying to accomplish is to	2	us how we should deal with broadband and small cell in any way at all.
2 3	staff, am I right in my assumption that you're one of the things you're trying to accomplish is to broadly define "utility" for the purposes of meeting	2 3	us how we should deal with broadband and small cell in any way at all. And so part of what we're trying to do is
2 3 4	staff, am I right in my assumption that you're one of the things you're trying to accomplish is to broadly define "utility" for the purposes of meeting the FHWA where they're at in the Guidance Document,	2 3 4	us how we should deal with broadband and small cell in any way at all. And so part of what we're trying to do is not necessarily put anybody in a corner. We're just
2 3 4 5	staff, am I right in my assumption that you're one of the things you're trying to accomplish is to broadly define "utility" for the purposes of meeting the FHWA where they're at in the Guidance Document, expressing a preference for broadband to be provided	2 3 4 5	us how we should deal with broadband and small cell in any way at all. And so part of what we're trying to do is not necessarily put anybody in a corner. We're just trying to create an environment where we can manage
2 3 4 5 6	staff, am I right in my assumption that you're one of the things you're trying to accomplish is to broadly define "utility" for the purposes of meeting the FHWA where they're at in the Guidance Document, expressing a preference for broadband to be provided by or to be accommodated as a utility use of the	2 3 4 5 6	us how we should deal with broadband and small cell in any way at all. And so part of what we're trying to do is not necessarily put anybody in a corner. We're just trying to create an environment where we can manage this the rights-of-way for utilities,
2 3 4 5 6 7	staff, am I right in my assumption that you're one of the things you're trying to accomplish is to broadly define "utility" for the purposes of meeting the FHWA where they're at in the Guidance Document, expressing a preference for broadband to be provided by or to be accommodated as a utility use of the right-of-way; is that assumption correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7	us how we should deal with broadband and small cell in any way at all. And so part of what we're trying to do is not necessarily put anybody in a corner. We're just trying to create an environment where we can manage this the rights-of-way for utilities, non-utilities, broadband, small cell, everybody.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	staff, am I right in my assumption that you're one of the things you're trying to accomplish is to broadly define "utility" for the purposes of meeting the FHWA where they're at in the Guidance Document, expressing a preference for broadband to be provided by or to be accommodated as a utility use of the right-of-way; is that assumption correct? MR. BEACHLER: Thanks, Ben. And thank you for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	us how we should deal with broadband and small cell in any way at all. And so part of what we're trying to do is not necessarily put anybody in a corner. We're just trying to create an environment where we can manage this the rights-of-way for utilities, non-utilities, broadband, small cell, everybody. Everybody wants in. We're trying to figure out a way
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	staff, am I right in my assumption that you're one of the things you're trying to accomplish is to broadly define "utility" for the purposes of meeting the FHWA where they're at in the Guidance Document, expressing a preference for broadband to be provided by or to be accommodated as a utility use of the right-of-way; is that assumption correct? MR. BEACHLER: Thanks, Ben. And thank you for your comments and participation in the last two	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	us how we should deal with broadband and small cell in any way at all. And so part of what we're trying to do is not necessarily put anybody in a corner. We're just trying to create an environment where we can manage this the rights-of-way for utilities, non-utilities, broadband, small cell, everybody. Everybody wants in. We're trying to figure out a way to say, "Okay. How do you get here? How can we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	staff, am I right in my assumption that you're one of the things you're trying to accomplish is to broadly define "utility" for the purposes of meeting the FHWA where they're at in the Guidance Document, expressing a preference for broadband to be provided by or to be accommodated as a utility use of the right-of-way; is that assumption correct? MR. BEACHLER: Thanks, Ben. And thank you for your comments and participation in the last two meetings.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	us how we should deal with broadband and small cell in any way at all. And so part of what we're trying to do is not necessarily put anybody in a corner. We're just trying to create an environment where we can manage this the rights-of-way for utilities, non-utilities, broadband, small cell, everybody. Everybody wants in. We're trying to figure out a way to say, "Okay. How do you get here? How can we manage that space?"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	staff, am I right in my assumption that you're one of the things you're trying to accomplish is to broadly define "utility" for the purposes of meeting the FHWA where they're at in the Guidance Document, expressing a preference for broadband to be provided by or to be accommodated as a utility use of the right-of-way; is that assumption correct? MR. BEACHLER: Thanks, Ben. And thank you for your comments and participation in the last two meetings. We have one of our challenges has been	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	us how we should deal with broadband and small cell in any way at all. And so part of what we're trying to do is not necessarily put anybody in a corner. We're just trying to create an environment where we can manage this the rights-of-way for utilities, non-utilities, broadband, small cell, everybody. Everybody wants in. We're trying to figure out a way to say, "Okay. How do you get here? How can we manage that space?" BEN ARON: I guess I would just say, just to
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	staff, am I right in my assumption that you're one of the things you're trying to accomplish is to broadly define "utility" for the purposes of meeting the FHWA where they're at in the Guidance Document, expressing a preference for broadband to be provided by or to be accommodated as a utility use of the right-of-way; is that assumption correct? MR. BEACHLER: Thanks, Ben. And thank you for your comments and participation in the last two meetings. We have one of our challenges has been to determine what is a "utility." You know, some	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	us how we should deal with broadband and small cell in any way at all. And so part of what we're trying to do is not necessarily put anybody in a corner. We're just trying to create an environment where we can manage this the rights-of-way for utilities, non-utilities, broadband, small cell, everybody. Everybody wants in. We're trying to figure out a way to say, "Okay. How do you get here? How can we manage that space?" BEN ARON: I guess I would just say, just to make sure I'm abundantly clear with this, we really
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12	staff, am I right in my assumption that you're one of the things you're trying to accomplish is to broadly define "utility" for the purposes of meeting the FHWA where they're at in the Guidance Document, expressing a preference for broadband to be provided by or to be accommodated as a utility use of the right-of-way; is that assumption correct? MR. BEACHLER: Thanks, Ben. And thank you for your comments and participation in the last two meetings. We have one of our challenges has been to determine what is a "utility." You know, some providers want you know, there's a lot of existing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	us how we should deal with broadband and small cell in any way at all. And so part of what we're trying to do is not necessarily put anybody in a corner. We're just trying to create an environment where we can manage this the rights-of-way for utilities, non-utilities, broadband, small cell, everybody. Everybody wants in. We're trying to figure out a way to say, "Okay. How do you get here? How can we manage that space?" BEN ARON: I guess I would just say, just to make sure I'm abundantly clear with this, we really applaud the work that you've done. We think that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	staff, am I right in my assumption that you're one of the things you're trying to accomplish is to broadly define "utility" for the purposes of meeting the FHWA where they're at in the Guidance Document, expressing a preference for broadband to be provided by or to be accommodated as a utility use of the right-of-way; is that assumption correct? MR. BEACHLER: Thanks, Ben. And thank you for your comments and participation in the last two meetings. We have one of our challenges has been to determine what is a "utility." You know, some providers want you know, there's a lot of existing Idaho Law that provides access to public rights-of-way	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	us how we should deal with broadband and small cell in any way at all. And so part of what we're trying to do is not necessarily put anybody in a corner. We're just trying to create an environment where we can manage this the rights-of-way for utilities, non-utilities, broadband, small cell, everybody. Everybody wants in. We're trying to figure out a way to say, "Okay. How do you get here? How can we manage that space?" BEN ARON: I guess I would just say, just to make sure I'm abundantly clear with this, we really applaud the work that you've done. We think that you've done excellent work, frankly. And I think that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	staff, am I right in my assumption that you're one of the things you're trying to accomplish is to broadly define "utility" for the purposes of meeting the FHWA where they're at in the Guidance Document, expressing a preference for broadband to be provided by or to be accommodated as a utility use of the right-of-way; is that assumption correct? MR. BEACHLER: Thanks, Ben. And thank you for your comments and participation in the last two meetings. We have one of our challenges has been to determine what is a "utility." You know, some providers want you know, there's a lot of existing Idaho Law that provides access to public rights-of-way for public utilities. So that's been our our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	us how we should deal with broadband and small cell in any way at all. And so part of what we're trying to do is not necessarily put anybody in a corner. We're just trying to create an environment where we can manage this the rights-of-way for utilities, non-utilities, broadband, small cell, everybody. Everybody wants in. We're trying to figure out a way to say, "Okay. How do you get here? How can we manage that space?" BEN ARON: I guess I would just say, just to make sure I'm abundantly clear with this, we really applaud the work that you've done. We think that you've done excellent work, frankly. And I think that what you've produced is you know, is today probably
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	staff, am I right in my assumption that you're one of the things you're trying to accomplish is to broadly define "utility" for the purposes of meeting the FHWA where they're at in the Guidance Document, expressing a preference for broadband to be provided by or to be accommodated as a utility use of the right-of-way; is that assumption correct? MR. BEACHLER: Thanks, Ben. And thank you for your comments and participation in the last two meetings. We have one of our challenges has been to determine what is a "utility." You know, some providers want you know, there's a lot of existing Idaho Law that provides access to public rights-of-way for public utilities. So that's been our our normal basis of granting access to the right-of-way.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	us how we should deal with broadband and small cell in any way at all. And so part of what we're trying to do is not necessarily put anybody in a corner. We're just trying to create an environment where we can manage this the rights-of-way for utilities, non-utilities, broadband, small cell, everybody. Everybody wants in. We're trying to figure out a way to say, "Okay. How do you get here? How can we manage that space?" BEN ARON: I guess I would just say, just to make sure I'm abundantly clear with this, we really applaud the work that you've done. We think that you've done excellent work, frankly. And I think that what you've produced is you know, is today probably fairly workable for I think on the wireless side,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	staff, am I right in my assumption that you're one of the things you're trying to accomplish is to broadly define "utility" for the purposes of meeting the FHWA where they're at in the Guidance Document, expressing a preference for broadband to be provided by or to be accommodated as a utility use of the right-of-way; is that assumption correct? MR. BEACHLER: Thanks, Ben. And thank you for your comments and participation in the last two meetings. We have one of our challenges has been to determine what is a "utility." You know, some providers want you know, there's a lot of existing Idaho Law that provides access to public rights-of-way for public utilities. So that's been our our normal basis of granting access to the right-of-way. So as we enter into helping manage and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	us how we should deal with broadband and small cell in any way at all. And so part of what we're trying to do is not necessarily put anybody in a corner. We're just trying to create an environment where we can manage this the rights-of-way for utilities, non-utilities, broadband, small cell, everybody. Everybody wants in. We're trying to figure out a way to say, "Okay. How do you get here? How can we manage that space?" BEN ARON: I guess I would just say, just to make sure I'm abundantly clear with this, we really applaud the work that you've done. We think that you've done excellent work, frankly. And I think that what you've produced is you know, is today probably fairly workable for I think on the wireless side, you know, this is a workable approach. I think it can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	staff, am I right in my assumption that you're one of the things you're trying to accomplish is to broadly define "utility" for the purposes of meeting the FHWA where they're at in the Guidance Document, expressing a preference for broadband to be provided by or to be accommodated as a utility use of the right-of-way; is that assumption correct? MR. BEACHLER: Thanks, Ben. And thank you for your comments and participation in the last two meetings. We have one of our challenges has been to determine what is a "utility." You know, some providers want you know, there's a lot of existing Idaho Law that provides access to public rights-of-way for public utilities. So that's been our our normal basis of granting access to the right-of-way. So as we enter into helping manage and accommodate every increasing demand for broadband	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	us how we should deal with broadband and small cell in any way at all. And so part of what we're trying to do is not necessarily put anybody in a corner. We're just trying to create an environment where we can manage this the rights-of-way for utilities, non-utilities, broadband, small cell, everybody. Everybody wants in. We're trying to figure out a way to say, "Okay. How do you get here? How can we manage that space?" BEN ARON: I guess I would just say, just to make sure I'm abundantly clear with this, we really applaud the work that you've done. We think that you've done excellent work, frankly. And I think that what you've produced is you know, is today probably fairly workable for I think on the wireless side, you know, this is a workable approach. I think it can be perfected.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	staff, am I right in my assumption that you're one of the things you're trying to accomplish is to broadly define "utility" for the purposes of meeting the FHWA where they're at in the Guidance Document, expressing a preference for broadband to be provided by or to be accommodated as a utility use of the right-of-way; is that assumption correct? MR. BEACHLER: Thanks, Ben. And thank you for your comments and participation in the last two meetings. We have one of our challenges has been to determine what is a "utility." You know, some providers want you know, there's a lot of existing Idaho Law that provides access to public rights-of-way for public utilities. So that's been our our normal basis of granting access to the right-of-way. So as we enter into helping manage and accommodate every increasing demand for broadband facilities in the State right-of-way, you know, that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	us how we should deal with broadband and small cell in any way at all. And so part of what we're trying to do is not necessarily put anybody in a corner. We're just trying to create an environment where we can manage this the rights-of-way for utilities, non-utilities, broadband, small cell, everybody. Everybody wants in. We're trying to figure out a way to say, "Okay. How do you get here? How can we manage that space?" BEN ARON: I guess I would just say, just to make sure I'm abundantly clear with this, we really applaud the work that you've done. We think that you've done excellent work, frankly. And I think that what you've produced is you know, is today probably fairly workable for I think on the wireless side, you know, this is a workable approach. I think it can be perfected. And I you know, I I don't think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	staff, am I right in my assumption that you're one of the things you're trying to accomplish is to broadly define "utility" for the purposes of meeting the FHWA where they're at in the Guidance Document, expressing a preference for broadband to be provided by or to be accommodated as a utility use of the right-of-way; is that assumption correct? MR. BEACHLER: Thanks, Ben. And thank you for your comments and participation in the last two meetings. We have one of our challenges has been to determine what is a "utility." You know, some providers want you know, there's a lot of existing Idaho Law that provides access to public rights-of-way for public utilities. So that's been our our normal basis of granting access to the right-of-way. So as we enter into helping manage and accommodate every increasing demand for broadband facilities in the State right-of-way, you know, that's what we had to determine: Is this a "utility?" Is it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	us how we should deal with broadband and small cell in any way at all. And so part of what we're trying to do is not necessarily put anybody in a corner. We're just trying to create an environment where we can manage this the rights-of-way for utilities, non-utilities, broadband, small cell, everybody. Everybody wants in. We're trying to figure out a way to say, "Okay. How do you get here? How can we manage that space?" BEN ARON: I guess I would just say, just to make sure I'm abundantly clear with this, we really applaud the work that you've done. We think that you've done excellent work, frankly. And I think that what you've produced is you know, is today probably fairly workable for I think on the wireless side, you know, this is a workable approach. I think it can be perfected. And I you know, I I don't think that just to make sure that we're I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	staff, am I right in my assumption that you're one of the things you're trying to accomplish is to broadly define "utility" for the purposes of meeting the FHWA where they're at in the Guidance Document, expressing a preference for broadband to be provided by or to be accommodated as a utility use of the right-of-way; is that assumption correct? MR. BEACHLER: Thanks, Ben. And thank you for your comments and participation in the last two meetings. We have one of our challenges has been to determine what is a "utility." You know, some providers want you know, there's a lot of existing Idaho Law that provides access to public rights-of-way for public utilities. So that's been our our normal basis of granting access to the right-of-way. So as we enter into helping manage and accommodate every increasing demand for broadband facilities in the State right-of-way, you know, that's what we had to determine: Is this a "utility?" Is it not a "utility?"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	us how we should deal with broadband and small cell in any way at all. And so part of what we're trying to do is not necessarily put anybody in a corner. We're just trying to create an environment where we can manage this the rights-of-way for utilities, non-utilities, broadband, small cell, everybody. Everybody wants in. We're trying to figure out a way to say, "Okay. How do you get here? How can we manage that space?" BEN ARON: I guess I would just say, just to make sure I'm abundantly clear with this, we really applaud the work that you've done. We think that you've done excellent work, frankly. And I think that what you've produced is you know, is today probably fairly workable for I think on the wireless side, you know, this is a workable approach. I think it can be perfected. And I you know, I I don't think that just to make sure that we're I'm [unintelligible] correctly we very much recognize
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	staff, am I right in my assumption that you're one of the things you're trying to accomplish is to broadly define "utility" for the purposes of meeting the FHWA where they're at in the Guidance Document, expressing a preference for broadband to be provided by or to be accommodated as a utility use of the right-of-way; is that assumption correct? MR. BEACHLER: Thanks, Ben. And thank you for your comments and participation in the last two meetings. We have one of our challenges has been to determine what is a "utility." You know, some providers want you know, there's a lot of existing Idaho Law that provides access to public rights-of-way for public utilities. So that's been our our normal basis of granting access to the right-of-way. So as we enter into helping manage and accommodate every increasing demand for broadband facilities in the State right-of-way, you know, that's what we had to determine: Is this a "utility?" Is it not a "utility?" Prior to the April Guidance Memo regarding	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	us how we should deal with broadband and small cell in any way at all. And so part of what we're trying to do is not necessarily put anybody in a corner. We're just trying to create an environment where we can manage this the rights-of-way for utilities, non-utilities, broadband, small cell, everybody. Everybody wants in. We're trying to figure out a way to say, "Okay. How do you get here? How can we manage that space?" BEN ARON: I guess I would just say, just to make sure I'm abundantly clear with this, we really applaud the work that you've done. We think that you've done excellent work, frankly. And I think that what you've produced is you know, is today probably fairly workable for I think on the wireless side, you know, this is a workable approach. I think it can be perfected. And I you know, I I don't think that just to make sure that we're I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	staff, am I right in my assumption that you're one of the things you're trying to accomplish is to broadly define "utility" for the purposes of meeting the FHWA where they're at in the Guidance Document, expressing a preference for broadband to be provided by or to be accommodated as a utility use of the right-of-way; is that assumption correct? MR. BEACHLER: Thanks, Ben. And thank you for your comments and participation in the last two meetings. We have one of our challenges has been to determine what is a "utility." You know, some providers want you know, there's a lot of existing Idaho Law that provides access to public rights-of-way for public utilities. So that's been our our normal basis of granting access to the right-of-way. So as we enter into helping manage and accommodate every increasing demand for broadband facilities in the State right-of-way, you know, that's what we had to determine: Is this a "utility?" Is it not a "utility?" Prior to the April Guidance Memo regarding	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	us how we should deal with broadband and small cell in any way at all. And so part of what we're trying to do is not necessarily put anybody in a corner. We're just trying to create an environment where we can manage this the rights-of-way for utilities, non-utilities, broadband, small cell, everybody. Everybody wants in. We're trying to figure out a way to say, "Okay. How do you get here? How can we manage that space?" BEN ARON: I guess I would just say, just to make sure I'm abundantly clear with this, we really applaud the work that you've done. We think that you've done excellent work, frankly. And I think that what you've produced is you know, is today probably fairly workable for I think on the wireless side, you know, this is a workable approach. I think it can be perfected. And I you know, I I don't think that just to make sure that we're I'm [unintelligible] correctly we very much recognize
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	staff, am I right in my assumption that you're one of the things you're trying to accomplish is to broadly define "utility" for the purposes of meeting the FHWA where they're at in the Guidance Document, expressing a preference for broadband to be provided by or to be accommodated as a utility use of the right-of-way; is that assumption correct? MR. BEACHLER: Thanks, Ben. And thank you for your comments and participation in the last two meetings. We have one of our challenges has been to determine what is a "utility." You know, some providers want you know, there's a lot of existing Idaho Law that provides access to public rights-of-way for public utilities. So that's been our our normal basis of granting access to the right-of-way. So as we enter into helping manage and accommodate every increasing demand for broadband facilities in the State right-of-way, you know, that's what we had to determine: Is this a "utility?" Is it not a "utility?" Prior to the April Guidance Memo regarding	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	us how we should deal with broadband and small cell in any way at all. And so part of what we're trying to do is not necessarily put anybody in a corner. We're just trying to create an environment where we can manage this the rights-of-way for utilities, non-utilities, broadband, small cell, everybody. Everybody wants in. We're trying to figure out a way to say, "Okay. How do you get here? How can we manage that space?" BEN ARON: I guess I would just say, just to make sure I'm abundantly clear with this, we really applaud the work that you've done. We think that you've done excellent work, frankly. And I think that what you've produced is you know, is today probably fairly workable for I think on the wireless side, you know, this is a workable approach. I think it can be perfected. And I you know, I I don't think that just to make sure that we're I'm [unintelligible] correctly we very much recognize that you are absolutely you are taking it you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	staff, am I right in my assumption that you're one of the things you're trying to accomplish is to broadly define "utility" for the purposes of meeting the FHWA where they're at in the Guidance Document, expressing a preference for broadband to be provided by or to be accommodated as a utility use of the right-of-way; is that assumption correct? MR. BEACHLER: Thanks, Ben. And thank you for your comments and participation in the last two meetings. We have one of our challenges has been to determine what is a "utility." You know, some providers want you know, there's a lot of existing Idaho Law that provides access to public rights-of-way for public utilities. So that's been our our normal basis of granting access to the right-of-way. So as we enter into helping manage and accommodate every increasing demand for broadband facilities in the State right-of-way, you know, that's what we had to determine: Is this a "utility?" Is it not a "utility?" Prior to the April Guidance Memo regarding "utility," broadband could be considered a utility	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	us how we should deal with broadband and small cell in any way at all. And so part of what we're trying to do is not necessarily put anybody in a corner. We're just trying to create an environment where we can manage this the rights-of-way for utilities, non-utilities, broadband, small cell, everybody. Everybody wants in. We're trying to figure out a way to say, "Okay. How do you get here? How can we manage that space?" BEN ARON: I guess I would just say, just to make sure I'm abundantly clear with this, we really applaud the work that you've done. We think that you've done excellent work, frankly. And I think that what you've produced is you know, is today probably fairly workable for I think on the wireless side, you know, this is a workable approach. I think it can be perfected. And I you know, I I don't think that just to make sure that we're I'm [unintelligible] correctly we very much recognize that you are absolutely you are taking it you're making every effort to get broadband throughout Idaho,

	Page 46		Page 48
1	rule set that works for the State, that works for	1	place.
	CTI's members, and basically gets wireless built out	2	That's the only comment that I really have
	in your right-of-ways so you have all the advanced		at this point concerning the micro-trenching.
	services for Idaho citizens that they can get.	4	Thanks.
5	THE MODERATOR: Well, again, thank you very	5	MR. BEACHLER: Okay. Thank you, Matthew.
	much, Ben. We really appreciate your engagement	-	Appreciate those comments.
	today. And as Robert mentioned, the last couple	7	And again, we that was brought up by
	minutes or meetings, we'll look forward to those	-	one of our providers who or one of the commenters
	submitted comments as well.		who noted that this is being done. And it's it's
10	We do have a I've got another hand		done back East quite a bit I from my understanding,
	here, so we'll go ahead and put you live.		and it's done more in a residential-type area, not on
12	Matthew, you're now open on the mic.		the State Highway System.
	Please introduce yourself and who you represent.	13	We've contacted our
14	MATTHEW BEZAYIFF: Well, I'm Matthew Bezayiff.		materials headquarters materials section and said,
	I'm the infrastructure engineer with Enterprise		you know, "What" "what" "could we do this?
	Technology Services with ITD and also the regional		Could it impact the road prism and the base?" So
	network engineer for eastern Idaho.		they've noted that.
18	Reviewing the Utility Manual Draft [sic]	18	And definitely we would note in the
	and then looking at the slides concerning the oh,		permit I'll take that as a thing for guidance to
	what was I thinking here the micro-trenching, if		staff: If we do permit micro-trenching, that those
	ITD and everybody out there that does this the cost		providers know that subsequent road restoration
	of laying fiber is still the most expensive part of		projects may impact them.
	bringing broadband to any new places.	23	Again, we would probably only use this in
24	Now, the National Electrical Code and the		one of these areas where it's very difficult to
	Outside Plant Designer from the Building Industry		construct, very limited right-of-way space, or it's
	Subide Flait Designer Hom die Dananig maasay		construct, very minica right of way space, of its
	Page 47		Page 49
1	-	1	-
	Page 47 Consulting Services International, we've got fiber going from 24 inches to 36 inches down underground for	1	Page 49 very difficult to bore due to the parent material. So that would be important to note in
2	Consulting Services International, we've got fiber	2	very difficult to bore due to the parent material.
2	Consulting Services International, we've got fiber going from 24 inches to 36 inches down underground for	2 3	very difficult to bore due to the parent material. So that would be important to note in
2 3 4	Consulting Services International, we've got fiber going from 24 inches to 36 inches down underground for our conduit.	2 3	very difficult to bore due to the parent material. So that would be important to note in those permit applications approved permits if we
2 3 4 5	Consulting Services International, we've got fiber going from 24 inches to 36 inches down underground for our conduit. Micro-trenching would be good if ITD, you	2 3 4	very difficult to bore due to the parent material. So that would be important to note in those permit applications approved permits if we did do this micro-trenching.
2 3 4 5 6	Consulting Services International, we've got fiber going from 24 inches to 36 inches down underground for our conduit. Micro-trenching would be good if ITD, you know, was to go forward and look at this in areas	2 3 4 5 6	very difficult to bore due to the parent material. So that would be important to note in those permit applications approved permits if we did do this micro-trenching. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7	Consulting Services International, we've got fiber going from 24 inches to 36 inches down underground for our conduit. Micro-trenching would be good if ITD, you know, was to go forward and look at this in areas that where we don't have a lot of right-of-way. So	2 3 4 5 6	very difficult to bore due to the parent material. So that would be important to note in those permit applications approved permits if we did do this micro-trenching. Thank you. THE MODERATOR: Yes. Thank you, Matthew.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Consulting Services International, we've got fiber going from 24 inches to 36 inches down underground for our conduit. Micro-trenching would be good if ITD, you know, was to go forward and look at this in areas that where we don't have a lot of right-of-way. So we're talking the areas where it's two-lane roads.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	very difficult to bore due to the parent material. So that would be important to note in those permit applications approved permits if we did do this micro-trenching. Thank you. THE MODERATOR: Yes. Thank you, Matthew. Really appreciate that. I think this is a good example of we've been learning things. And, you know, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Consulting Services International, we've got fiber going from 24 inches to 36 inches down underground for our conduit. Micro-trenching would be good if ITD, you know, was to go forward and look at this in areas that where we don't have a lot of right-of-way. So we're talking the areas where it's two-lane roads. We've got rock faces on one side and just guardrail on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	very difficult to bore due to the parent material. So that would be important to note in those permit applications approved permits if we did do this micro-trenching. Thank you. THE MODERATOR: Yes. Thank you, Matthew. Really appreciate that. I think this is a good example of we've been learning things. And, you know, the micro-trenching, as Robert mentioned, was something we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Consulting Services International, we've got fiber going from 24 inches to 36 inches down underground for our conduit. Micro-trenching would be good if ITD, you know, was to go forward and look at this in areas that where we don't have a lot of right-of-way. So we're talking the areas where it's two-lane roads. We've got rock faces on one side and just guardrail on the other. But the problem is it's cheaper to do the micro-trenching. You can get multiple providers	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	very difficult to bore due to the parent material. So that would be important to note in those permit applications approved permits if we did do this micro-trenching. Thank you. THE MODERATOR: Yes. Thank you, Matthew. Really appreciate that. I think this is a good example of we've been learning things. And, you know, the micro-trenching, as Robert mentioned, was something we immediately looked into. And so it's just a good
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	Consulting Services International, we've got fiber going from 24 inches to 36 inches down underground for our conduit. Micro-trenching would be good if ITD, you know, was to go forward and look at this in areas that where we don't have a lot of right-of-way. So we're talking the areas where it's two-lane roads. We've got rock faces on one side and just guardrail on the other. But the problem is it's cheaper to do the micro-trenching. You can get multiple providers into those areas. The con to that is that we're only	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	very difficult to bore due to the parent material. So that would be important to note in those permit applications approved permits if we did do this micro-trenching. Thank you. THE MODERATOR: Yes. Thank you, Matthew. Really appreciate that. I think this is a good example of we've been learning things. And, you know, the micro-trenching, as Robert mentioned, was something we immediately looked into. And so it's just a good example of just kind of the shared knowledge as we
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Consulting Services International, we've got fiber going from 24 inches to 36 inches down underground for our conduit. Micro-trenching would be good if ITD, you know, was to go forward and look at this in areas that where we don't have a lot of right-of-way. So we're talking the areas where it's two-lane roads. We've got rock faces on one side and just guardrail on the other. But the problem is it's cheaper to do the micro-trenching. You can get multiple providers into those areas. The con to that is that we're only going to go down no more [unintelligible] than	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	very difficult to bore due to the parent material. So that would be important to note in those permit applications approved permits if we did do this micro-trenching. Thank you. THE MODERATOR: Yes. Thank you, Matthew. Really appreciate that. I think this is a good example of we've been learning things. And, you know, the micro-trenching, as Robert mentioned, was something we immediately looked into. And so it's just a good example of just kind of the shared knowledge as we have these discussions and meetings.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Consulting Services International, we've got fiber going from 24 inches to 36 inches down underground for our conduit. Micro-trenching would be good if ITD, you know, was to go forward and look at this in areas that where we don't have a lot of right-of-way. So we're talking the areas where it's two-lane roads. We've got rock faces on one side and just guardrail on the other. But the problem is it's cheaper to do the micro-trenching. You can get multiple providers into those areas. The con to that is that we're only going to go down no more [unintelligible] than [unintelligible] inches, maybe 24, depending on the	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	very difficult to bore due to the parent material. So that would be important to note in those permit applications approved permits if we did do this micro-trenching. Thank you. THE MODERATOR: Yes. Thank you, Matthew. Really appreciate that. I think this is a good example of we've been learning things. And, you know, the micro-trenching, as Robert mentioned, was something we immediately looked into. And so it's just a good example of just kind of the shared knowledge as we have these discussions and meetings. So just kind of looking at those that are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Consulting Services International, we've got fiber going from 24 inches to 36 inches down underground for our conduit. Micro-trenching would be good if ITD, you know, was to go forward and look at this in areas that where we don't have a lot of right-of-way. So we're talking the areas where it's two-lane roads. We've got rock faces on one side and just guardrail on the other. But the problem is it's cheaper to do the micro-trenching. You can get multiple providers into those areas. The con to that is that we're only going to go down no more [unintelligible] than [unintelligible] inches, maybe 24, depending on the area. So we're going to be above that, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	very difficult to bore due to the parent material. So that would be important to note in those permit applications approved permits if we did do this micro-trenching. Thank you. THE MODERATOR: Yes. Thank you, Matthew. Really appreciate that. I think this is a good example of we've been learning things. And, you know, the micro-trenching, as Robert mentioned, was something we immediately looked into. And so it's just a good example of just kind of the shared knowledge as we have these discussions and meetings. So just kind of looking at those that are virtually joining us. I don't see any raised hands,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Consulting Services International, we've got fiber going from 24 inches to 36 inches down underground for our conduit. Micro-trenching would be good if ITD, you know, was to go forward and look at this in areas that where we don't have a lot of right-of-way. So we're talking the areas where it's two-lane roads. We've got rock faces on one side and just guardrail on the other. But the problem is it's cheaper to do the micro-trenching. You can get multiple providers into those areas. The con to that is that we're only going to go down no more [unintelligible] than [unintelligible] inches, maybe 24, depending on the area. So we're going to be above that, the 2-foot-to-3-foot barrier for normal conduit.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	very difficult to bore due to the parent material. So that would be important to note in those permit applications approved permits if we did do this micro-trenching. Thank you. THE MODERATOR: Yes. Thank you, Matthew. Really appreciate that. I think this is a good example of we've been learning things. And, you know, the micro-trenching, as Robert mentioned, was something we immediately looked into. And so it's just a good example of just kind of the shared knowledge as we have these discussions and meetings. So just kind of looking at those that are virtually joining us. I don't see any raised hands, so let me give another call or request for anyone that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Consulting Services International, we've got fiber going from 24 inches to 36 inches down underground for our conduit. Micro-trenching would be good if ITD, you know, was to go forward and look at this in areas that where we don't have a lot of right-of-way. So we're talking the areas where it's two-lane roads. We've got rock faces on one side and just guardrail on the other. But the problem is it's cheaper to do the micro-trenching. You can get multiple providers into those areas. The con to that is that we're only going to go down no more [unintelligible] than [unintelligible] inches, maybe 24, depending on the area. So we're going to be above that, the 2-foot-to-3-foot barrier for normal conduit. So as a permitting process that we need to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	very difficult to bore due to the parent material. So that would be important to note in those permit applications approved permits if we did do this micro-trenching. Thank you. THE MODERATOR: Yes. Thank you, Matthew. Really appreciate that. I think this is a good example of we've been learning things. And, you know, the micro-trenching, as Robert mentioned, was something we immediately looked into. And so it's just a good example of just kind of the shared knowledge as we have these discussions and meetings. So just kind of looking at those that are virtually joining us. I don't see any raised hands, so let me give another call or request for anyone that signed in via WebEx.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Consulting Services International, we've got fiber going from 24 inches to 36 inches down underground for our conduit. Micro-trenching would be good if ITD, you know, was to go forward and look at this in areas that where we don't have a lot of right-of-way. So we're talking the areas where it's two-lane roads. We've got rock faces on one side and just guardrail on the other. But the problem is it's cheaper to do the micro-trenching. You can get multiple providers into those areas. The con to that is that we're only going to go down no more [unintelligible] than [unintelligible] inches, maybe 24, depending on the area. So we're going to be above that, the 2-foot-to-3-foot barrier for normal conduit. So as a permitting process that we need to look at from ITD's point of view is is that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	very difficult to bore due to the parent material. So that would be important to note in those permit applications approved permits if we did do this micro-trenching. Thank you. THE MODERATOR: Yes. Thank you, Matthew. Really appreciate that. I think this is a good example of we've been learning things. And, you know, the micro-trenching, as Robert mentioned, was something we immediately looked into. And so it's just a good example of just kind of the shared knowledge as we have these discussions and meetings. So just kind of looking at those that are virtually joining us. I don't see any raised hands, so let me give another call or request for anyone that signed in via WebEx. If you'd like to make a comment, ask a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Consulting Services International, we've got fiber going from 24 inches to 36 inches down underground for our conduit. Micro-trenching would be good if ITD, you know, was to go forward and look at this in areas that where we don't have a lot of right-of-way. So we're talking the areas where it's two-lane roads. We've got rock faces on one side and just guardrail on the other. But the problem is it's cheaper to do the micro-trenching. You can get multiple providers into those areas. The con to that is that we're only going to go down no more [unintelligible] than [unintelligible] inches, maybe 24, depending on the area. So we're going to be above that, the 2-foot-to-3-foot barrier for normal conduit. So as a permitting process that we need to look at from ITD's point of view is is that somebody's going to micro-trench in those areas.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	very difficult to bore due to the parent material. So that would be important to note in those permit applications approved permits if we did do this micro-trenching. Thank you. THE MODERATOR: Yes. Thank you, Matthew. Really appreciate that. I think this is a good example of we've been learning things. And, you know, the micro-trenching, as Robert mentioned, was something we immediately looked into. And so it's just a good example of just kind of the shared knowledge as we have these discussions and meetings. So just kind of looking at those that are virtually joining us. I don't see any raised hands, so let me give another call or request for anyone that signed in via WebEx. If you'd like to make a comment, ask a question, we're totally open to any direction you'd
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Consulting Services International, we've got fiber going from 24 inches to 36 inches down underground for our conduit. Micro-trenching would be good if ITD, you know, was to go forward and look at this in areas that where we don't have a lot of right-of-way. So we're talking the areas where it's two-lane roads. We've got rock faces on one side and just guardrail on the other. But the problem is it's cheaper to do the micro-trenching. You can get multiple providers into those areas. The con to that is that we're only going to go down no more [unintelligible] than [unintelligible] inches, maybe 24, depending on the area. So we're going to be above that, the 2-foot-to-3-foot barrier for normal conduit. So as a permitting process that we need to look at from ITD's point of view is is that somebody's going to micro-trench in those areas. Those permits need to be carried over to the drawings	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	very difficult to bore due to the parent material. So that would be important to note in those permit applications approved permits if we did do this micro-trenching. Thank you. THE MODERATOR: Yes. Thank you, Matthew. Really appreciate that. I think this is a good example of we've been learning things. And, you know, the micro-trenching, as Robert mentioned, was something we immediately looked into. And so it's just a good example of just kind of the shared knowledge as we have these discussions and meetings. So just kind of looking at those that are virtually joining us. I don't see any raised hands, so let me give another call or request for anyone that signed in via WebEx. If you'd like to make a comment, ask a question, we're totally open to any direction you'd like to go.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Consulting Services International, we've got fiber going from 24 inches to 36 inches down underground for our conduit. Micro-trenching would be good if ITD, you know, was to go forward and look at this in areas that where we don't have a lot of right-of-way. So we're talking the areas where it's two-lane roads. We've got rock faces on one side and just guardrail on the other. But the problem is it's cheaper to do the micro-trenching. You can get multiple providers into those areas. The con to that is that we're only going to go down no more [unintelligible] than [unintelligible] inches, maybe 24, depending on the area. So we're going to be above that, the 2-foot-to-3-foot barrier for normal conduit. So as a permitting process that we need to look at from ITD's point of view is is that somebody's going to micro-trench in those areas. Those permits need to be carried over to the drawings that ITD has for that area to ensure that later on, if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 very difficult to bore due to the parent material. So that would be important to note in those permit applications approved permits if we did do this micro-trenching. Thank you. THE MODERATOR: Yes. Thank you, Matthew. Really appreciate that. I think this is a good example of we've been learning things. And, you know, the micro-trenching, as Robert mentioned, was something we immediately looked into. And so it's just a good example of just kind of the shared knowledge as we have these discussions and meetings. So just kind of looking at those that are virtually joining us. I don't see any raised hands, so let me give another call or request for anyone that signed in via WebEx. If you'd like to make a comment, ask a question, we're totally open to any direction you'd like to go. If I don't see anyone pop up here, I would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Consulting Services International, we've got fiber going from 24 inches to 36 inches down underground for our conduit. Micro-trenching would be good if ITD, you know, was to go forward and look at this in areas that where we don't have a lot of right-of-way. So we're talking the areas where it's two-lane roads. We've got rock faces on one side and just guardrail on the other. But the problem is it's cheaper to do the micro-trenching. You can get multiple providers into those areas. The con to that is that we're only going to go down no more [unintelligible] than [unintelligible] inches, maybe 24, depending on the area. So we're going to be above that, the 2-foot-to-3-foot barrier for normal conduit. So as a permitting process that we need to look at from ITD's point of view is is that somebody's going to micro-trench in those areas. Those permits need to be carried over to the drawings that ITD has for that area to ensure that later on, if we had to repave and take it down to the base, which	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>very difficult to bore due to the parent material. So that would be important to note in those permit applications approved permits if we did do this micro-trenching. Thank you. THE MODERATOR: Yes. Thank you, Matthew. Really appreciate that. I think this is a good example of we've been learning things. And, you know, the micro-trenching, as Robert mentioned, was something we immediately looked into. And so it's just a good example of just kind of the shared knowledge as we have these discussions and meetings. So just kind of looking at those that are virtually joining us. I don't see any raised hands, so let me give another call or request for anyone that signed in via WebEx. If you'd like to make a comment, ask a question, we're totally open to any direction you'd like to go. If I don't see anyone pop up here, I would like to give the folks that are strictly on the phones</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Consulting Services International, we've got fiber going from 24 inches to 36 inches down underground for our conduit. Micro-trenching would be good if ITD, you know, was to go forward and look at this in areas that where we don't have a lot of right-of-way. So we're talking the areas where it's two-lane roads. We've got rock faces on one side and just guardrail on the other. But the problem is it's cheaper to do the micro-trenching. You can get multiple providers into those areas. The con to that is that we're only going to go down no more [unintelligible] than [unintelligible] inches, maybe 24, depending on the area. So we're going to be above that, the 2-foot-to-3-foot barrier for normal conduit. So as a permitting process that we need to look at from ITD's point of view is is that somebody's going to micro-trench in those areas. Those permits need to be carried over to the drawings that ITD has for that area to ensure that later on, if we had to repave and take it down to the base, which is going to be down 18 inches or so, we may have to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>very difficult to bore due to the parent material. So that would be important to note in those permit applications approved permits if we did do this micro-trenching. Thank you. THE MODERATOR: Yes. Thank you, Matthew. Really appreciate that. I think this is a good example of we've been learning things. And, you know, the micro-trenching, as Robert mentioned, was something we immediately looked into. And so it's just a good example of just kind of the shared knowledge as we have these discussions and meetings. So just kind of looking at those that are virtually joining us. I don't see any raised hands, so let me give another call or request for anyone that signed in via WebEx. If you'd like to make a comment, ask a question, we're totally open to any direction you'd like to go. If I don't see anyone pop up here, I would like to give the folks that are strictly on the phones an opportunity.</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Consulting Services International, we've got fiber going from 24 inches to 36 inches down underground for our conduit. Micro-trenching would be good if ITD, you know, was to go forward and look at this in areas that where we don't have a lot of right-of-way. So we're talking the areas where it's two-lane roads. We've got rock faces on one side and just guardrail on the other. But the problem is it's cheaper to do the micro-trenching. You can get multiple providers into those areas. The con to that is that we're only going to go down no more [unintelligible] than [unintelligible] inches, maybe 24, depending on the area. So we're going to be above that, the 2-foot-to-3-foot barrier for normal conduit. So as a permitting process that we need to look at from ITD's point of view is is that somebody's going to micro-trench in those areas. Those permits need to be carried over to the drawings that ITD has for that area to ensure that later on, if we had to repave and take it down to the base, which is going to be down 18 inches or so, we may have to notify those utilities that we're going to be tearing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<pre>very difficult to bore due to the parent material. So that would be important to note in those permit applications approved permits if we did do this micro-trenching. Thank you. THE MODERATOR: Yes. Thank you, Matthew. Really appreciate that. I think this is a good example of we've been learning things. And, you know, the micro-trenching, as Robert mentioned, was something we immediately looked into. And so it's just a good example of just kind of the shared knowledge as we have these discussions and meetings. So just kind of looking at those that are virtually joining us. I don't see any raised hands, so let me give another call or request for anyone that signed in via WebEx. If you'd like to make a comment, ask a question, we're totally open to any direction you'd like to go. If I don't see anyone pop up here, I would like to give the folks that are strictly on the phones an opportunity. And so I'm not seeing not seeing any</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Consulting Services International, we've got fiber going from 24 inches to 36 inches down underground for our conduit. Micro-trenching would be good if ITD, you know, was to go forward and look at this in areas that where we don't have a lot of right-of-way. So we're talking the areas where it's two-lane roads. We've got rock faces on one side and just guardrail on the other. But the problem is it's cheaper to do the micro-trenching. You can get multiple providers into those areas. The con to that is that we're only going to go down no more [unintelligible] than [unintelligible] inches, maybe 24, depending on the area. So we're going to be above that, the 2-foot-to-3-foot barrier for normal conduit. So as a permitting process that we need to look at from ITD's point of view is is that somebody's going to micro-trench in those areas. Those permits need to be carried over to the drawings that ITD has for that area to ensure that later on, if we had to repave and take it down to the base, which is going to be down 18 inches or so, we may have to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<pre>very difficult to bore due to the parent material. So that would be important to note in those permit applications approved permits if we did do this micro-trenching. Thank you. THE MODERATOR: Yes. Thank you, Matthew. Really appreciate that. I think this is a good example of we've been learning things. And, you know, the micro-trenching, as Robert mentioned, was something we immediately looked into. And so it's just a good example of just kind of the shared knowledge as we have these discussions and meetings. So just kind of looking at those that are virtually joining us. I don't see any raised hands, so let me give another call or request for anyone that signed in via WebEx. If you'd like to make a comment, ask a question, we're totally open to any direction you'd like to go. If I don't see anyone pop up here, I would like to give the folks that are strictly on the phones an opportunity.</pre>

	Page 50		Page 52
1 2	So what I'll go ahead and do is if you are calling from area code 509, you're un-muted and		that really are wanting to kind of go that written submission format, which we greatly appreciate and
	given the opportunity to make any comments or ask any		encourage, you can go ahead and work on that within
4	questions.	4	the next week. And whether that's submitting it to
5	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Nope. This		myself or Robert, that'll give staff some good
	is [unintelligible] with [unintelligible] Utilities.		substance to start going over.
	I'm just listening intently. And we plan to provide	7	Robert, Blake, is there anything
	comment via the written method. Great discussion, though.		particular you would like to share comment at this time?
9 10	THE MODERATOR: Awesome. Thank you very much.	9 10	MR. BEACHLER: Thanks, Ramon.
	Yes. We will we'll look forward to those written	11	Again, we just wanted to thank all of our
	comments and, again, invite you to visit the		participants, our industry subject matter experts that
13	"itd.idaho.gov/rulemaking" web page.		come in and present information and help us be better
14	What about the individual calling from		stewards of the State right-of-way, understand these
15	area code 301?		technologies, how do we can accommodate them. So
16	Would you like to ask any questions or	16	we really do appreciate those comments.
	make any comments?	17	And we frantically try to take notes,
18	Okay.		but and capture the content, but we really do
19	And then we've got a few 208 numbers. So if you're calling from a 208 number	19	appreciate written comments to help us, you know, compile this and note the proper references and help
20 21	ending in 04, you're un-muted. Do you have any	20	us with our responses and changes to our
	questions or comments?		documentation.
23	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No. Thank you. It's	23	So really appreciate everybody's time and
	awesome listening to you guys. I'm getting a lot of		consideration and, again, this opportunity to come out
25	insight on what's going on.	25	and present new information to us. And I give you
	Page 51		Page 53
1	Appreciate it.		another opportunity to provide clarification on some
2	Appreciate it. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We	2	another opportunity to provide clarification on some of your earlier comments.
2 3	Appreciate it. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate that.	2 3	another opportunity to provide clarification on some of your earlier comments. We really do appreciate that.
2 3 4	Appreciate it. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate that. And then looking at our last specific	2 3 4	another opportunity to provide clarification on some of your earlier comments. We really do appreciate that. THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Rob. Appreciate it.
2 3 4 5	Appreciate it. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate that. And then looking at our last specific caller. This is a 202 area code.	2 3 4 5	another opportunity to provide clarification on some of your earlier comments. We really do appreciate that. THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Rob. Appreciate it. Again, want to emphasize, for those that
2 3 4 5 6	Appreciate it. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate that. And then looking at our last specific caller. This is a 202 area code. You're un-muted. Do you have any	2 3 4 5 6	another opportunity to provide clarification on some of your earlier comments. We really do appreciate that. THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Rob. Appreciate it. Again, want to emphasize, for those that may maybe weren't able to join us for those first
2 3 4 5 6	Appreciate it. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate that. And then looking at our last specific caller. This is a 202 area code. You're un-muted. Do you have any questions or comments?	2 3 4 5 6 7	another opportunity to provide clarification on some of your earlier comments. We really do appreciate that. THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Rob. Appreciate it. Again, want to emphasize, for those that may maybe weren't able to join us for those first couple meetings, we have both full transcripts posted
2 3 4 5 6 7	Appreciate it. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate that. And then looking at our last specific caller. This is a 202 area code. You're un-muted. Do you have any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	another opportunity to provide clarification on some of your earlier comments. We really do appreciate that. THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Rob. Appreciate it. Again, want to emphasize, for those that may maybe weren't able to join us for those first
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	Appreciate it. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate that. And then looking at our last specific caller. This is a 202 area code. You're un-muted. Do you have any questions or comments? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, but it's a great discussion, and I appreciate your efforts. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	another opportunity to provide clarification on some of your earlier comments. We really do appreciate that. THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Rob. Appreciate it. Again, want to emphasize, for those that may maybe weren't able to join us for those first couple meetings, we have both full transcripts posted online so you can see the discussion points. And then we also have Robert's full presentation from Meeting Number 2 posted online as well.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Appreciate it. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate that. And then looking at our last specific caller. This is a 202 area code. You're un-muted. Do you have any questions or comments? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, but it's a great discussion, and I appreciate your efforts. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate your time, sir, and your participation as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	another opportunity to provide clarification on some of your earlier comments. We really do appreciate that. THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Rob. Appreciate it. Again, want to emphasize, for those that may maybe weren't able to join us for those first couple meetings, we have both full transcripts posted online so you can see the discussion points. And then we also have Robert's full presentation from Meeting Number 2 posted online as well. So if we wanted, we could take a little
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Appreciate it. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate that. And then looking at our last specific caller. This is a 202 area code. You're un-muted. Do you have any questions or comments? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, but it's a great discussion, and I appreciate your efforts. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate your time, sir, and your participation as well.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	another opportunity to provide clarification on some of your earlier comments. We really do appreciate that. THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Rob. Appreciate it. Again, want to emphasize, for those that may maybe weren't able to join us for those first couple meetings, we have both full transcripts posted online so you can see the discussion points. And then we also have Robert's full presentation from Meeting Number 2 posted online as well. So if we wanted, we could take a little break.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Appreciate it. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate that. And then looking at our last specific caller. This is a 202 area code. You're un-muted. Do you have any questions or comments? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, but it's a great discussion, and I appreciate your efforts. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate your time, sir, and your participation as well. So that does cover everyone that was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	another opportunity to provide clarification on some of your earlier comments. We really do appreciate that. THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Rob. Appreciate it. Again, want to emphasize, for those that may maybe weren't able to join us for those first couple meetings, we have both full transcripts posted online so you can see the discussion points. And then we also have Robert's full presentation from Meeting Number 2 posted online as well. So if we wanted, we could take a little break. Again, kind of just keeping an eye on who
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Appreciate it. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate that. And then looking at our last specific caller. This is a 202 area code. You're un-muted. Do you have any questions or comments? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, but it's a great discussion, and I appreciate your efforts. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate your time, sir, and your participation as well. So that does cover everyone that was online and with a hand raised or calling in.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	another opportunity to provide clarification on some of your earlier comments. We really do appreciate that. THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Rob. Appreciate it. Again, want to emphasize, for those that may maybe weren't able to join us for those first couple meetings, we have both full transcripts posted online so you can see the discussion points. And then we also have Robert's full presentation from Meeting Number 2 posted online as well. So if we wanted, we could take a little break. Again, kind of just keeping an eye on who we have joining us here. We've got a handful still
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Appreciate it. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate that. And then looking at our last specific caller. This is a 202 area code. You're un-muted. Do you have any questions or comments? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, but it's a great discussion, and I appreciate your efforts. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate your time, sir, and your participation as well. So that does cover everyone that was online and with a hand raised or calling in. Still, we've got a couple here in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	another opportunity to provide clarification on some of your earlier comments. We really do appreciate that. THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Rob. Appreciate it. Again, want to emphasize, for those that may maybe weren't able to join us for those first couple meetings, we have both full transcripts posted online so you can see the discussion points. And then we also have Robert's full presentation from Meeting Number 2 posted online as well. So if we wanted, we could take a little break. Again, kind of just keeping an eye on who we have joining us here. We've got a handful still with us. But again, the Department didn't really have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Appreciate it. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate that. And then looking at our last specific caller. This is a 202 area code. You're un-muted. Do you have any questions or comments? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, but it's a great discussion, and I appreciate your efforts. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate your time, sir, and your participation as well. So that does cover everyone that was online and with a hand raised or calling in. Still, we've got a couple here in the auditorium. The podium's up if there's any further	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	another opportunity to provide clarification on some of your earlier comments. We really do appreciate that. THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Rob. Appreciate it. Again, want to emphasize, for those that may maybe weren't able to join us for those first couple meetings, we have both full transcripts posted online so you can see the discussion points. And then we also have Robert's full presentation from Meeting Number 2 posted online as well. So if we wanted, we could take a little break. Again, kind of just keeping an eye on who we have joining us here. We've got a handful still with us. But again, the Department didn't really have any additional material that would be new. What we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Appreciate it. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate that. And then looking at our last specific caller. This is a 202 area code. You're un-muted. Do you have any questions or comments? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, but it's a great discussion, and I appreciate your efforts. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate your time, sir, and your participation as well. So that does cover everyone that was online and with a hand raised or calling in. Still, we've got a couple here in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	another opportunity to provide clarification on some of your earlier comments. We really do appreciate that. THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Rob. Appreciate it. Again, want to emphasize, for those that may maybe weren't able to join us for those first couple meetings, we have both full transcripts posted online so you can see the discussion points. And then we also have Robert's full presentation from Meeting Number 2 posted online as well. So if we wanted, we could take a little break. Again, kind of just keeping an eye on who we have joining us here. We've got a handful still with us. But again, the Department didn't really have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Appreciate it. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate that. And then looking at our last specific caller. This is a 202 area code. You're un-muted. Do you have any questions or comments? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, but it's a great discussion, and I appreciate your efforts. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate your time, sir, and your participation as well. So that does cover everyone that was online and with a hand raised or calling in. Still, we've got a couple here in the auditorium. The podium's up if there's any further discussion.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	another opportunity to provide clarification on some of your earlier comments. We really do appreciate that. THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Rob. Appreciate it. Again, want to emphasize, for those that may maybe weren't able to join us for those first couple meetings, we have both full transcripts posted online so you can see the discussion points. And then we also have Robert's full presentation from Meeting Number 2 posted online as well. So if we wanted, we could take a little break. Again, kind of just keeping an eye on who we have joining us here. We've got a handful still with us. But again, the Department didn't really have any additional material that would be new. What we really wanted to emphasize is what we have heard, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Appreciate it. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate that. And then looking at our last specific caller. This is a 202 area code. You're un-muted. Do you have any questions or comments? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, but it's a great discussion, and I appreciate your efforts. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate your time, sir, and your participation as well. So that does cover everyone that was online and with a hand raised or calling in. Still, we've got a couple here in the auditorium. The podium's up if there's any further discussion. And we also have the chat boxes open. I know Lisa and I are monitoring those. We haven't seen any chats at this point.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	another opportunity to provide clarification on some of your earlier comments. We really do appreciate that. THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Rob. Appreciate it. Again, want to emphasize, for those that may maybe weren't able to join us for those first couple meetings, we have both full transcripts posted online so you can see the discussion points. And then we also have Robert's full presentation from Meeting Number 2 posted online as well. So if we wanted, we could take a little break. Again, kind of just keeping an eye on who we have joining us here. We've got a handful still with us. But again, the Department didn't really have any additional material that would be new. What we really wanted to emphasize is what we have heard, the comments that have been made. And so, again, I think some of the discussion we've had today is right on par with that,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Appreciate it. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate that. And then looking at our last specific caller. This is a 202 area code. You're un-muted. Do you have any questions or comments? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, but it's a great discussion, and I appreciate your efforts. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate your time, sir, and your participation as well. So that does cover everyone that was online and with a hand raised or calling in. Still, we've got a couple here in the auditorium. The podium's up if there's any further discussion. And we also have the chat boxes open. I know Lisa and I are monitoring those. We haven't seen any chats at this point. So, again, maybe just an opportunity for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	another opportunity to provide clarification on some of your earlier comments. We really do appreciate that. THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Rob. Appreciate it. Again, want to emphasize, for those that may maybe weren't able to join us for those first couple meetings, we have both full transcripts posted online so you can see the discussion points. And then we also have Robert's full presentation from Meeting Number 2 posted online as well. So if we wanted, we could take a little break. Again, kind of just keeping an eye on who we have joining us here. We've got a handful still with us. But again, the Department didn't really have any additional material that would be new. What we really wanted to emphasize is what we have heard, the comments that have been made. And so, again, I think some of the discussion we've had today is right on par with that, kind of just making sure we're on the same page in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Appreciate it. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate that. And then looking at our last specific caller. This is a 202 area code. You're un-muted. Do you have any questions or comments? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, but it's a great discussion, and I appreciate your efforts. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate your time, sir, and your participation as well. So that does cover everyone that was online and with a hand raised or calling in. Still, we've got a couple here in the auditorium. The podium's up if there's any further discussion. And we also have the chat boxes open. I know Lisa and I are monitoring those. We haven't seen any chats at this point. So, again, maybe just an opportunity for those that are online if you'd like to raise your hand	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	another opportunity to provide clarification on some of your earlier comments. We really do appreciate that. THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Rob. Appreciate it. Again, want to emphasize, for those that may maybe weren't able to join us for those first couple meetings, we have both full transcripts posted online so you can see the discussion points. And then we also have Robert's full presentation from Meeting Number 2 posted online as well. So if we wanted, we could take a little break. Again, kind of just keeping an eye on who we have joining us here. We've got a handful still with us. But again, the Department didn't really have any additional material that would be new. What we really wanted to emphasize is what we have heard, the comments that have been made. And so, again, I think some of the discussion we've had today is right on par with that, kind of just making sure we're on the same page in terms of each listening to each other and taking in as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Appreciate it. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate that. And then looking at our last specific caller. This is a 202 area code. You're un-muted. Do you have any questions or comments? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, but it's a great discussion, and I appreciate your efforts. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate your time, sir, and your participation as well. So that does cover everyone that was online and with a hand raised or calling in. Still, we've got a couple here in the auditorium. The podium's up if there's any further discussion. And we also have the chat boxes open. I know Lisa and I are monitoring those. We haven't seen any chats at this point. So, again, maybe just an opportunity for those that are online if you'd like to raise your hand and engage.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	another opportunity to provide clarification on some of your earlier comments. We really do appreciate that. THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Rob. Appreciate it. Again, want to emphasize, for those that may maybe weren't able to join us for those first couple meetings, we have both full transcripts posted online so you can see the discussion points. And then we also have Robert's full presentation from Meeting Number 2 posted online as well. So if we wanted, we could take a little break. Again, kind of just keeping an eye on who we have joining us here. We've got a handful still with us. But again, the Department didn't really have any additional material that would be new. What we really wanted to emphasize is what we have heard, the comments that have been made. And so, again, I think some of the discussion we've had today is right on par with that, kind of just making sure we're on the same page in terms of each listening to each other and taking in as much information as possible.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Appreciate it. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate that. And then looking at our last specific caller. This is a 202 area code. You're un-muted. Do you have any questions or comments? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, but it's a great discussion, and I appreciate your efforts. THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate your time, sir, and your participation as well. So that does cover everyone that was online and with a hand raised or calling in. Still, we've got a couple here in the auditorium. The podium's up if there's any further discussion. And we also have the chat boxes open. I know Lisa and I are monitoring those. We haven't seen any chats at this point. So, again, maybe just an opportunity for those that are online if you'd like to raise your hand	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	another opportunity to provide clarification on some of your earlier comments. We really do appreciate that. THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Rob. Appreciate it. Again, want to emphasize, for those that may maybe weren't able to join us for those first couple meetings, we have both full transcripts posted online so you can see the discussion points. And then we also have Robert's full presentation from Meeting Number 2 posted online as well. So if we wanted, we could take a little break. Again, kind of just keeping an eye on who we have joining us here. We've got a handful still with us. But again, the Department didn't really have any additional material that would be new. What we really wanted to emphasize is what we have heard, the comments that have been made. And so, again, I think some of the discussion we've had today is right on par with that, kind of just making sure we're on the same page in terms of each listening to each other and taking in as

	Page 54		Page 56
1	So we are right here at 4:10. We'll go	1	He's one of our engineering Enterprise
	ahead and take a short, 10-minute break. We're going		Technology network engineers, and he does a lot of
	to be available here until 5:00.		plant reviews and oh, can you state your name when
4	And so why don't we just plan on coming		I when I'm done making my question for you.
5	back online here at 4:20?	5	Thanks.
6	Thank you.	6	You know, we we are going to look at
7	(Recess taken from 1:09:20 to 1:15:00 of	-	that. I know it's been done a lot back East, and it's
8	audio file.)		typically residential. You know, we may have some
9	THE MODERATOR: All right, everyone. Thanks for		concerns on the integrity of road system based on the
	that.		depth.
11	We're going to go ahead and sign back on	11	
	here. And looking at the participant list, we've		placing it shallow, any information on the types of
	still got a handful with us, but haven't seen anyone		conduits that would be used that could take that
	raise their hand and no new questions or comments have		freeze/thaw-type stuff or the slurry that was is
	come through the chat. So we're going to go ahead and		placed in micro-trenching I don't know if you've
	just stand by.		done any of those yet, but we'd be interested in
17	What we have up on the screen right now		how how that's worked.
	is, again, the ITD Administrative Rulemaking web page,	18	ADRIAN PRESCOTT: So to state my name again,
	specifically with the Utility Accommodation documents.	-	I'm Adrian Prescott with Direct Communications.
20	And again, really just encourage everyone	20	Is that working, you guys?
	to not only think about what you've heard over the	21	
	past three meetings, but really take a close look at	22	
	the documents that are posted, whether you want to	23	
	draft or comment on the draft that we have up	24	
	there. That's the one from June 2021.	25	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Unintelligible] hear it.
	Page 55		Page 57
1		1	
	We also have the existing policies,		
2	We also have the existing policies, Utility Accommodation Policy from July 2003, Guide for		LISA HOAG: Maybe she can just use one of these mics.
2 3	We also have the existing policies, Utility Accommodation Policy from July 2003, Guide for Utility Management, January 2012. Those would both be	2	LISA HOAG: Maybe she can just use one of these mics. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. You can come up.
2 3 4	We also have the existing policies, Utility Accommodation Policy from July 2003, Guide for Utility Management, January 2012. Those would both be great documents to open up, review, and let us know if	2 3	LISA HOAG: Maybe she can just use one of these mics. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. You can come up. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay.
2 3 4 5	We also have the existing policies, Utility Accommodation Policy from July 2003, Guide for Utility Management, January 2012. Those would both be	2 3 4	LISA HOAG: Maybe she can just use one of these mics. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. You can come up. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6	We also have the existing policies, Utility Accommodation Policy from July 2003, Guide for Utility Management, January 2012. Those would both be great documents to open up, review, and let us know if you have any comments as well as any thoughts on	2 3 4 5	LISA HOAG: Maybe she can just use one of these mics. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. You can come up. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: Join us on the round table here. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, there you go.
2 3 4 5 6	We also have the existing policies, Utility Accommodation Policy from July 2003, Guide for Utility Management, January 2012. Those would both be great documents to open up, review, and let us know if you have any comments as well as any thoughts on process, procedure. We're really open to any and all	2 3 4 5 6	LISA HOAG: Maybe she can just use one of these mics. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. You can come up. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: Join us on the round table here. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, there you go.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	We also have the existing policies, Utility Accommodation Policy from July 2003, Guide for Utility Management, January 2012. Those would both be great documents to open up, review, and let us know if you have any comments as well as any thoughts on process, procedure. We're really open to any and all types of feedback.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	LISA HOAG: Maybe she can just use one of these mics. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. You can come up. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: Join us on the round table here. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, there you go. MR. BEACHLER: There you go.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	We also have the existing policies, Utility Accommodation Policy from July 2003, Guide for Utility Management, January 2012. Those would both be great documents to open up, review, and let us know if you have any comments as well as any thoughts on process, procedure. We're really open to any and all types of feedback. So again, we're going to be live here at the auditorium until 5:00 p.m. this evening and want to continue to monitor for new folks that may jump	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	LISA HOAG: Maybe she can just use one of these mics. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. You can come up. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: Join us on the round table here. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, there you go. MR. BEACHLER: There you go. THE MODERATOR: Yeah, I like that. A little
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	We also have the existing policies, Utility Accommodation Policy from July 2003, Guide for Utility Management, January 2012. Those would both be great documents to open up, review, and let us know if you have any comments as well as any thoughts on process, procedure. We're really open to any and all types of feedback. So again, we're going to be live here at the auditorium until 5:00 p.m. this evening and want to continue to monitor for new folks that may jump online or call in.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	LISA HOAG: Maybe she can just use one of these mics. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. You can come up. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: Join us on the round table here. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, there you go. MR. BEACHLER: There you go. THE MODERATOR: Yeah, I like that. A little more a little more informal. I like that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: [Unintelligible] just press this [unintelligible]?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	We also have the existing policies, Utility Accommodation Policy from July 2003, Guide for Utility Management, January 2012. Those would both be great documents to open up, review, and let us know if you have any comments as well as any thoughts on process, procedure. We're really open to any and all types of feedback. So again, we're going to be live here at the auditorium until 5:00 p.m. this evening and want to continue to monitor for new folks that may jump online or call in. Again, just encourage those that want to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	LISA HOAG: Maybe she can just use one of these mics. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. You can come up. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: Join us on the round table here. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, there you go. MR. BEACHLER: There you go. THE MODERATOR: Yeah, I like that. A little more a little more informal. I like that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: [Unintelligible] just press this [unintelligible]? MR. BEACHLER: Yeah.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12	We also have the existing policies, Utility Accommodation Policy from July 2003, Guide for Utility Management, January 2012. Those would both be great documents to open up, review, and let us know if you have any comments as well as any thoughts on process, procedure. We're really open to any and all types of feedback. So again, we're going to be live here at the auditorium until 5:00 p.m. this evening and want to continue to monitor for new folks that may jump online or call in. Again, just encourage those that want to make reference to a document, a policy, a potential	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	LISA HOAG: Maybe she can just use one of these mics. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. You can come up. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: Join us on the round table here. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, there you go. MR. BEACHLER: There you go. THE MODERATOR: Yeah, I like that. A little more a little more informal. I like that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: [Unintelligible] just press this [unintelligible]? MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. To state my name again,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	We also have the existing policies, Utility Accommodation Policy from July 2003, Guide for Utility Management, January 2012. Those would both be great documents to open up, review, and let us know if you have any comments as well as any thoughts on process, procedure. We're really open to any and all types of feedback. So again, we're going to be live here at the auditorium until 5:00 p.m. this evening and want to continue to monitor for new folks that may jump online or call in. Again, just encourage those that want to make reference to a document, a policy, a potential question, go ahead and use that raise-your-hand	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	LISA HOAG: Maybe she can just use one of these mics. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. You can come up. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: Join us on the round table here. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, there you go. MR. BEACHLER: There you go. THE MODERATOR: Yeah, I like that. A little more a little more informal. I like that. A little more a little more informal. I like that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: [Unintelligible] just press this [unintelligible]? MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. To state my name again, I'm Adrian Prescott with Direct Communications.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	We also have the existing policies, Utility Accommodation Policy from July 2003, Guide for Utility Management, January 2012. Those would both be great documents to open up, review, and let us know if you have any comments as well as any thoughts on process, procedure. We're really open to any and all types of feedback. So again, we're going to be live here at the auditorium until 5:00 p.m. this evening and want to continue to monitor for new folks that may jump online or call in. Again, just encourage those that want to make reference to a document, a policy, a potential question, go ahead and use that raise-your-hand function within the WebEx application.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	LISA HOAG: Maybe she can just use one of these mics. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. You can come up. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: Join us on the round table here. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, there you go. MR. BEACHLER: There you go. THE MODERATOR: Yeah, I like that. A little more a little more informal. I like that. A little more a little more informal. I like that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: [Unintelligible] just press this [unintelligible]? MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. To state my name again, I'm Adrian Prescott with Direct Communications. So with the micro-trenching, what we've
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	We also have the existing policies, Utility Accommodation Policy from July 2003, Guide for Utility Management, January 2012. Those would both be great documents to open up, review, and let us know if you have any comments as well as any thoughts on process, procedure. We're really open to any and all types of feedback. So again, we're going to be live here at the auditorium until 5:00 p.m. this evening and want to continue to monitor for new folks that may jump online or call in. Again, just encourage those that want to make reference to a document, a policy, a potential question, go ahead and use that raise-your-hand function within the WebEx application. So just wanted to touch base. Not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	LISA HOAG: Maybe she can just use one of these mics. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. You can come up. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: Join us on the round table here. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, there you go. MR. BEACHLER: There you go. THE MODERATOR: Yeah, I like that. A little more a little more informal. I like that. A little more a little more informal. I like that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: [Unintelligible] just press this [unintelligible]? MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. To state my name again, I'm Adrian Prescott with Direct Communications. So with the micro-trenching, what we've found is we are using the micro-ducts, which are 18 by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	We also have the existing policies, Utility Accommodation Policy from July 2003, Guide for Utility Management, January 2012. Those would both be great documents to open up, review, and let us know if you have any comments as well as any thoughts on process, procedure. We're really open to any and all types of feedback. So again, we're going to be live here at the auditorium until 5:00 p.m. this evening and want to continue to monitor for new folks that may jump online or call in. Again, just encourage those that want to make reference to a document, a policy, a potential question, go ahead and use that raise-your-hand function within the WebEx application. So just wanted to touch base. Not necessarily going on break, but wanted to let you know	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	LISA HOAG: Maybe she can just use one of these mics. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. You can come up. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: Join us on the round table here. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, there you go. MR. BEACHLER: There you go. THE MODERATOR: Yeah, I like that. A little more a little more informal. I like that. A little more a little more informal. I like that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: [Unintelligible] just press this [unintelligible]? MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. To state my name again, I'm Adrian Prescott with Direct Communications. So with the micro-trenching, what we've found is we are using the micro-ducts, which are 18 by 14 millimeters, and we're placing four of those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	We also have the existing policies, Utility Accommodation Policy from July 2003, Guide for Utility Management, January 2012. Those would both be great documents to open up, review, and let us know if you have any comments as well as any thoughts on process, procedure. We're really open to any and all types of feedback. So again, we're going to be live here at the auditorium until 5:00 p.m. this evening and want to continue to monitor for new folks that may jump online or call in. Again, just encourage those that want to make reference to a document, a policy, a potential question, go ahead and use that raise-your-hand function within the WebEx application. So just wanted to touch base. Not necessarily going on break, but wanted to let you know we're all here and available for questions and/or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	LISA HOAG: Maybe she can just use one of these mics. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. You can come up. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: Join us on the round table here. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, there you go. MR. BEACHLER: There you go. THE MODERATOR: Yeah, I like that. A little more a little more informal. I like that. A little more a little more informal. I like that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: [Unintelligible] just press this [unintelligible]? MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. To state my name again, I'm Adrian Prescott with Direct Communications. So with the micro-trenching, what we've found is we are using the micro-ducts, which are 18 by 14 millimeters, and we're placing four of those anywhere from 18 to 24 inches. Like Matthew stated,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	We also have the existing policies, Utility Accommodation Policy from July 2003, Guide for Utility Management, January 2012. Those would both be great documents to open up, review, and let us know if you have any comments as well as any thoughts on process, procedure. We're really open to any and all types of feedback. So again, we're going to be live here at the auditorium until 5:00 p.m. this evening and want to continue to monitor for new folks that may jump online or call in. Again, just encourage those that want to make reference to a document, a policy, a potential question, go ahead and use that raise-your-hand function within the WebEx application. So just wanted to touch base. Not necessarily going on break, but wanted to let you know we're all here and available for questions and/or comments.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	LISA HOAG: Maybe she can just use one of these mics. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. You can come up. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: Join us on the round table here. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, there you go. MR. BEACHLER: There you go. THE MODERATOR: Yeah, I like that. A little more a little more informal. I like that. A little more a little more informal. I like that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: [Unintelligible] just press this [unintelligible]? MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. To state my name again, I'm Adrian Prescott with Direct Communications. So with the micro-trenching, what we've found is we are using the micro-ducts, which are 18 by 14 millimeters, and we're placing four of those anywhere from 18 to 24 inches. Like Matthew stated, that is the 24 inches is right where minimum is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	We also have the existing policies, Utility Accommodation Policy from July 2003, Guide for Utility Management, January 2012. Those would both be great documents to open up, review, and let us know if you have any comments as well as any thoughts on process, procedure. We're really open to any and all types of feedback. So again, we're going to be live here at the auditorium until 5:00 p.m. this evening and want to continue to monitor for new folks that may jump online or call in. Again, just encourage those that want to make reference to a document, a policy, a potential question, go ahead and use that raise-your-hand function within the WebEx application. So just wanted to touch base. Not necessarily going on break, but wanted to let you know we're all here and available for questions and/or comments. Thanks.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	LISA HOAG: Maybe she can just use one of these mics. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. You can come up. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: Join us on the round table here. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, there you go. MR. BEACHLER: There you go. THE MODERATOR: Yeah, I like that. A little more a little more informal. I like that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: [Unintelligible] just press this [unintelligible]? MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. To state my name again, I'm Adrian Prescott with Direct Communications. So with the micro-trenching, what we've found is we are using the micro-ducts, which are 18 by 14 millimeters, and we're placing four of those anywhere from 18 to 24 inches. Like Matthew stated, that is the 24 inches is right where minimum is right now. And so I have asked my construction
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	We also have the existing policies, Utility Accommodation Policy from July 2003, Guide for Utility Management, January 2012. Those would both be great documents to open up, review, and let us know if you have any comments as well as any thoughts on process, procedure. We're really open to any and all types of feedback. So again, we're going to be live here at the auditorium until 5:00 p.m. this evening and want to continue to monitor for new folks that may jump online or call in. Again, just encourage those that want to make reference to a document, a policy, a potential question, go ahead and use that raise-your-hand function within the WebEx application. So just wanted to touch base. Not necessarily going on break, but wanted to let you know we're all here and available for questions and/or comments. Thanks. MR. BEACHLER: So one of the topics at the last	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	LISA HOAG: Maybe she can just use one of these mics. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. You can come up. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: Join us on the round table here. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, there you go. MR. BEACHLER: There you go. THE MODERATOR: Yeah, I like that. A little more a little more informal. I like that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: [Unintelligible] just press this [unintelligible]? MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. To state my name again, I'm Adrian Prescott with Direct Communications. So with the micro-trenching, what we've found is we are using the micro-ducts, which are 18 by 14 millimeters, and we're placing four of those anywhere from 18 to 24 inches. Like Matthew stated, that is the 24 inches is right where minimum is right now. And so I have asked my construction manager to get me more information to see if in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	We also have the existing policies, Utility Accommodation Policy from July 2003, Guide for Utility Management, January 2012. Those would both be great documents to open up, review, and let us know if you have any comments as well as any thoughts on process, procedure. We're really open to any and all types of feedback. So again, we're going to be live here at the auditorium until 5:00 p.m. this evening and want to continue to monitor for new folks that may jump online or call in. Again, just encourage those that want to make reference to a document, a policy, a potential question, go ahead and use that raise-your-hand function within the WebEx application. So just wanted to touch base. Not necessarily going on break, but wanted to let you know we're all here and available for questions and/or comments. Thanks. MR. BEACHLER: So one of the topics at the last meeting that you provided some comments to us on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	LISA HOAG: Maybe she can just use one of these mics. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. You can come up. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: Join us on the round table here. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, there you go. MR. BEACHLER: There you go. THE MODERATOR: Yeah, I like that. A little more a little more informal. I like that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: [Unintelligible] just press this [unintelligible]? MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. To state my name again, I'm Adrian Prescott with Direct Communications. So with the micro-trenching, what we've found is we are using the micro-ducts, which are 18 by 14 millimeters, and we're placing four of those anywhere from 18 to 24 inches. Like Matthew stated, that is the 24 inches is right where minimum is right now. And so I have asked my construction manager to get me more information to see if in the future we'll be able to go deeper than that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	We also have the existing policies, Utility Accommodation Policy from July 2003, Guide for Utility Management, January 2012. Those would both be great documents to open up, review, and let us know if you have any comments as well as any thoughts on process, procedure. We're really open to any and all types of feedback. So again, we're going to be live here at the auditorium until 5:00 p.m. this evening and want to continue to monitor for new folks that may jump online or call in. Again, just encourage those that want to make reference to a document, a policy, a potential question, go ahead and use that raise-your-hand function within the WebEx application. So just wanted to touch base. Not necessarily going on break, but wanted to let you know we're all here and available for questions and/or comments. MR. BEACHLER: So one of the topics at the last meeting that you provided some comments to us on micro-trenching. So and Matthew commented on that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	LISA HOAG: Maybe she can just use one of these mics. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. You can come up. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: Join us on the round table here. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, there you go. MR. BEACHLER: There you go. THE MODERATOR: Yeah, I like that. A little more a little more informal. I like that. A little more a little more informal. I like that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: [Unintelligible] just press this [unintelligible]? MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. To state my name again, I'm Adrian Prescott with Direct Communications. So with the micro-trenching, what we've found is we are using the micro-ducts, which are 18 by 14 millimeters, and we're placing four of those anywhere from 18 to 24 inches. Like Matthew stated, that is the 24 inches is right where minimum is right now. And so I have asked my construction manager to get me more information to see if in the future we'll be able to go deeper than that. What we've found with working with cities
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	We also have the existing policies, Utility Accommodation Policy from July 2003, Guide for Utility Management, January 2012. Those would both be great documents to open up, review, and let us know if you have any comments as well as any thoughts on process, procedure. We're really open to any and all types of feedback. So again, we're going to be live here at the auditorium until 5:00 p.m. this evening and want to continue to monitor for new folks that may jump online or call in. Again, just encourage those that want to make reference to a document, a policy, a potential question, go ahead and use that raise-your-hand function within the WebEx application. So just wanted to touch base. Not necessarily going on break, but wanted to let you know we're all here and available for questions and/or comments. Thanks. MR. BEACHLER: So one of the topics at the last meeting that you provided some comments to us on micro-trenching. So and Matthew commented on that online.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	LISA HOAG: Maybe she can just use one of these mics. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. You can come up. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: Join us on the round table here. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, there you go. MR. BEACHLER: There you go. THE MODERATOR: Yeah, I like that. A little more a little more informal. I like that. A little more a little more informal. I like that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: [Unintelligible] just press this [unintelligible]? MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. To state my name again, I'm Adrian Prescott with Direct Communications. So with the micro-trenching, what we've found is we are using the micro-ducts, which are 18 by 14 millimeters, and we're placing four of those anywhere from 18 to 24 inches. Like Matthew stated, that is the 24 inches is right where minimum is right now. And so I have asked my construction manager to get me more information to see if in the future we'll be able to go deeper than that. What we've found with working with cities over in eastern Idaho is we have agreed to work on a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	We also have the existing policies, Utility Accommodation Policy from July 2003, Guide for Utility Management, January 2012. Those would both be great documents to open up, review, and let us know if you have any comments as well as any thoughts on process, procedure. We're really open to any and all types of feedback. So again, we're going to be live here at the auditorium until 5:00 p.m. this evening and want to continue to monitor for new folks that may jump online or call in. Again, just encourage those that want to make reference to a document, a policy, a potential question, go ahead and use that raise-your-hand function within the WebEx application. So just wanted to touch base. Not necessarily going on break, but wanted to let you know we're all here and available for questions and/or comments. MR. BEACHLER: So one of the topics at the last meeting that you provided some comments to us on micro-trenching. So and Matthew commented on that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	LISA HOAG: Maybe she can just use one of these mics. MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. You can come up. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. MR. BEACHLER: Join us on the round table here. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, there you go. MR. BEACHLER: There you go. THE MODERATOR: Yeah, I like that. A little more a little more informal. I like that. A little more a little more informal. I like that. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: [Unintelligible] just press this [unintelligible]? MR. BEACHLER: Yeah. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Okay. To state my name again, I'm Adrian Prescott with Direct Communications. So with the micro-trenching, what we've found is we are using the micro-ducts, which are 18 by 14 millimeters, and we're placing four of those anywhere from 18 to 24 inches. Like Matthew stated, that is the 24 inches is right where minimum is right now. And so I have asked my construction manager to get me more information to see if in the future we'll be able to go deeper than that. What we've found with working with cities

	Page 58		Page 60
			· · · · ·
	we're working with them on what roads they're not		these types of river canyons.
	touching for multiple years. So we're not going into a brand-new road that they're going to be doing in the	2	
	a next five years. Or that they have just recently		it had a lot of subsurface drainage features because it was such an impervious surface, and so a lot of the
	done. We're trying to work with them on projects that		drainage features are right under the road base. And
	are, you know, future projects.		so they were concerned a little bit about doing that,
			not going too deep where we could be cutting some of
	10 years down the road, they go ahead and they have to		these covers and drainage facilities.
	redo the road base. We've agreed that we will come	9	So we're definitely would like to look
	back in, and we will as soon as they, you know,		into that and see if we can accommodate that as an
	tear out the first portion of that road, once all of		alternative installation method.
	our stuff is exposed, we will dig down below grade and	12	ADRIAN PRESCOTT: I have asked my construction
	push all of our stuff down. So we are accommodating	13	manager to get me more specific information for you
14	for that in the slack to be able to move those if that		guys on how shallow we can go as well, so that you can
15	makes sense.	15	accommodate
16		16	MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm.
17	projects that are more of those we can't get off	17	5 5 5 5
18			come to one of those drainages, how you can reduce the
	is where we are interested in working with ITD on		depth as well as the specific PSI of what you put in
	micro-trenching, kind of like you guys stated before.		after and then specifics on the tarring so over the
21			top. So I will have all of those in the written
	a fact of "are you guys going to redo it in the next		comments for you so that you can look into it further.
	b five years? Can we just get in when you do it, or is	23	,
	this something that we can, you know, push out and then come back in and dig down further," if that makes		working with as soon as we have another project with micro-trenching up in eastern Idaho, both
23	then come back in and dig down further, in that makes	25	with meto-trenching up in eastern idano, both
	Page 59		Page 61
	-	1	
	sense.		District 5 and District 6 have agreed to come out and
1	MR. BEACHLER: Those are great points.	2	District 5 and District 6 have agreed to come out and look at that as so they can give you guys more
1	MR. BEACHLER: Those are great points. And again, that'd be a new, innovative,	2 3	District 5 and District 6 have agreed to come out and look at that as so they can give you guys more feedback on on the project installation and the
3	MR. BEACHLER: Those are great points. And again, that'd be a new, innovative, alternative installation method for these types of	2 3 4	District 5 and District 6 have agreed to come out and look at that as so they can give you guys more feedback on on the project installation and the machine and all of the information there. So
	 sense. MR. BEACHLER: Those are great points. And again, that'd be a new, innovative, alternative installation method for these types of facilities, as opposed to our traditional couple 	2 3 4 5	District 5 and District 6 have agreed to come out and look at that as so they can give you guys more feedback on on the project installation and the machine and all of the information there. So MR. BEACHLER: I've got another question for
	MR. BEACHLER: Those are great points. And again, that'd be a new, innovative, alternative installation method for these types of	2 3 4 5	District 5 and District 6 have agreed to come out and look at that as so they can give you guys more feedback on on the project installation and the machine and all of the information there. So MR. BEACHLER: I've got another question for you.
	 sense. MR. BEACHLER: Those are great points. And again, that'd be a new, innovative, alternative installation method for these types of facilities, as opposed to our traditional couple 2 2, 3, 4, 6 2-inch conduits off to the side where you've got plenty of room. 	2 3 4 5 6 7	District 5 and District 6 have agreed to come out and look at that as so they can give you guys more feedback on on the project installation and the machine and all of the information there. So MR. BEACHLER: I've got another question for you.
	 sense. MR. BEACHLER: Those are great points. And again, that'd be a new, innovative, alternative installation method for these types of facilities, as opposed to our traditional couple 2 2, 3, 4, 6 2-inch conduits off to the side where you've got plenty of room. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	District 5 and District 6 have agreed to come out and look at that as so they can give you guys more feedback on on the project installation and the machine and all of the information there. So MR. BEACHLER: I've got another question for you. When you're doing in this case, you've
	 sense. MR. BEACHLER: Those are great points. And again, that'd be a new, innovative, alternative installation method for these types of facilities, as opposed to our traditional couple 2 2, 3, 4, 6 2-inch conduits off to the side where you've got plenty of room. We had an inquiry from Commerce about a project we were doing in south central Idaho, it was a resurfacing-type project, reconstruction, but it's 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	District 5 and District 6 have agreed to come out and look at that as so they can give you guys more feedback on on the project installation and the machine and all of the information there. So MR. BEACHLER: I've got another question for you. When you're doing in this case, you've noted like four ducts were placed. Are you populating all of those? Are you kind of just running one, and you've got some spares in there? What's your plan for
	 sense. MR. BEACHLER: Those are great points. And again, that'd be a new, innovative, alternative installation method for these types of facilities, as opposed to our traditional couple 2 2, 3, 4, 6 2-inch conduits off to the side where you've got plenty of room. We had an inquiry from Commerce about a project we were doing in south central Idaho, it was a resurfacing-type project, reconstruction, but it's basically built on rock. So I said, "Hey. Could 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	District 5 and District 6 have agreed to come out and look at that as so they can give you guys more feedback on on the project installation and the machine and all of the information there. So MR. BEACHLER: I've got another question for you. When you're doing in this case, you've noted like four ducts were placed. Are you populating all of those? Are you kind of just running one, and you've got some spares in there? What's your plan for using those excess capacity?
	 sense. MR. BEACHLER: Those are great points. And again, that'd be a new, innovative, alternative installation method for these types of facilities, as opposed to our traditional couple 2 2, 3, 4, 6 2-inch conduits off to the side where you've got plenty of room. We had an inquiry from Commerce about a project we were doing in south central Idaho, it was a resurfacing-type project, reconstruction, but it's basically built on rock. So I said, "Hey. Could we" I talked to the project manager "could 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	District 5 and District 6 have agreed to come out and look at that as so they can give you guys more feedback on on the project installation and the machine and all of the information there. So MR. BEACHLER: I've got another question for you. When you're doing in this case, you've noted like four ducts were placed. Are you populating all of those? Are you kind of just running one, and you've got some spares in there? What's your plan for using those excess capacity? ADRIAN PRESCOTT: So we always, as a company,
2 3 4 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 10 11 12 13	 sense. MR. BEACHLER: Those are great points. And again, that'd be a new, innovative, alternative installation method for these types of facilities, as opposed to our traditional couple 2 2, 3, 4, 6 2-inch conduits off to the side where you've got plenty of room. We had an inquiry from Commerce about a project we were doing in south central Idaho, it was a resurfacing-type project, reconstruction, but it's basically built on rock. So I said, "Hey. Could we" I talked to the project manager "could we" "can we accommodate any conduits? How far 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	District 5 and District 6 have agreed to come out and look at that as so they can give you guys more feedback on on the project installation and the machine and all of the information there. So MR. BEACHLER: I've got another question for you. When you're doing in this case, you've noted like four ducts were placed. Are you populating all of those? Are you kind of just running one, and you've got some spares in there? What's your plan for using those excess capacity? ADRIAN PRESCOTT: So we always, as a company, are looking at the future. So even when we're
	 sense. MR. BEACHLER: Those are great points. And again, that'd be a new, innovative, alternative installation method for these types of facilities, as opposed to our traditional couple 2 2, 3, 4, 6 2-inch conduits off to the side where you've got plenty of room. We had an inquiry from Commerce about a project we were doing in south central Idaho, it was a resurfacing-type project, reconstruction, but it's basically built on rock. So I said, "Hey. Could we" I talked to the project manager "could we" "can we accommodate any conduits? How far along in the project you?" 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	District 5 and District 6 have agreed to come out and look at that as so they can give you guys more feedback on on the project installation and the machine and all of the information there. So MR. BEACHLER: I've got another question for you. When you're doing in this case, you've noted like four ducts were placed. Are you populating all of those? Are you kind of just running one, and you've got some spares in there? What's your plan for using those excess capacity? ADRIAN PRESCOTT: So we always, as a company, are looking at the future. So even when we're placing, you know, our dual inch-and-quarter, we're
	 sense. MR. BEACHLER: Those are great points. And again, that'd be a new, innovative, alternative installation method for these types of facilities, as opposed to our traditional couple 2 2, 3, 4, 6 2-inch conduits off to the side where you've got plenty of room. We had an inquiry from Commerce about a project we were doing in south central Idaho, it was a resurfacing-type project, reconstruction, but it's basically built on rock. So I said, "Hey. Could we" I talked to the project manager "could we" "can we accommodate any conduits? How far along in the project you?" And he and, you know, traditionally 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	District 5 and District 6 have agreed to come out and look at that as so they can give you guys more feedback on on the project installation and the machine and all of the information there. So MR. BEACHLER: I've got another question for you. When you're doing in this case, you've noted like four ducts were placed. Are you populating all of those? Are you kind of just running one, and you've got some spares in there? What's your plan for using those excess capacity? ADRIAN PRESCOTT: So we always, as a company, are looking at the future. So even when we're placing, you know, our dual inch-and-quarter, we're always thinking about where we can be in the future,
	 sense. MR. BEACHLER: Those are great points. And again, that'd be a new, innovative, alternative installation method for these types of facilities, as opposed to our traditional couple 2 2, 3, 4, 6 2-inch conduits off to the side where you've got plenty of room. We had an inquiry from Commerce about a project we were doing in south central Idaho, it was a resurfacing-type project, reconstruction, but it's basically built on rock. So I said, "Hey. Could we" I talked to the project manager "could we" "can we accommodate any conduits? How far along in the project you?" And he and, you know, traditionally with vaults and all that, he's like, "I literally have 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	District 5 and District 6 have agreed to come out and look at that as so they can give you guys more feedback on on the project installation and the machine and all of the information there. So MR. BEACHLER: I've got another question for you. When you're doing in this case, you've noted like four ducts were placed. Are you populating all of those? Are you kind of just running one, and you've got some spares in there? What's your plan for using those excess capacity? ADRIAN PRESCOTT: So we always, as a company, are looking at the future. So even when we're placing, you know, our dual inch-and-quarter, we're always thinking about where we can be in the future, our future capacity. So working with cities as well
	 sense. MR. BEACHLER: Those are great points. And again, that'd be a new, innovative, alternative installation method for these types of facilities, as opposed to our traditional couple 2 2, 3, 4, 6 2-inch conduits off to the side where you've got plenty of room. We had an inquiry from Commerce about a project we were doing in south central Idaho, it was a resurfacing-type project, reconstruction, but it's basically built on rock. So I said, "Hey. Could we" I talked to the project manager "could we" "can we accommodate any conduits? How far along in the project you?" And he and, you know, traditionally with vaults and all that, he's like, "I literally have to blow a hole to accommodate vaults. And we're 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	District 5 and District 6 have agreed to come out and look at that as so they can give you guys more feedback on on the project installation and the machine and all of the information there. So MR. BEACHLER: I've got another question for you. When you're doing in this case, you've noted like four ducts were placed. Are you populating all of those? Are you kind of just running one, and you've got some spares in there? What's your plan for using those excess capacity? ADRIAN PRESCOTT: So we always, as a company, are looking at the future. So even when we're placing, you know, our dual inch-and-quarter, we're always thinking about where we can be in the future, our future capacity. So working with cities as well as ITD
	 sense. MR. BEACHLER: Those are great points. And again, that'd be a new, innovative, alternative installation method for these types of facilities, as opposed to our traditional couple 2 2, 3, 4, 6 2-inch conduits off to the side where you've got plenty of room. We had an inquiry from Commerce about a project we were doing in south central Idaho, it was a resurfacing-type project, reconstruction, but it's basically built on rock. So I said, "Hey. Could we" I talked to the project manager "could we" "can we accommodate any conduits? How far along in the project you?" And he and, you know, traditionally with vaults and all that, he's like, "I literally have to blow a hole to accommodate vaults. And we're cutting through rock, and we're blowing up rock." So 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	District 5 and District 6 have agreed to come out and look at that as so they can give you guys more feedback on on the project installation and the machine and all of the information there. So MR. BEACHLER: I've got another question for you. When you're doing in this case, you've noted like four ducts were placed. Are you populating all of those? Are you kind of just running one, and you've got some spares in there? What's your plan for using those excess capacity? ADRIAN PRESCOTT: So we always, as a company, are looking at the future. So even when we're placing, you know, our dual inch-and-quarter, we're always thinking about where we can be in the future, our future capacity. So working with cities as well as ITD MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm.
	 sense. MR. BEACHLER: Those are great points. And again, that'd be a new, innovative, alternative installation method for these types of facilities, as opposed to our traditional couple 2 2, 3, 4, 6 2-inch conduits off to the side where you've got plenty of room. We had an inquiry from Commerce about a project we were doing in south central Idaho, it was a resurfacing-type project, reconstruction, but it's basically built on rock. So I said, "Hey. Could we" I talked to the project manager "could we" "can we accommodate any conduits? How far along in the project you?" And he and, you know, traditionally with vaults and all that, he's like, "I literally have to blow a hole to accommodate vaults. And we're cutting through rock, and we're blowing up rock." So 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	District 5 and District 6 have agreed to come out and look at that as so they can give you guys more feedback on on the project installation and the machine and all of the information there. So MR. BEACHLER: I've got another question for you. When you're doing in this case, you've noted like four ducts were placed. Are you populating all of those? Are you kind of just running one, and you've got some spares in there? What's your plan for using those excess capacity? ADRIAN PRESCOTT: So we always, as a company, are looking at the future. So even when we're placing, you know, our dual inch-and-quarter, we're always thinking about where we can be in the future, our future capacity. So working with cities as well as ITD MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: we always try and think
	 sense. MR. BEACHLER: Those are great points. And again, that'd be a new, innovative, alternative installation method for these types of facilities, as opposed to our traditional couple 2 2, 3, 4, 6 2-inch conduits off to the side where you've got plenty of room. We had an inquiry from Commerce about a project we were doing in south central Idaho, it was a resurfacing-type project, reconstruction, but it's basically built on rock. So I said, "Hey. Could we" I talked to the project manager "could we" "can we accommodate any conduits? How far along in the project you?" And he and, you know, traditionally with vaults and all that, he's like, "I literally have to blow a hole to accommodate vaults. And we're cutting through rock, and we're blowing up rock." So micro-trenching might be something if they got a tough 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	District 5 and District 6 have agreed to come out and look at that as so they can give you guys more feedback on on the project installation and the machine and all of the information there. So MR. BEACHLER: I've got another question for you. When you're doing in this case, you've noted like four ducts were placed. Are you populating all of those? Are you kind of just running one, and you've got some spares in there? What's your plan for using those excess capacity? ADRIAN PRESCOTT: So we always, as a company, are looking at the future. So even when we're placing, you know, our dual inch-and-quarter, we're always thinking about where we can be in the future, our future capacity. So working with cities as well as ITD MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: we always try and think about that as well as, "Hey. Maybe we can provide one
	 sense. MR. BEACHLER: Those are great points. And again, that'd be a new, innovative, alternative installation method for these types of facilities, as opposed to our traditional couple 2 2, 3, 4, 6 2-inch conduits off to the side where you've got plenty of room. We had an inquiry from Commerce about a project we were doing in south central Idaho, it was a resurfacing-type project, reconstruction, but it's basically built on rock. So I said, "Hey. Could we" I talked to the project manager "could we" "can we accommodate any conduits? How far along in the project you?" And he and, you know, traditionally with vaults and all that, he's like, "I literally have to blow a hole to accommodate vaults. And we're cutting through rock, and we're blowing up rock." So micro-trenching might be something if they got a tough enough saw that can cut through parent material like that to place conduits in those really difficult-type 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	District 5 and District 6 have agreed to come out and look at that as so they can give you guys more feedback on on the project installation and the machine and all of the information there. So MR. BEACHLER: I've got another question for you. When you're doing in this case, you've noted like four ducts were placed. Are you populating all of those? Are you kind of just running one, and you've got some spares in there? What's your plan for using those excess capacity? ADRIAN PRESCOTT: So we always, as a company, are looking at the future. So even when we're placing, you know, our dual inch-and-quarter, we're always thinking about where we can be in the future, our future capacity. So working with cities as well as ITD MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: we always try and think about that as well as, "Hey. Maybe we can provide one of these for the City or maybe we can provide one of
2 4 5 6 6 7 7 8 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 11 12 14 15 16 10 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	 sense. MR. BEACHLER: Those are great points. And again, that'd be a new, innovative, alternative installation method for these types of facilities, as opposed to our traditional couple 2 2, 3, 4, 6 2-inch conduits off to the side where you've got plenty of room. We had an inquiry from Commerce about a project we were doing in south central Idaho, it was a resurfacing-type project, reconstruction, but it's basically built on rock. So I said, "Hey. Could we" I talked to the project manager "could we" "can we accommodate any conduits? How far along in the project you?" And he and, you know, traditionally with vaults and all that, he's like, "I literally have to blow a hole to accommodate vaults. And we're cutting through rock, and we're blowing up rock." So micro-trenching might be something if they got a tough enough saw that can cut through parent material like that to place conduits in those really difficult-type projects. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	District 5 and District 6 have agreed to come out and look at that as so they can give you guys more feedback on on the project installation and the machine and all of the information there. So MR. BEACHLER: I've got another question for you. When you're doing in this case, you've noted like four ducts were placed. Are you populating all of those? Are you kind of just running one, and you've got some spares in there? What's your plan for using those excess capacity? ADRIAN PRESCOTT: So we always, as a company, are looking at the future. So even when we're placing, you know, our dual inch-and-quarter, we're always thinking about where we can be in the future, our future capacity. So working with cities as well as ITD MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: we always try and think about that as well as, "Hey. Maybe we can provide one of these for the City or maybe we can provide one of these for ITD." We're always thinking about how we
2 4 5 6 6 7 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 10 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	 sense. MR. BEACHLER: Those are great points. And again, that'd be a new, innovative, alternative installation method for these types of facilities, as opposed to our traditional couple 2 2, 3, 4, 6 2-inch conduits off to the side where you've got plenty of room. We had an inquiry from Commerce about a project we were doing in south central Idaho, it was a resurfacing-type project, reconstruction, but it's basically built on rock. So I said, "Hey. Could we" I talked to the project manager "could we" "can we accommodate any conduits? How far along in the project you?" And he and, you know, traditionally with vaults and all that, he's like, "I literally have to blow a hole to accommodate vaults. And we're cutting through rock, and we're blowing up rock." So micro-trenching might be something if they got a tough enough saw that can cut through parent material like that to place conduits in those really difficult-type projects. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	District 5 and District 6 have agreed to come out and look at that as so they can give you guys more feedback on on the project installation and the machine and all of the information there. So MR. BEACHLER: I've got another question for you. When you're doing in this case, you've noted like four ducts were placed. Are you populating all of those? Are you kind of just running one, and you've got some spares in there? What's your plan for using those excess capacity? ADRIAN PRESCOTT: So we always, as a company, are looking at the future. So even when we're placing, you know, our dual inch-and-quarter, we're always thinking about where we can be in the future, our future capacity. So working with cities as well as ITD MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: we always try and think about that as well as, "Hey. Maybe we can provide one of these for the City or maybe we can provide one of these for ITD." We're always thinking about how we can help be a good partner in partnership with the
2 3 4 5 5 10 11 12 14 15 16 15 20 21 22 23 24	 sense. MR. BEACHLER: Those are great points. And again, that'd be a new, innovative, alternative installation method for these types of facilities, as opposed to our traditional couple 2 2, 3, 4, 6 2-inch conduits off to the side where you've got plenty of room. We had an inquiry from Commerce about a project we were doing in south central Idaho, it was a resurfacing-type project, reconstruction, but it's basically built on rock. So I said, "Hey. Could we" I talked to the project manager "could we" "can we accommodate any conduits? How far along in the project you?" And he and, you know, traditionally with vaults and all that, he's like, "I literally have to blow a hole to accommodate vaults. And we're cutting through rock, and we're blowing up rock." So micro-trenching might be something if they got a tough enough saw that can cut through parent material like that to place conduits in those really difficult-type projects. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	District 5 and District 6 have agreed to come out and look at that as so they can give you guys more feedback on on the project installation and the machine and all of the information there. So MR. BEACHLER: I've got another question for you. When you're doing in this case, you've noted like four ducts were placed. Are you populating all of those? Are you kind of just running one, and you've got some spares in there? What's your plan for using those excess capacity? ADRIAN PRESCOTT: So we always, as a company, are looking at the future. So even when we're placing, you know, our dual inch-and-quarter, we're always thinking about where we can be in the future, our future capacity. So working with cities as well as ITD MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: we always try and think about that as well as, "Hey. Maybe we can provide one of these for the City or maybe we can provide one of these for ITD." We're always thinking about how we can help be a good partner in partnership with the State and with cities.

Pub	lic Meeting		July 20, 2021
	Page 62		Page 64
1	strands of cable can you get in one of those ducts	1	ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Right.
	because they're they've got to be a little are	2	
	they a little more rigid because they're placed on top		in something where we would do a micro-trenching
	of each other? Or	4	
5	ADRIAN PRESCOTT: They are pretty rigid, but	5	
-	we've been running with the technology nowadays the	6	
	fiber we're moving from we used to have that 288	-	something that we would like to see, if additional
	cable		capacity could be offered for lease or sale.
9	MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm.	9	
10	ADRIAN PRESCOTT: that was super big and	_	management team has been discussing this, and so we
	thick. And now we're getting into more of the ribbon		will have in our written comments more ideas for you
	fiber that we're running through these conduits, which		guys on what we would like to see
	is a little bit more we found is more rigid as well	13	
	as it's able to be placed.	14	
15	We're able to place the 288 ribbon fiber		min/maximum years, just kind of an idea of the
-	in something that's smaller because the cable sizes		estimate versus actual cost, and things like that.
	with the technology is going down if that makes sense.	17	
	So we're going from these big, huge cables down to	18	
	something super small as well as providing more fiber.	19	· · ·
20	MR. BEACHLER: And is there a big difference in		team as we discuss it in the written comments for you
	cost from the ribbon to the opposed to the		on the in the I think is it by the 28th?
	traditional [unintelligible]	22	
23	ADRIAN PRESCOTT: I could get you more cost	23	
	information on that. I would have to go back to my	24	
	supplier.	25	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Page 63		Page 65
1		1	-
1	MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm.	1	THE MODERATOR: Thanks a lot. We actually
2	MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: It changes, honestly,	2	THE MODERATOR: Thanks a lot. We actually have we do have someone here online if you you
2 3	MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: It changes, honestly, with month to month from	2 3	THE MODERATOR: Thanks a lot. We actually have we do have someone here online if you you can you're more than welcome to stick in stick
2 3 4	MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: It changes, honestly, with month to month from MR. BEACHLER: Right.	2 3 4	THE MODERATOR: Thanks a lot. We actually have we do have someone here online if you you can you're more than welcome to stick in stick around right where you're at.
2 3 4 5	MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: It changes, honestly, with month to month from MR. BEACHLER: Right. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: especially right now with	2 3 4 5	THE MODERATOR: Thanks a lot. We actually have we do have someone here online if you you can you're more than welcome to stick in stick around right where you're at. Matthew, go ahead. You're live with us
2 3 4 5 6	MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: It changes, honestly, with month to month from MR. BEACHLER: Right. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: especially right now with supply and demand. Everything is kind of changing.	2 3 4 5 6	THE MODERATOR: Thanks a lot. We actually have we do have someone here online if you you can you're more than welcome to stick in stick around right where you're at. Matthew, go ahead. You're live with us again.
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: It changes, honestly, with month to month from MR. BEACHLER: Right. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: especially right now with supply and demand. Everything is kind of changing. So I don't have exact costs, but I can get	2 3 4 5 6 7	THE MODERATOR: Thanks a lot. We actually have we do have someone here online if you you can you're more than welcome to stick in stick around right where you're at. Matthew, go ahead. You're live with us again. MATTHEW BEZAYIFF: Hey. Well, with regards to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: It changes, honestly, with month to month from MR. BEACHLER: Right. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: especially right now with supply and demand. Everything is kind of changing. So I don't have exact costs, but I can get you estimates of what we've done in the past to kind	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE MODERATOR: Thanks a lot. We actually have we do have someone here online if you you can you're more than welcome to stick in stick around right where you're at. Matthew, go ahead. You're live with us again. MATTHEW BEZAYIFF: Hey. Well, with regards to what she said about the ribbon fiber and the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: It changes, honestly, with month to month from MR. BEACHLER: Right. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: especially right now with supply and demand. Everything is kind of changing. So I don't have exact costs, but I can get you estimates of what we've done in the past to kind of what we're seeing right now for our written	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE MODERATOR: Thanks a lot. We actually have we do have someone here online if you you can you're more than welcome to stick in stick around right where you're at. Matthew, go ahead. You're live with us again. MATTHEW BEZAYIFF: Hey. Well, with regards to what she said about the ribbon fiber and the micro-trenching, typically it's 1-and-a-half inches
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: It changes, honestly, with month to month from MR. BEACHLER: Right. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: especially right now with supply and demand. Everything is kind of changing. So I don't have exact costs, but I can get you estimates of what we've done in the past to kind of what we're seeing right now for our written comments.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE MODERATOR: Thanks a lot. We actually have we do have someone here online if you you can you're more than welcome to stick in stick around right where you're at. Matthew, go ahead. You're live with us again. MATTHEW BEZAYIFF: Hey. Well, with regards to what she said about the ribbon fiber and the micro-trenching, typically it's 1-and-a-half inches wide. We're going to go down to a depth of maybe
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: It changes, honestly, with month to month from MR. BEACHLER: Right. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: especially right now with supply and demand. Everything is kind of changing. So I don't have exact costs, but I can get you estimates of what we've done in the past to kind of what we're seeing right now for our written comments. MR. BEACHLER: One of the I guess one of our	2 3 6 7 8 9 10	THE MODERATOR: Thanks a lot. We actually have we do have someone here online if you you can you're more than welcome to stick in stick around right where you're at. Matthew, go ahead. You're live with us again. MATTHEW BEZAYIFF: Hey. Well, with regards to what she said about the ribbon fiber and the micro-trenching, typically it's 1-and-a-half inches wide. We're going to go down to a depth of maybe 14 inches from the top of the pavement. We're going
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: It changes, honestly, with month to month from MR. BEACHLER: Right. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: especially right now with supply and demand. Everything is kind of changing. So I don't have exact costs, but I can get you estimates of what we've done in the past to kind of what we're seeing right now for our written comments. MR. BEACHLER: One of the I guess one of our questions is in regards to our concepts for our policy	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	THE MODERATOR: Thanks a lot. We actually have we do have someone here online if you you can you're more than welcome to stick in stick around right where you're at. Matthew, go ahead. You're live with us again. MATTHEW BEZAYIFF: Hey. Well, with regards to what she said about the ribbon fiber and the micro-trenching, typically it's 1-and-a-half inches wide. We're going to go down to a depth of maybe 14 inches from the top of the pavement. We're going to take that conduit. We're going to stack that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12	MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: It changes, honestly, with month to month from MR. BEACHLER: Right. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: especially right now with supply and demand. Everything is kind of changing. So I don't have exact costs, but I can get you estimates of what we've done in the past to kind of what we're seeing right now for our written comments. MR. BEACHLER: One of the I guess one of our questions is in regards to our concepts for our policy that provided future capacity you know, would you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE MODERATOR: Thanks a lot. We actually have we do have someone here online if you you can you're more than welcome to stick in stick around right where you're at. Matthew, go ahead. You're live with us again. MATTHEW BEZAYIFF: Hey. Well, with regards to what she said about the ribbon fiber and the micro-trenching, typically it's 1-and-a-half inches wide. We're going to go down to a depth of maybe 14 inches from the top of the pavement. We're going to take that conduit. We're going to stack that conduit on top of each other.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: It changes, honestly, with month to month from MR. BEACHLER: Right. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: especially right now with supply and demand. Everything is kind of changing. So I don't have exact costs, but I can get you estimates of what we've done in the past to kind of what we're seeing right now for our written comments. MR. BEACHLER: One of the I guess one of our questions is in regards to our concepts for our policy that provided future capacity you know, would you see big issues with if you were going through, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE MODERATOR: Thanks a lot. We actually have we do have someone here online if you you can you're more than welcome to stick in stick around right where you're at. Matthew, go ahead. You're live with us again. MATTHEW BEZAYIFF: Hey. Well, with regards to what she said about the ribbon fiber and the micro-trenching, typically it's 1-and-a-half inches wide. We're going to go down to a depth of maybe 14 inches from the top of the pavement. We're going to take that conduit. We're going to stack that conduit on top of each other. So if we're putting in a couple conduits
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13 14	MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: It changes, honestly, with month to month from MR. BEACHLER: Right. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: especially right now with supply and demand. Everything is kind of changing. So I don't have exact costs, but I can get you estimates of what we've done in the past to kind of what we're seeing right now for our written comments. MR. BEACHLER: One of the I guess one of our questions is in regards to our concepts for our policy that provided future capacity you know, would you see big issues with if you were going through, and we requested you provide additional capacity and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE MODERATOR: Thanks a lot. We actually have we do have someone here online if you you can you're more than welcome to stick in stick around right where you're at. Matthew, go ahead. You're live with us again. MATTHEW BEZAYIFF: Hey. Well, with regards to what she said about the ribbon fiber and the micro-trenching, typically it's 1-and-a-half inches wide. We're going to go down to a depth of maybe 14 inches from the top of the pavement. We're going to take that conduit. We're going to stack that conduit on top of each other. So if we're putting in a couple conduits rather than normal trenching and whatnot, where we're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: It changes, honestly, with month to month from MR. BEACHLER: Right. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: especially right now with supply and demand. Everything is kind of changing. So I don't have exact costs, but I can get you estimates of what we've done in the past to kind of what we're seeing right now for our written comments. MR. BEACHLER: One of the I guess one of our questions is in regards to our concepts for our policy that provided future capacity you know, would you see big issues with if you were going through, and we requested you provide additional capacity and you can always take this back to your leadership	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE MODERATOR: Thanks a lot. We actually have we do have someone here online if you you can you're more than welcome to stick in stick around right where you're at. Matthew, go ahead. You're live with us again. MATTHEW BEZAYIFF: Hey. Well, with regards to what she said about the ribbon fiber and the micro-trenching, typically it's 1-and-a-half inches wide. We're going to go down to a depth of maybe 14 inches from the top of the pavement. We're going to take that conduit. We're going to stack that conduit on top of each other. So if we're putting in a couple conduits rather than normal trenching and whatnot, where we're putting the conduits side by side or in a group, we're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: It changes, honestly, with month to month from MR. BEACHLER: Right. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: especially right now with supply and demand. Everything is kind of changing. So I don't have exact costs, but I can get you estimates of what we've done in the past to kind of what we're seeing right now for our written comments. MR. BEACHLER: One of the I guess one of our questions is in regards to our concepts for our policy that provided future capacity you know, would you see big issues with if you were going through, and we requested you provide additional capacity and you can always take this back to your leadership team	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE MODERATOR: Thanks a lot. We actually have we do have someone here online if you you can you're more than welcome to stick in stick around right where you're at. Matthew, go ahead. You're live with us again. MATTHEW BEZAYIFF: Hey. Well, with regards to what she said about the ribbon fiber and the micro-trenching, typically it's 1-and-a-half inches wide. We're going to go down to a depth of maybe 14 inches from the top of the pavement. We're going to take that conduit. We're going to stack that conduit on top of each other. So if we're putting in a couple conduits rather than normal trenching and whatnot, where we're putting the conduits side by side or in a group, we're going to put these things right on top of each other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: It changes, honestly, with month to month from MR. BEACHLER: Right. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: especially right now with supply and demand. Everything is kind of changing. So I don't have exact costs, but I can get you estimates of what we've done in the past to kind of what we're seeing right now for our written comments. MR. BEACHLER: One of the I guess one of our questions is in regards to our concepts for our policy that provided future capacity you know, would you see big issues with if you were going through, and we requested you provide additional capacity and you can always take this back to your leadership team ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE MODERATOR: Thanks a lot. We actually have we do have someone here online if you you can you're more than welcome to stick in stick around right where you're at. Matthew, go ahead. You're live with us again. MATTHEW BEZAYIFF: Hey. Well, with regards to what she said about the ribbon fiber and the micro-trenching, typically it's 1-and-a-half inches wide. We're going to go down to a depth of maybe 14 inches from the top of the pavement. We're going to take that conduit. We're going to stack that conduit on top of each other. So if we're putting in a couple conduits rather than normal trenching and whatnot, where we're putting the conduits side by side or in a group, we're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: It changes, honestly, with month to month from MR. BEACHLER: Right. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: especially right now with supply and demand. Everything is kind of changing. So I don't have exact costs, but I can get you estimates of what we've done in the past to kind of what we're seeing right now for our written comments. MR. BEACHLER: One of the I guess one of our questions is in regards to our concepts for our policy that provided future capacity you know, would you see big issues with if you were going through, and we requested you provide additional capacity and you can always take this back to your leadership team ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Right. MR. BEACHLER: whether it be big issues with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE MODERATOR: Thanks a lot. We actually have we do have someone here online if you you can you're more than welcome to stick in stick around right where you're at. Matthew, go ahead. You're live with us again. MATTHEW BEZAYIFF: Hey. Well, with regards to what she said about the ribbon fiber and the micro-trenching, typically it's 1-and-a-half inches wide. We're going to go down to a depth of maybe 14 inches from the top of the pavement. We're going to take that conduit. We're going to stack that conduit on top of each other. So if we're putting in a couple conduits rather than normal trenching and whatnot, where we're putting the conduits side by side or in a group, we're going to put these things right on top of each other with about a 2-inch separation between the between the conduits.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: It changes, honestly, with month to month from MR. BEACHLER: Right. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: especially right now with supply and demand. Everything is kind of changing. So I don't have exact costs, but I can get you estimates of what we've done in the past to kind of what we're seeing right now for our written comments. MR. BEACHLER: One of the I guess one of our questions is in regards to our concepts for our policy that provided future capacity you know, would you see big issues with if you were going through, and we requested you provide additional capacity and you can always take this back to your leadership team ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Right. MR. BEACHLER: whether it be big issues with placing additional conduits, you know, during this and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE MODERATOR: Thanks a lot. We actually have we do have someone here online if you you can you're more than welcome to stick in stick around right where you're at. Matthew, go ahead. You're live with us again. MATTHEW BEZAYIFF: Hey. Well, with regards to what she said about the ribbon fiber and the micro-trenching, typically it's 1-and-a-half inches wide. We're going to go down to a depth of maybe 14 inches from the top of the pavement. We're going to take that conduit. We're going to stack that conduit on top of each other. So if we're putting in a couple conduits rather than normal trenching and whatnot, where we're putting the conduits side by side or in a group, we're going to put these things right on top of each other with about a 2-inch separation between the between the conduits. With that regard, then, the hole that they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: It changes, honestly, with month to month from MR. BEACHLER: Right. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: especially right now with supply and demand. Everything is kind of changing. So I don't have exact costs, but I can get you estimates of what we've done in the past to kind of what we're seeing right now for our written comments. MR. BEACHLER: One of the I guess one of our questions is in regards to our concepts for our policy that provided future capacity you know, would you see big issues with if you were going through, and we requested you provide additional capacity and you can always take this back to your leadership team ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Right. MR. BEACHLER: whether it be big issues with placing additional conduits, you know, during this and then, you know, selling them off after a certain	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE MODERATOR: Thanks a lot. We actually have we do have someone here online if you you can you're more than welcome to stick in stick around right where you're at. Matthew, go ahead. You're live with us again. MATTHEW BEZAYIFF: Hey. Well, with regards to what she said about the ribbon fiber and the micro-trenching, typically it's 1-and-a-half inches wide. We're going to go down to a depth of maybe 14 inches from the top of the pavement. We're going to take that conduit. We're going to stack that conduit on top of each other. So if we're putting in a couple conduits rather than normal trenching and whatnot, where we're putting the conduits side by side or in a group, we're going to put these things right on top of each other with about a 2-inch separation between the between the conduits. With that regard, then, the hole that they drilled into and whatnot, the backfill has got to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: It changes, honestly, with month to month from MR. BEACHLER: Right. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: especially right now with supply and demand. Everything is kind of changing. So I don't have exact costs, but I can get you estimates of what we've done in the past to kind of what we're seeing right now for our written comments. MR. BEACHLER: One of the I guess one of our questions is in regards to our concepts for our policy that provided future capacity you know, would you see big issues with if you were going through, and we requested you provide additional capacity and you can always take this back to your leadership team ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Right. MR. BEACHLER: whether it be big issues with placing additional conduits, you know, during this and then, you know, selling them off after a certain amount of time if you needed a non-compete clause or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE MODERATOR: Thanks a lot. We actually have we do have someone here online if you you can you're more than welcome to stick in stick around right where you're at. Matthew, go ahead. You're live with us again. MATTHEW BEZAYIFF: Hey. Well, with regards to what she said about the ribbon fiber and the micro-trenching, typically it's 1-and-a-half inches wide. We're going to go down to a depth of maybe 14 inches from the top of the pavement. We're going to take that conduit. We're going to stack that conduit on top of each other. So if we're putting in a couple conduits rather than normal trenching and whatnot, where we're putting the conduits side by side or in a group, we're going to put these things right on top of each other with about a 2-inch separation between the between the conduits. With that regard, then, the hole that they drilled into and whatnot, the backfill has got to be some sort of a cementitious-type backfill. Once
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: It changes, honestly, with month to month from MR. BEACHLER: Right. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: especially right now with supply and demand. Everything is kind of changing. So I don't have exact costs, but I can get you estimates of what we've done in the past to kind of what we're seeing right now for our written comments. MR. BEACHLER: One of the I guess one of our questions is in regards to our concepts for our policy that provided future capacity you know, would you see big issues with if you were going through, and we requested you provide additional capacity and you can always take this back to your leadership team ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Right. MR. BEACHLER: whether it be big issues with placing additional conduits, you know, during this and then, you know, selling them off after a certain amount of time if you needed a non-compete clause or something. But that would be, you know, some of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE MODERATOR: Thanks a lot. We actually have we do have someone here online if you you can you're more than welcome to stick in stick around right where you're at. Matthew, go ahead. You're live with us again. MATTHEW BEZAYIFF: Hey. Well, with regards to what she said about the ribbon fiber and the micro-trenching, typically it's 1-and-a-half inches wide. We're going to go down to a depth of maybe 14 inches from the top of the pavement. We're going to take that conduit. We're going to stack that conduit on top of each other. So if we're putting in a couple conduits rather than normal trenching and whatnot, where we're putting the conduits side by side or in a group, we're going to put these things right on top of each other with about a 2-inch separation between the between the conduits. With that regard, then, the hole that they drilled into and whatnot, the backfill has got to be some sort of a cementitious-type backfill. Once they're done, till up everything else, and then there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. BEACHLER: Mm-hmm. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: It changes, honestly, with month to month from MR. BEACHLER: Right. ADRIAN PRESCOTT: especially right now with supply and demand. Everything is kind of changing. So I don't have exact costs, but I can get you estimates of what we've done in the past to kind of what we're seeing right now for our written comments. MR. BEACHLER: One of the I guess one of our questions is in regards to our concepts for our policy that provided future capacity you know, would you see big issues with if you were going through, and we requested you provide additional capacity and you can always take this back to your leadership team ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Right. MR. BEACHLER: whether it be big issues with placing additional conduits, you know, during this and then, you know, selling them off after a certain amount of time if you needed a non-compete clause or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE MODERATOR: Thanks a lot. We actually have we do have someone here online if you you can you're more than welcome to stick in stick around right where you're at. Matthew, go ahead. You're live with us again. MATTHEW BEZAYIFF: Hey. Well, with regards to what she said about the ribbon fiber and the micro-trenching, typically it's 1-and-a-half inches wide. We're going to go down to a depth of maybe 14 inches from the top of the pavement. We're going to take that conduit. We're going to stack that conduit on top of each other. So if we're putting in a couple conduits rather than normal trenching and whatnot, where we're putting the conduits side by side or in a group, we're going to put these things right on top of each other with about a 2-inch separation between the between the conduits. With that regard, then, the hole that they drilled into and whatnot, the backfill has got to be some sort of a cementitious-type backfill. Once

	Page 66		Page 68
1	going down, like I say, 18 inches, typically with	1	participation and look forward to receiving and
	that.		reviewing everyone's submitted comments.
3	With regards to the fiber cost itself, it	3	Thank you.
4	varies. The last time I looked at a 1,000-count	4	
5	ribbon fiber cable, that was 15 to \$16 a foot in that	5	THE MODERATOR: All right. Ramon Hobdey-Sanchez
	area. Now, that's a big count of fiber for the	6	again here. We have reached the 5 o'clock hour, and
	micro-fiber or I should say the ribbon fiber, but	7	so our third negotiated rulemaking meeting regarding
8	those prices are going to vary from one manufacturer	8	utility accommodation in the State's right-of-way on
9	to another.	9	Tuesday, July 20th, 2021, has now come to an end.
10	So I just wanted to just throw that in.	10	We, again, want to emphasize the deadline
11	THE MODERATOR: Thanks, Matthew.	11	for all written comments in relation to this
12	ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Well, if you guys have any	12	rulemaking, any of discussions we've had over the last
13	other questions, let us know.	13	three meetings, or the materials on our web page will
14	But if not, I'm going to go ahead and take	14	be due next Wednesday, July 28th. You can submit
15	off.		, , , , , , , , , ,
16		16	for us is also available online.
17	ADRIAN PRESCOTT: [Unintelligible].	17	So, again, appreciate everyone's
18	MR. BEACHLER: Thank you so much.	18	participation and engagement. We've enjoyed working
19	ADRIAN PRESCOTT: Thank you, [unintelligible].	19	with everyone to this point and look forward to our
20	11	20	continued discussions and work.
21	ADRIAN PRESCOTT: [Unintelligible].	21	Signing off for Meeting Number 3.
22	THE MODERATOR: Well, again, we really thank	22	Thank you.
23		23	(End transcription at 1:32:23 of audio
24	those that have stuck with us here this afternoon.	24	file.)
25	Again, going forward, just want to	25	-000-
	Page 67		
1	emphasize that deadline for submitted comments being		TRANSCRIPTIONIST'S CERTIFICATE
	next Wednesday, July 28th.		
3	And then what we will do as staff is start		I, VICTORIA HILLES, transcriptionist, certify:
4	furthering our analysis and consideration of those		That the audio recording of the proceedings
	comments.		was transcribed by me or under my direction.

And then most of you, if not all, already
are a part of our stakeholder list, which is key to
this whole process. And as we start to see kind of
what the path forward looks like, we'll be sure to
have communications likely coming from Robert or
myself. And so I would expect something from the
Department after -- after the deadline and after we
have a little time to comb over everything.
We do expect quite a bit of submissions
via the written process. To date, haven't had any.

- 15 via the written process. To date, haven't had any.16 So kind of have the sense that people might be waiting
- 17 for that deadline. And so we'll be standing by, ready 18 to do that work, and then we'll continue our
- 19 discussions and communications and make sure all the20 stakeholders know what direction we're going with the
- 21 final communications via e-mail for our stakeholders.
- So again, open to any comments or
 questions at this time. We're going to go ahead and
 hold live here for next 20 minutes.
- **25** But really appreciate everyone's

That the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of all testimony given, to the best of my ability.

I further certify that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or party, nor am I financially interested in the matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I set my hand and seal this 3rd day of August, 2021.

VICTORIA HILLES POST OFFICE BOX 2636 Boise, Idaho 83701-2636

actually (2) \$ \$16(1) add (1) 66:5 37:4 \$900 (1) 34:18 [[sic] (4) 27:25;30:5;33:22;46:18 [unintelligible] (21) 6:25;18:25;22:6,9;24:25; 45:21;47:13,14;50:6,6;53:24; 56:23,25;57:10,11;62:22; 40:1 64:25;66:17,19,21;68:4 13:6 А adjust (1) 35:23 able (11) 10:25;13:24;17:3;23:12,25; 7:16 53:6;57:22;58:14;59:25;62:14, 15 28:7 above (2) 32:4;47:15 absolutely (2) 40:9:45:22 abundantly (1) 45:12 26:11 access (14) 10:6;12:2;14:2,5,12;20:14; 21:1;32:2;34:20;36:21;37:11; 40:4;43:14,16 accommodate (11) 12:8,21;15:1;24:5;35:24; 43:18;52:15;59:13,17;60:10,15 19.21 accommodated (2) 38:19:43:6 3:2 accommodating (7) 4:11;10:6,19;11:16;14:19,20; 58:13 accommodation (13) 29:17 2:18;4:4;5:12;6:18;7:11,19, 23;10:1;13:3;44:24;54:19; 34:5 55:2;68:8 accomplish (1) 2:1243:2 affect (3) accordance (1) 13:12 afoul (1) account (1) 30:14 acknowledged (1) 14:23 across (2) 9:23:11:3 Act (11) 7:12:30:12.16.16.17.23:31:6. 10,11,25;34:15 active (1) 14:11 actual (3) 10.17 19:23,25;64:16

40:1:65:1 Adams (1) 26:11 addition (4) 14:6;26:12;32:21;44:19 additional (22) 4:23;7:7;11:5;16:21;17:5,10, 16;20:2,7,14;21:16,17;25:17, 18;27:16;28:15;44:15;53:16; 63:15,20,24;64:7 address (2) 37:11,12 addressing (1) adequately (1) adjusting (1) Administration (1) Administration's (2) 38:18,25 administrative (4) 2:13;7:12;32:7;54:18 administrator (1) ADRIAN (43) 23:6.6.24:24:3,13,17,22,25; 25:3.6.15.19.21.23:26:5:56:18. 19,24;57:4,10,13,14;60:12,17; 61:12,19;62:5,10,23;63:2,5,18; 64:1,4,9,14,19,23,25;66:12,17, advance (1) advanced (2) 12:19;46:3 adverse (1) Advisory (1) Affairs (1) 8:16;13:1,4 33:10 afternoon (4) 2:2,10;22:1;66:24 Again (43) 2:8;3:22;5:8,17,25;6:15;7:8; 13:16;14:1;15:24;17:5;23:16; 32:23;34:17;36:20;42:3;46:5; 48:7,23;50:12;51:21,24;52:11, 24;53:5,13,15,19;54:18,20; 55:8,12;56:18;57:13;58:21; 59:3;65:6;66:22,25;67:22;68:6, apply (2)

agency (2) 26:14:35:11 agenda (1) 6:13 agreed (4) 20:21;57:24;58:9;61:1 Agreement (9) 19:12,19,24;20:6,12,20,24; 32:4;33:8 Agreements (3) 19:17;27:25;31:24 ahead (18) 6:2;12:12;23:2;26:19;36:7, 10,19;46:11;50:1;52:3;54:2,11, 15;55:14;58:8;65:5;66:14; 67:23 Alex (1) 26:11 aligning (1) 13:10 allow (4) 12:18;17:24;18:4;20:8 allowed (1) 17:4 allows (5) 8:18;17:6,14,16;19:4 alluded (1) 23:1 almost (1) 33:12 along (2) 23:21:59:14 alternative (6) 7:24;18:12,18,19;59:4;60:11 always (6) 38:4;61:12,15,19,22;63:16 amended (1) 19:25 Amendment (1) 19:24 amount (1) 63:22 analysis (1) 67:4 analyze (1) 4:15 and/or (4) 3:6;5:21;20:21;55:18 announcement (1) 34:17 Appeals (1) 32:10 applaud (2) 45:13.24 application (4) 2:24;3:6;36:14;55:15 application-by-application (1) 39:5 applications (1) 49:3 applies (3) 28:12;31:13;33:9

23:14:30:6 Appreciate (26) 2:7;18:19;22:11;25:1;26:6; 35:7;36:1,22;39:20;44:17;46:6; 48:6;49:7;51:1,3,9,11;52:2,16, 19,23;53:3,4;66:20;67:25; 68:17 approach (1) 45:17 approval (1) 39:5 approve (1) 33:23 approved (1) **49:3** April (2) 43:22;44:11 area (16) 8:19;11:11;13:20,22;16:21; 24:6;39:18;47:15,21;48:11; 50:2,15;51:5;60:2;64:6;66:6 areas (13) 11:3;14:16;16:20;18:14; 23:11;24:2,8,15;47:5,7,12,19; 48:24 arise (1) 39:24 ARON (2) 36:20;45:11 around (2) 15:12:65:4 ARPA(1) 34:16 As-Built (4) 18:21,23:19:3,10 as-builts (2) 19:1.7 aside (1) 40:1 Association (2) 26:24:27:5 association's (1) 39:19 assuming (1) 39:12 assumption (3) 41:24;43:1,7 assurances (1) 17:2 atmosphere (1) 3:15 attempting (1) 27:21 attention (1) 40:4 audience (1) 21:25 audio (3) 2:1;54:8;68:23 auditorium (7) 2:16;3:5;10:21;26:19;36:9; 51:16:55:9 authorities (1)

Fublic Meeting	
31:25	
authority (7)	Be
30:25;31:1,4,14;32:13,23;	
33:4 automated (1)	biş
9:11	
automatically (2)	big
5:19;36:12	
available (7)	bit
5:11;8:14;17:7;22:2;54:3; 55:18;68:16	
Awesome (4)	Bla
50:10,24;64:24;66:16	
awkward (1) 27:21	Bli
	blo
В	
	blo
back (14) 3:3;13:16;20:5;44:2,21;	Bo
48:10;54:5,11;56:7,22;58:10,	DU
25;62:24;63:16	bo
backfill (2)	
65:21,22 background (1)	Bo
35:10	bo
banks (1)	
18:1	Bo
barrier (1) 47:16	bo
base (6)	
18:10;47:22;48:16;55:16;	bo
58:9;60:5 based (5)	bo
4:22;7:3;19:22;34:9;56:9	00
basically (2)	bo
46:2;59:11	, ,
basis (2) 10:9;43:16	bo
Beachler (50)	
3:1;6:3,5,7;23:16,25;24:10,	bo
14,18,23;25:1,4,10,16,20,22; 26:4;35:9,16;36:4,6;43:8;48:5;	br
52:10;55:21;56:21;57:3,5,7,12;	DI.
59:2;60:16;61:5,18,25;62:9,20;	br
63:1,4,11,19;64:2,5,13,18,22,	L -
24;66:16,18,20 become (1)	bri
30:24	br
Begin (1)	
2:1 below (1)	bri
58:12	bri
Ben (6)	
36:18,19,20;43:8;45:11;46:6	br
benefits (1) 34:10	br
best (1)	
28:8	BF
better (6) 9:5;10:20;24:24;39:15;	
42:18;52:13	
beyond (1)	

	1
32:5	28
ezayiff (3)	30
46:14,14;65:7	23
ig (7)	18
61:25;62:10,18,20;63:14,19;	broa 43
66:6 iggest (1)	43 brok
8:23	14
it (9)	brou
26:25;28:11;33:21;38:11;	48
44:22;48:10;60:6;62:13;67:14	buil
lake (5)	23
2:24;6:1;35:8;44:20;52:7 liss (1)	buile
20:11	built
low (1)	46
59:17	bury
lowing (1)	8:
59:18	busi
oard (1) 41:20	11
pards (1)	
9:12	
obbi-Jo (1)	cabl
26:11	8:
$\log(1)$	26
42:23 oise (1)	24 6,1
10:12	41
olts (1)	cabl
22:18	32
order (1)	cabl
20:11	17
ore (2) 18:16;49:1	calcu 33
oth (10)	Cali
7:6;8:6,11;10:21;16:23;	40
17:10;39:2;53:7;55:3;60:25	call
ox (2)	28
5:21,22	44
51:18	calle 5:
rand-new (1)	calle
58:3	51
reak (3)	calli
53:12;54:2;55:17	50
ridge-replacement-type (1) 12:16	can 9:
ridges (1)	9. 16
12:6	20
riefly (1)	40
19:11	46
ring (3)	56
26:25;34:11,11 ringing (1)	60 21
46:23	cany
road (1)	58
40:22	cap
ROADBAND (60)	32
1:5;2:25;4:11;8:1,4,11,24;	capa
9:2,23;10:3,6,25;11:3,22;13:3, 6;14:18;15:11,13,14,19,20;	14 19
18:23;19:8;26:24;27:5,7,22;	25
10.20,17.0,20.27,27.0,7,22,	20

28:1,5,9,16:29:9,14,17,19,23; 0:1,8;33:5,25;34:4,5,7,11,20, 3;35:1,2;39:14;42:10,20;43:5, 8,23;44:12;45:1,7,23;46:23 adly (1) 3:3 ken (1) 4:22 ught (1) 8:7 d (1) 3:21 ding (3) 4:25;16:15;46:25 t (2) 6:2;59:11 ying (1) :24 iness (2) 1:14;27:7 С le (34) :24;17:20;21:3,7;25:18; 6:24;27:5,6;28:3;30:16,16,19, 4;31:1,7,11,12,17,21,25;32:1, 25,25;33:5,9,13;38:11;39:19; 1:1;62:1,8,16;66:5 le-related (1) 2:12les (6) 7:15,16,21,24;18:5;62:18 ulating (1) 3:6 ifornia (1) 0:7(7)8:24;32:15;37:13;38:25; 4:12;49:16;55:11 ed (2) :18:32:22 er (1) 1:5 ing (4) 0:2,14,20;51:14 (52) 10;11:21,22;12:3,8,21; 6:12;22:15,19;23:14,22;24:5, 0;26:16;29:20;33:23;39:7; 0:15;41:3,3;45:5,9,17,25; 6:4;47:11;52:3,15;53:8;55:25; 6:3;57:1,3;58:23,24;59:13,20; 0:10,14,14,18,22;61:2,15,20, 1,23;62:1;63:7,16;65:3;68:14 yons (2) 8:18;60:1 (1)2:14 acity (19) 4:25;16:22,23;17:5,10; 9:20,22;20:2,22;21:7,9;24:2; 5:18;61:11,16;63:13,15,25;

64:8 capital (1) 17:1 capitalize (1) 17:6 capture (3) 7:2;42:10;52:18 captures (1) 11:11 CARES (1) 34:15 carried (1) 47:20 carrier (7) 13:22;16:4;25:5;33:1;40:7,8, 15 Carriers (2) 13:18,21 case (3) 32:9,11;61:7 cases (1) 32:8 cash (1) 32:5 categories (2) 41:9;42:19 category (4) 41:23;42:1,16,19 caution (1) 41:5 **CELL** (4) 1:5:8:1:45:1.7 cementitious-type (1) 65:22 central (1) 59:9 certain (2) 29:1;63:21 certainly (3) 33:12;39:16,20 certificate (1) 41:13 challenges (1) 43:11 change (1) 4:21 changes (3) 39:11;52:21;63:2 changing (1) 63:6 channel (1) 18:9 chapter (1) 4:2 charge (1) 34:20 charged (1) 31:12 charging (1) 32:1 Charter (1) 27:10 chat (4)

5:21,22:51:18:54:15 chats (1) 51:20 cheaper (2) 11:23:47:10 chief (3) 2:24;5:25;26:10 circularity (1) 41:18 citations (2) 33:16;35:22 cite (1) 43:25 cities (5) 31:2;33:14;57:23;61:16,24 citing (1) 44:11 citizens (2) 34:11:46:4 City (3) 32:11:33:2:61:21 clarification (5) 6:25;21:17;23:9,14;53:1 classified (1) 29:10 classifies (1) 32:19 classify (1) 27:22 clause (2) 16:25:63:22 clear (2) 37:22:45:12 client (1) 27:6 close (1) 54:22 Code (9) 15:8,14;30:11;31:7;44:7; 46:24:50:2,15:51:5 colleagues (1) 2:22 collected (1) 32:6 collection (1) 9:20 colocation (1) 9:7 comb (1) 67:13 comfortable (1) 40:16 coming (3) 54:4;64:19;67:10 comment (10) 12:7;16:19;19:14,21;21:25; 48:2;49:18;50:8;52:8;54:24 commented (1) 55:23 commenters (3) 3:4:19:2:48:8 comments (65) 4:16,17,19,22,25;5:5;6:4,21, **Audio Transcription**

23;7:3,7;10:13,20;13:9,14; 14:5;15:20;16:2;21:12,14,16, 18,22;22:3;25:8;27:12,14; 33:16;35:10,22;36:1,9,24;37:5, 7;41:7,20;42:18,22;43:9;44:15; 46:9;48:6;50:3,12,17,22;51:7; 52:16,19;53:2,18;54:14;55:5, 19,22;60:22;63:10;64:11,20; 67:1,5,22;68:2,11 Commerce (1) 59:8 **Commission** (1) 16:11 common (1) 32:25 **Communications (9)** 23:7;27:10,11;30:17;56:19; 57:14;67:10,19,21 companies (11) 27:6;28:3;29:4;31:2,7,12,21; 32:1,6:33:9,13 company (2) 20:21:61:12 company's (1) 31:17 compelling (1) 32:9 compete (1) 11:1 competing (1) 11:14 competition (4) 11:6,7,8:14:24 competitively (2) 9:17;10:8 competitors (1) 17:8 compile (1) 52:20 complexities (1) 22:15 compliance (3) 8:6:35:19;44:10 compliant (1) 39:16 comply (1) 41:25 comprehensive (1) 30:18 comprised (1) 27:6 con (1) 47:12 concept (2) 16:23;41:23 concepts (3) 10:13,19;63:12 concern (2) 10:24;11:4 concerned (2) 60:2.6 concerning (2) 46:19:48:3

concerns (3) 10:24:21:22:56:9 conclusion (1) 42:14 conduit (16) 4:11;12:9,10;14:25;16:22; 17:5,10;18:1,16;22:18;25:17; 33:25;47:3,16;65:12,13 conduits (25) 8:25;11:5,9;12:7;13:19; 14:22;17:7,14,19;18:2,10; 19:22;20:7,15,18;21:1;56:13; 59:6,13,21;62:12;63:20;65:14, 16,19 conjunction (2) 31:10;34:6 connect (1) 9:9 connectivity (1) 9:13 consider (4) 34:7:40:23:41:21.21 consideration (5) 6:16;15:3,17;52:24;67:4 considered (7) 14:6,15;15:21;16:3;24:8; 37:20;43:23 consistent (1) 34:23 construct (4) 18:14;28:23;29:14;48:25 constructed (1) 20:11construction (9) 9:1;12:2;14:2;15:1;19:23; 20:1;57:20;60:12;64:6 Consulting (1) 47:1 contact (1) 68:15 contacted (1) 48:13 contained (1) 7:20 content (1) 52:18 context (3) 3:19;28:25;29:16 contexts (1) 29:18 continue (10) 4:15;14:1;16:12;22:21; 23:12,18;25:24;26:2;55:10; 67:18 continued (1) 68:20 contractor (1) 12:1 contractors (1) 19:5 controlling (1) 36:13 controls (1)

56:22 conversation (1) 22:21 coordinate (3) 12:20;14:1;23:22 coordinated (1) 12:11 **Coordinating** (1) 8:25 coordination (3) 10:20;12:5;23:19 coordinator (1) 2:14corner (1) 45:4 correctly (1) 45:21 cost (11) 8:23;11:24;19:19,21,23;20:1; 46:21;62:21,23;64:16;66:3 costs (3) 9:2;20:1;63:7 cost-saving (1) 11:21 council (1) 34:5 count (1) 66:6 counties (2) 31:2:33:14 couple (13) 2:3.7:3:8:12:14:19:15:20:9: 26:9:46:7:51:15:53:7:59:5.25; 65:14 course (2) 36:25;41:14 court (4) 32:8,9,10;33:3 cover (2) 10:15:51:13 coverage (1) 39:7 covered (2) 41:6:44:4 covering (1) 3:24 covers (1) 60:8 Cox (1) 27:9 CPCNs (1) 30:5 create (3) 9:16;13:8;45:5 **CTI's** (1) 46:2 curious (1) 22:22 current (6) 9:4,9:16:23:17:10:24:1: 44:23 currently (1) 23:12

Min-U-Script®

Audio Transcription

Public Meeting			July 20, 202
cut (2)	deployment (3)	discussed (2)	due (2)
18:9;59:20	9:23;13:13;14:9	15:9;34:16	49:1;68:14
cutting (2)	depth (3)	discussing (2)	duly (2)
59:18;60:7	56:10;60:19;65:10	4:8;64:10	16:2;20:3
cycle (1)	deputy (1)	discussion (11)	during (4)
36:15	26:10	15:6,12,18;17:9;18:7;19:16;	10:16;12:2;14:2;63:20
	description (1)	50:9;51:9,17;53:8,20	dynamic (1)
D	22:11	discussions (5)	9:11
	design (1)	17:11;49:13;67:19;68:12,20	
dark (1)	7:15	disruptions (1)	E
21:2	designated (2)	8:22	
data (1)	8:19,20	dissect (1)	earlier (5)
40:22	Designer (1)	4:15	10:10;12:13;53:2;60:23;
date (1)	46:25	distinction (1)	66:23
67:15	detail (1)	16:1	early (1)
days (2)	27:14	distribute (1)	12:20
19:3,6	detailed (2)	14:17	easier (1)
deadline (9)	6:9;33:15	District (2)	17:16
4:21,21,23,24;51:25;67:1,12,	details (2)	61:1,1	East (2)
17;68:10	3:16;27:16	districts (1)	48:10;56:7
deal (2)	determination (2)	25:25	eastern (5)
16:6;45:1	33:24,25	disturbances (1)	23:7;26:1;46:17;57:24;60:25
		11:19	
dealing (2)	determine (2)		easy(1)
40:2;44:3	43:12,20	document (6)	5:14
decision (2)	developing (1)	7:21;35:23;39:1;42:2;43:4;	economic (1)
32:10;33:3	10:5	55:13	34:10
declare (1)	devices (2)	documentation (1)	effectively (2)
28:9	9:10,13	52:22	9:3;11:18
declared (1)	DFM's (1)	documents (8)	effects (1)
35:2	26:11	4:2,3,8;5:6;22:2;54:19,23;	12:24
dedicated (1)	dialing (1)	55:4	effort (1)
14:22	36:17	dollars (1)	45:23
deep (1)	dialogue (1)	34:14	efforts (2)
60:7	33:20	done (13)	12:14;51:9
deeper (1)	differ (1)	18:20;20:6;45:13,14;48:9,10,	either (1)
57:22	39:18	11;56:4,7,16;58:5;63:8;65:23	28:21
define (4)	difference (2)	down (14)	elect (1)
3:13;40:12,12;43:3	37:15;62:20	29:7;42:23;47:2,13,22,23;	29:5
defined (3)	different (15)	58:8,12,13,25;62:17,18;65:10;	electrical (2)
15:14;40:15;41:12	15:7,8,25;17:15,17,23;18:4,	66:1	13:7;46:24
definitely (3)	5;32:17;35:19,24;39:23;41:9,	draft (7)	elements (1)
48:18;59:23;60:9	21;43:25	4:7;5:8;18:22,24;46:18;	8:23
definition (10)	differently (1)	54:24,24	eligible (2)
15:12;28:11;29:25;38:2;	33:3	drafts (1)	38:14,20
39:14,15;40:5,20;41:7,18	differs (1)	44:8	else (3)
definitions (8)	40:11	drainage (3)	30:7;36:8;65:23
15:7,25;27:19;28:12;29:12;	difficult (5)	60:3,5,8	e-mail (2)
37:18;42:5,10	18:14,16;48:24;49:1;64:6	drainages (1)	4:20;67:21
deliver (1)	difficult-type (1)	60:18	emphasis (1)
11:2	59:21	dramatically (1)	11:23
demand (3)	Dig (9)	40:11	emphasize (6)
8:14;43:18;63:6	8:18;16:22;20:3,8;23:13,16;	drawings (3)	6:20;51:24;53:5,17;67:1;
	25:16;58:12,25	18:24;19:4;47:20	68:10
demands (1)			
9:4 Description of (10)	digest (1)	drilled (1)	emphasizing (1)
Department (10)	37:4 dimension (1)	65:21	4:7
2:12,15;3:10;5:2;11:14;	dimension (1)	driven (1)	enabled (1)
26:14;37:22;42:25;53:15;67:12	37:19	28:6	21:4
DEPARTMENT'S (2)	direct (5)	dual (1)	encourage (6)
		61:14	4:18;5:20;12:20;52:3;54:20;
1:1;2:13	3:11;5:7;23:7;56:19;57:14		
1:1;2:13 depending (1)	direction (4)	duct (1)	55:12
1:1;2:13 depending (1) 47:14	direction (4) 12:9,10;49:19;67:20	duct (1) 18:1	55:12 encroachment (1)
1:1;2:13 depending (1)	direction (4)	duct (1)	55:12

Audio Transcription

Negotiated Rulemaking Public Meeting

68:9,23 ending (1) 50:21 engage (1) 51:23 engagement (3) 3:11;46:6;68:18 engineer (4) 2:24;5:25;46:15,17 engineering (1) 56:1 engineers (1) 56:2 enjoyed (1) 68:18 enough (2) 2:21;59:20 ensure (2) 8:5;47:21 enter (1) 43:17 **Enterprise** (2) 46:15;56:1 enters (1) 16:20 entity (1) 42:17 environment (2) 9:17;45:5 equipment (1) 14:13 especially (4) 14:16;18:13;63:5;64:2 essence (3) 29:9:32:3.18 establish (1) 8:3 establishes (1) 30:17 estimate (1) 64:16 estimates (1) 63:8 Eugene (2) 32:11;33:3 even (1) 61:13 evening (1) 55:9 everybody (5) 6:24;40:23;45:7,8;46:21 everybody's (1) 52:23 everyone (14) 2:2,6,9,15;3:2,7;5:18;39:12, 13;51:13;54:9,20;66:23;68:19 everyone's (4) 36:12;67:25;68:2,17 exact (1) 63:7 example (3) 12:6:49:8,12 examples (5)

19:12,15:20:6,24,25 excavations (2) 8:21:9:3 exceed (4) 8:14;31:13;37:19;38:1 exceeds (1) 31:18 excellent (1) 45:14 exceptions (1) 33:23 excess (3) 19:22;20:21;61:11 exchange (7) 9:19;13:18;16:4,9,16;21:2; 25:5 excited (1) 22:21 excuse (2) 19:18,24 executive (1) 26:14 exempt (2) 23:23;44:13 exemption (7) 15:22;38:8,15,20,23;39:6; 40:17 exemptions (1) 38:16 existing (5) 16:13:17:13:18:9:43:13:55:1 expanded (1) 21:5 expect (2) 67:11,14 expensive (1) 46:22 experts (1) 52:12 explain (1) 29:7 explicitly (1) 29:9 exposed (1) 58:12 express (1) 39:2 expressed (1) 39:16 expresses (1) 42:1 expressing (1) 43:5 extra (1) 2:7 extract (1) 28:5extraction (2) 32:4;33:6 extractions (2) 32:12,19 eye (1) 53:13

eve-to-eve (1) 41:3 8:24 F field (1) 22:2 faces (1) 47:8 45:8 facilitate (2) file (4) 7:22;25:20 facilitating (1) filed (2) 25:14 facilitator (1) final (3) 2:20facilities (24) 8:5,12,19;9:2,9,11,12,20; 9:21 10:3,20;11:22;12:22;13:13; 14:7,9,10;16:12;18:23;21:5; 34:19 find (1) 33:25;37:12;43:19;59:5;60:8 facility (4) 35:1 37:15,18,20;38:2 finite (2) fact (1) 58:22 first (14) failure (1) 13:5 Fair (8) 15:22;28:5;31:19;33:23; fits (3) 34:25;38:16,20;44:9 fairly (1) five (2) 45:16 familiar (3) 22:14:24:14:25:4 34:15 focus (1) far (5) 3:16;31:18;36:11;41:23; 9:19 59:13 farmers (1) 30:6 favorable (1) 45:25 FCC (6) 13:12,15;32:7,11,22;35:17 FCC's (3) 32:16.21:33:10 11:20 features (2) foot (3) 60:3,5 Federal (23) force (1) 8:6;11:2;13:10;28:2,6,18; 11:5 29:10;30:15,17,18;31:10,11; 32:10;35:17,17;38:17,24; 11:4 39:21,22,24;40:2;42:6;44:5 form (2) fee (6) 31:3,18,20;32:2,14,20 feedback (2) 25:8 55:7:61:3 fees (5) 52:2 9:21;30:21;31:12,16;33:13 feet (1) 24:24 forth (2) 37:25 few (3) 16:25;37:8;50:19 **FHWA (5)** 2:2139:6,9,16;42:1;43:4 fiber (13) 21:2;46:22;47:1,25;62:7,12,

15,19:65:8:66:3.5,6.7 fiberoptic (1) figure (1) 2:1;37:5;54:8;68:24 36:25;37:2 19:23,25;67:21 financial (1) financially (1) 8:13;37:17 10:23;11:10;16:19;17:3; 20:10;21:18;27:19;28:16;31:6; 36:18;41:15,25;53:6;58:11 39:12,14;40:5 58:4,23 flowing (1) focused (3) 7:10,24;14:9 folks (10) 2:4;5:7,17;21:15;37:22; 40:19;41:2;44:3;49:22;55:10 following (4) 13:14:24:23:27:13:30:3 follow-on (1) 20:1,16;66:5 forced (1) 4:20;27:22 formal (1) format (1) formulate (1) 3:3;44:2 fortunate (1) forward (13) 3:7;4:12;35:21;36:3,12; 44:14;46:8;47:5;50:11;66:25;

Min-U-Script®

67:9:68:1.19 found (5) 33:11,11;57:16,23;62:13 four (3) 3:20;57:17;61:8 framework (1) 10:3 franchise (8) 30:21;31:3,12,16;32:2,14,20; 33:13 franchises (1) 30:20 franchising (8) 30:24;31:1,3,14,25;32:12,23; 33:4 frankly (1) 45:14 frantically (1) 52:17 freeze/thaw-type (1) 56:14 friends (1) 38:11 full (2) 53:7,9 full-on (1) 28:24 function (3) 5:21;36:15;55:15 funds (1) 11:2 further (4) 29:7:51:16:58:25:60:22 furthering (1) 67:4 future (13) 9:4,9:15:1:16:22,23:17:10; 24:1;57:22;58:6;61:13,15,16; 63:13

G

general (1) 12:1 generally (2) 38:1;39:21 gentleman (1) 39:19 gets (1) 46:2 given (3) 10:21;19:3;50:3 gives (1) 31:7 goal (2) 15:3;25:16 goals (6) 3:16;6:18;8:8,17;10:17; 23:17 Good (11) 2:2,10;7:1;17:9;18:5;42:4: 47:4;49:8,11;52:5;61:23 gosh(1)

30:6 **GOVERNING** (3) 1:3:3:25:7:13 **Governmental** (1) 2:11governments (1) 31:17 Governor (1) 34:18 Governor's (3) 26:10,14;34:5 grade (1) 58:12 grain (1) 38:3 granted (2) 20:13;21:1 granting (2) 30:20;43:16 granular (1) 42:22 great (6) 2:22;50:9;51:8;55:4;59:2; 64:24 greater (2) 11:23;37:7 greatest (1) 9:6 greatly (1) 52:2 gross (1) 31:17 ground (2) 11:19:14:21 grounds (1) 40:18 group (2) 42:24;65:16 guardrail (1) 47:8 guess (5) 38:25;39:7;42:25;45:11; 63:11 guests (1) 26:9 guidance (10) 8:2;13:12;24:20;35:20;39:1; 42:2;43:4,22;44:6;48:19 Guide (9) 4:5,6;5:8;7:20;10:2;18:22, 24;44:25;55:2 guidelines (1) 13:15 **GUM** (1) 39:11 guys (11) 25:23;26:1;41:8;50:24; 56:20;58:20,22;60:14;61:2; 64:12;66:12 Η half-dozen (2)

Audio Transcription

22:23.24 hand (6) 6:3:38:10:46:10:51:14.22; 54:14 handful (2) 53:14;54:13 handle (1) 35:18 hands (2) 49:15,25 happening (1) 13:20 happy (6) 5:15;23:5;27:20;29:6,21; 35:4 hard (3) 42:5,9,9 hardships (1) 13:8 Headquarters (4) 22:24;23:2;36:13;48:14 health (1) 34:10 hear (5) 5:2;21:20;23:5;37:4;56:25 heard (3) 21:14;53:17;54:21 hearing (3) 3:7;6:24;36:5 held (2) 10:11:32:11 help (13) 3:12;7:21;9:14;24:4,24; 25:20,23;26:1;35:22;52:13,19, 20:61:23 helpful (1) 25:11 helping (2) 2:23:43:17 helps (1) 7:14 Hev (3) 59:11;61:20;65:7 Hi (1) 36:20 high (1) 26:16 high-level (3) 21:11,12;22:11 highlight (2) 20:9,23 HIGHWAY (13) 1:4;3:25;7:14,25;8:25;14:12; 23:21;28:6,12;35:17;38:17,24; 48:12 Highways (1) 44:5 HILLES (1) 1:21 hit (1) 22:16 Hoag₍₂₎ 2:22:57:1

HOBDEY-SANCHEZ (3) 1:9:2:11:68:5 hold (1) 67:24 hole (3) 29:8;59:17;65:20 homework (2) 24:12,19 honestly (1) 63:2 hope (1) 27:3 hosting (1) 36:20 hour (1) 68:6 HQ(1) 2:16huge (1) 62:18 hundreds (2) 34:14,22 Ι I-84(1) 20:10 I-90(1) 20:25 **IDAHO** (45) 1:1:2:12:7:12:9:24:15:8.14. 15;16:10;20:12,25;23:7;26:1, 23;27:5,9,11;28:17,19;29:25; 30:22,23,24;31:6,7,9,15;32:24; 34:3,5,12,18;40:5,14,15,21; 42:5,6,10;43:14;45:23;46:4,17; 57:24;59:9;60:25 Idaho's (1) 34:8 IDAPA (1) 3:24 idea (3) 8:12;11:25:64:15 ideas (2) 6:22;64:11 identified (2) 20:16;59:24 identify (1) 44:1 ILEC (6) 13:19;16:7,9,15;23:8;24:8 ILECs (1) 29:5 illegal (1) 33:11 imagine (1) 38:5 immediately (1) 49:11 impact (2) 48:16,22 impacts (1) 26:16

impede (1) 35:1 impediment (1) 35:3 impervious (1) 60:4 imply (1) 39:8 important (11) 3:9,10;5:2;16:14;17:12,18, 20;21:10;29:12;31:5;49:2 importantly (1) 31:20 impose (1) 32:13 impossible (1) 41:16 imputation (1) 31:15 inch (3) 37:17,19,25 inch-and-quarter (1) 61:14 inches (9) 47:2,2,14,23;57:18,19;65:9, 11:66:1 include (4) 6:8;9:10;41:19;42:17 includes (2) 30:20;40:22 including (1) 8:11 inclusion (1) 42:11incorporated (1) 4:2incorporates (1) 7:18 increased (2) 21:6,9 increasing (1) 43:18 Incumbent (2) 13:17;16:4 incurred (1) 9:2 incurring (1) 8:21 indicate (2) 38:13;44:21 indicated (1) 38:6 indicative (1) 38:4 indirectly (1) 13:3individual (2) 12:7;50:14 industry (4) 30:19;38:11;46:25;52:12

25:12:29:10.19:33:5:35:10: 52:13,25;53:23;56:12;57:21; 60:13:61:4:62:24:68:15 infrastructure (4) 9:23;10:7;34:16;46:15 initial (2) 14:8;44:8 In-Kind (5) 32:16,16,18,21;33:10 inner-ducts (4) 17:11,13,19:25:12 innovative (1) 59:3 input (3) 3:11;4:9;7:7 inputs (1) 21:22 inquiries (1) 14:11 inquiry (1) 59:8 insight (1) 50:25 install (1) 11:5 installation (12) 9:1;17:13,16,21;18:8,13,18; 22:19;23:19;59:4;60:11;61:3 installations (2) 11:22;15:2 installed (5) 14:22;17:14,20;20:14;34:8 installing (1) 7:15 installs (1) 16:21 instance (1) 41:15 instead (3) 19:4;25:9;35:1 integrity (1) 56:9 intently (1) 50:7 interest (13) 9:6;26:17;28:8,9;34:1,4,9; 35:3;38:8,15,22,23;39:6 interest' (1) 15:22 interested (8) 3:12;11:16,16;14:24;26:13, 15;56:16;58:19 interesting (2) 18:6,12 internal (1) 7:21 International (1) 47:1 Internet (1) 29:18 Interstate (1) 20:25

Audio Transcription

Re: Rules Governing Utilities on State Highway July 20, 2021

5:7,11:6:9:10:17,18:14:18: into (20) 6:3;11:10;14:11;15:17; K 16:20;18:9;21:8;22:17;30:14; 34:15;37:5,24;43:17;47:12; keep (1) 49:11:58:2:60:10,22:62:11; 17:15 65:21 keeping (1) introduce (2) 53:13 33:17:46:13 key (2) introductions (1) 15:2;67:7 6:14 kind (20) invested (1) 3:3;6:23;11:15;19:14;20:5; 3:13 22:19;24:7;49:12,14;52:1; investment (3) 53:13,21;58:20;59:24;61:9; 16:19;17:1,3 63:6,8;64:15;67:8,16 invite (1) knowledge (1) 50:12 49:12 involved (1) 3:14 L ISPs (1) 29:19 language (3) issue (1) 35:23;41:12;44:16 29:21 large (1) issued (1) 21:7 39:1 larger (3) issues (4) 10:25:14:14:15:18 22:16;39:24;63:14,19 last (15) ITD (33) 3:20;6:8;7:4;10:10;12:14; 5:8;9:9;11:13,25;12:16,17, 25:10:28:20:32:17:43:9:44:18: 20;13:10,20,21;14:24;16:5; 46:7;51:4;55:21;66:4;68:12 19:9,17;20:15;21:1;24:4;28:1, later (1) 5;31:15;33:22;34:6,19;40:4; 47:21 46:16,21;47:4,21;54:18;58:16, law (19) 19:61:17.22 28:2,17,18;29:11;31:10; itdidahogov/rulemaking (3) 39:21,22,24;40:2,6,11,14,16, 5:14;7:9;50:13 21;42:5,6,6;43:14,24 **ITD's** (7) laws (1) 7:19,20;16:13;31:23;33:7; 30:13 39:10:47:18 laying (1) iterations (1) 46:22 32:17 leadership (1) 63:16 J learn (1) 26:1January (1) learning (1) 55:3 49:9 join (2) lease (2) 53:6;57:5 17:5;64:8 joining (2) least (3) 49:15;53:14 28:2;33:8,17 jointly (1) led (1) 3:13 15:18 judgement (1) legal (1) 40:24 33:11 July (7) legislation (1) 1:13;4:23;51:25;55:2;67:2; 34:17 68:9,14 Legislature (1) jump (3) 30:22 6:3;36:7;55:10 Legislature's (1) June (3) 26:154:22;10:11:54:25 length (1) jurisdictions (1) 37:7 35:16 lesser (1) 27:22

informal (2)

4:13:57:9

information (20)

Audio Transcription

Public Meeting			July 20, 2021
letter (1)	lot (16)	may (14)	28:10;38:5;39:18;56:21;
4:20	3:19;5:10;22:16;29:16;32:7;	2:4;5:10;14:25;18:15,15;	59:19,25;67:16
level (1)	34:22;39:23;42:21;43:13;47:6;	22:22,22;32:9;39:14;47:23;	millimeters (1)
26:16	50:24;56:2,7;60:3,4;65:1	48:22;53:6;55:10;56:8	57:17
leverage (1)		maybe (10)	million (1)
9:8	Μ	29:21;42:18;47:14;51:21;	34:18
Lewiston (1)		53:6;57:1;59:24;61:20,21;	millions (2)
27:9	Ma'am (1)	65:10	34:14,22
LFA (1)	22:7	mean (2)	min/maximum (1)
30:25	machine (1)	23:13;29:15	64:15
likely (4)	61:4	meanings (1)	mind (1)
28:2;31:24;33:7;67:10 limitation (2)	macro (6)	29:17 measures (1)	22:7 minimum (1)
31:11,13	14:5,14;37:13,16,20;38:5 maintain (1)	35:20	57:19
limited (3)	18:4	meet (1)	minor (1)
18:15;42:12;48:25	maintaining (1)	45:25	37:14
limitless (1)	7:16	MEETING (21)	minute (1)
13:5	maintenance (3)	1:2;2:18;3:17,23;4:23;5:16;	40:1
lines (1)	9:10;17:24;57:25	6:13,20;16:18;21:14,21;22:17;	minutes (4)
36:17	major-ground-disturbance (1)	25:11,14;36:25;37:1;43:3;53:9;	2:4,8;46:8;67:24
Lisa (4)	12:15	55:22;68:7,21	Mixed-Use (2)
2:22;6:1;51:19;57:1	makes (4)	meetings (18)	32:22;33:10
list (2)	25:6;58:15,25;62:17	3:8;4:17;6:9,22;7:4;10:11,14,	Mm-hmm (5)
54:12;67:7	making (3)	16;15:25;21:13,19;43:10;	60:16;61:18;62:9;63:1;64:13
listening (3)	45:23;53:21;56:4	44:18;46:8;49:13;53:7;54:22;	MODERATOR (22)
50:7,24;53:22 literally (3)	manage (8)	68:13 meeting-wise (1)	1:9;2:2;6:6;22:7,10;26:6; 35:6;36:7;46:5;49:6;50:10;
37:16,19;59:16	2:23;8:14;9:14,25;13:6; 43:17;45:5,10	5:4	51:2,10;53:4,25;54:9;56:22;
little (15)	Management (10)	members (1)	57:8;65:1;66:11,22;68:5
24:11,19;27:15;28:11;33:21;	4:5,6;5:9;7:20;10:2;18:22;	46:2	money (1)
38:11;44:22;53:11;57:8,9;60:6;	44:25;55:3;64:10,19	memo (5)	34:21
62:2,3,13;67:13	manager (4)	39:1;43:22;44:5,6,11	monitor (1)
live (5)	2:25;57:21;59:12;60:13	mention (3)	55:10
36:19;46:11;55:8;65:5;67:24	managing (3)	3:22;26:8;33:20	monitoring (2)
local (9)	9:3;10:3,6	mentioned (4)	5:22;51:19
11:1;13:18;16:4,15;30:18,25;	mandated (1)	36:11;37:10;46:7;49:10	month (3)
31:14,16;33:14 location (2)	33:8 mondating (1)	merely (1) 32:13	10:10;63:3,3 more (37)
7:15;12:15	mandating (1) 31:23	message (1)	2:3;12:5,18;14:25;19:14;
locations (1)	mandatory (2)	9:12	21:20:24:7,8,12,19:25:7,24;
12:18	32:4,19	method (6)	26:1;27:13;31:20;32:1;33:15;
Logistically (1)	manner (1)	18:8,13,18;50:8;59:4;60:11	34:13,13;39:16;47:13;48:11;
5:17	11:18	methods (3)	57:9,9,21;58:17;60:13;61:2;
logistics (2)	Manual (1)	7:15;18:19,19	62:3,11,13,13,19,23;64:11,17;
5:5;36:11	46:18	Meuleman (1)	65:3
long (3)	manufacturer (1)	26:11	most (6)
23:20;42:9,9	66:8	Mexico (1)	5:9;13:11;32:8;34:2;46:22;
longer-range-type (1) 14:17	many (3)	40:9 mic (2)	67:6 motivated (2)
longitudinal (1)	8:15;11:1;61:25 market (11)	26:20;46:12	34:6,19
23:20	11:10,11;15:23;17:7;28:5;	micro-ducts (1)	move (3)
look (21)	31:19;33:24;34:25;38:16,21;	57:16	4:12;36:11;58:14
3:7;18:13;35:21,23;36:2;	44:9	micro-fiber (1)	moving (1)
40:19;42:5;44:14,23;46:8;47:5,	material (3)	66:7	62:7
18;50:11;54:22;56:6;59:24;	49:1;53:16;59:20	micro-trench (2)	much (15)
60:9,22;61:2;68:1,19	materials (6)	47:19,25	8:20;23:23;26:6,22;27:13;
looked (2)	3:21;4:10;22:1;48:14,14;	Micro-Trenching (17)	33:15;35:6;37:7;45:21;46:6;
49:11;66:4	68:13	18:7,8;46:20;47:4,11;48:3,	50:10;51:2,10;53:23;66:18
looking (7)	matter (2)	20;49:4,10;55:23;56:15;57:15;	multiple (5)
18:17;41:25;46:19;49:14; 51:4:54:12:61:13	22:15;52:12 Matthew (11)	58:20;59:19;60:25;64:3;65:9	8:19;17:22;18:3;47:11;58:2
51:4;54:12;61:13 looks (1)	Matthew (11) 46:12,14,14;48:5;49:6;55:23;	mics (1) 57:2	must (1) 8:15
100KS (1) 67.0	40:12,14,14,46:5,49:0,55:25;	57.2 might (7)	0.13 mute (1)

Min-U-Script®

looks (1) 67:9

might (7)

56:11;57:18;65:5,7;66:11

mute (1)

Audio Transcription

36:13 nonpublic (2) offered (1) 15:25:25:9,25:27:2;32:17; muted (2) 7:25:8:11 64:8 44:17;47:20;52:6;54:21;57:24; 5:19:28:14 non-public (5) offering (1) 60:20:65:24:67:13:68:12 27:23:41:10.12.17:42:16 myself (3) 39:13 overall (2) 52:5;67:11;68:15 non-transportation (1) Office (4) 17:21:34:8 44:9 2:11;26:10,14;34:6 overlapping (1) non-utilities (1) 35:14 Ν offline (1) 45:7 41:2 Р name (7) Nope (1) **Once** (13) 2:10;23:4;26:21,22;56:3,18; 50:5 8:18,20;12:8;14:21;16:22; 57:13 20:3,8;23:13,16;25:16;36:20; normal (3) page (8)43:16:47:16:65:15 5:6.13:30:10:38:10:50:13: name's (1) 58:11:65:22 53:21;54:18;68:13 23:6 north (2) one (41) 20:25;27:11 2:13;5:9;8:17,23;10:23;11:9; paid (3) narrow (2) 18:9;58:18 note (18) 12:6;15:10;19:2,14;20:10,12, 31:16,18,20 19;22:5;23:16;36:18;37:9; National (1) 6:7,22;11:13;14:14;15:16; par (1) 16:9,14;17:12,18;18:5;21:11, 46:24 38:10;39:18;41:5,11;43:1,11; 53:20 14;33:21;34:13;44:14;48:18; 44:22;47:8;48:8,8,24;54:25; necessarily (3) paragraph (2) 37:23;45:4;55:17 49:2;52:20 55:21;56:1;57:1;60:2,18;61:9, 29:24;30:3 need (14) noted (15) 20,21;62:1;63:11,11;66:8 parent (2) 8:5;10:1;14:17,25;19:8; 7:11:10:10:11:9:15:10.23; 49:1;59:20 ones (1) 5:9 28:10;29:7,13;30:14;42:15,23; 16:2;17:20,22;20:3;21:22; part (6) 44:8;47:17,20 35:25;48:9,17;56:11;61:8 online (14) 12:13;28:15;30:16;45:3; needed (1) notes (1) 2:17;5:11,20;22:2;36:8; 46:22;67:7 63:22 52:17 51:14,22;53:8,10;54:5;55:11, participant (1) notification (1) 24;65:2;68:16 needs (3) 54:12 9:13;37:23;40:4 12:19 only (8) participants (2) 29:16;37:11;40:3;42:12; **NEGOTIATED (5)** notify (1) 26:12;52:12 1:2;2:17;3:22;4:14;68:7 47:24 47:12;48:2,23;54:21 participate (1) network (3) nowadays (1) open (7) 5:20 62:6 36:16:46:12:49:19:51:18: participation (6) 21:6:46:17:56:2 Number (6) 55:4.6:67:22 43:9;44:17;51:11;66:23; neutral (2) 9:17:10:8 8:9:22:17:30:15:50:20; opened (1) 68:1.18 new (15) 53:10:68:21 27:2particular (2) numbers (1) opinion (1) 11:10;14:19,20;16:20,20,21; 4:1;52:8 50:19 33:7 21:4;35:18;40:9;46:23;52:25; parties (3) 53:16;54:14;55:10;59:3 numerous (1) opportunities (1) 3:12,14;12:3 newer (1) 32:8 11:21 partner (1) nuts (1) opportunity (10) 44:561:23 newly (1) 22:17 5:23;7:1,5;17:6;21:19;49:23; partnership (1) 50:3;51:21;52:24;53:1 17:13 61:23 0 opposed (2) partnership-type (1) next (13) 10:15;11:20;14:3;30:10,12; 59:5;62:21 3:15 36:25;37:1;52:4;58:4,22;67:2, **o0o-** (1) option (1) passed (1) 68:25 24;68:14 24:6 30:22 objectives (6) nice (1) order (3) past (4) 3:17;6:19;8:9,17;10:17; 9:25;15:21;20:7 3:8;20:6;54:22;63:8 63:24 non-cable (1) 23:17 orderly (3) path (5) 32:24 observed (1) 8:10;11:18;15:4 39:9,10,15;42:18;67:9 34:14 Oregon (1) patience (1) non-cash (1) 32:12 obviously (1) 20:11 3:3 pavement (2) non-certificated (1) 24:4originally (2) 4:21:37:1 42:17 occupy (1) 18:9;65:11 Non-Compete (3) pay (2) 31:8 out (13) 16:24;24:7;63:22 11:1;13:21;23:7;29:6;30:4; 31:2;40:4 occurring (1) 33:2;45:8;46:2,21;52:24;58:11, non-competes (1) 13:25 paying (1) 24;61:1 64:14 o'clock (1) 33:14 non-discriminatory (1) 68:6 outreach (1) payment (2) off (6) 12:14 30:21;32:5 10:9 Non-ILEC (3) 36:23:58:17:59:6:63:21; Outside (1) payments (1) 16:5,8;23:8 66:15:68:21 46:25 33:24 non-price (1) offer (3) over (20) Pennsylvania (1) 40:13;41:5;42:22 3:21;6:3,17,21;10:25;12:14; 40:8 29:1

people (1) 67:16 per(2)20:1.16 percent (8) 31:13,17,18,20;32:1,5,14; 33:13 Perfect (1) 64:23 perfected (1) 45:18 permissive (1) 32:13 permit (6) 16:12;23:12;48:19,20;49:3; 57:25 permits (2) 47:20;49:3 permitting (4) 8:4;16:13;23:9;47:17 person (2) 7:6:10:21 pertains (1) 28:3 pertinent (2) 4:1;5:9 phone (1) 22:24 phones (1) 49:22 phoning (1) 3:6 physically (2) 2:16:3:4 piece (1) 3:9 place (7)8:18;12:3;13:19;43:25;48:1; 59:21:62:15 placed (10) 12:7:17:19:18:10:20:7: 25:13:56:15:61:8:62:3.14; 65:24 placement (2) 12:10;18:17 places (1) 46:23 placing (5) 24:1;56:12;57:17;61:14; 63:20 plan (4) 12:21;50:7;54:4;61:10 Plant (2) 46:25;56:3 play (1) 22:16 please (7) 14:3;23:3;26:4,20;36:15; 46:13;64:22 plenty (2) 34:21:59:7

Audio Transcription

podium (1) 22:8 podium's (1) 51:16 point (15) 18:2;24:20;27:24;28:16; 30:13,15;34:3;37:3,14;40:11; 47:18:48:3:51:20:65:25:68:19 points (7) 6:25;21:8;27:18;37:6,8;53:8; 59:2 pole (1) 37:25 policies (4) 10:5,19;34:25;55:1 Policy (12) 4:4;6:18;7:19;8:2,18;10:1; 20:3,8;22:16;55:2,13;63:12 policymakers (1) 34:3 pop (1) 49:21 populating (1) 61:8 portion (1) 58:11 position (1) 24:24 possible (2) 9:22:53:23 posted (5) 5:6:6:10:53:7.10:54:23 potential (1) 55:13 **PowerPoint** (1) 6:10 practical (1) 34:13 practiced (1) 28:19 practices (1) 9:7 preference (4) 39:2,17;42:1;43:5 preferred (3) 17:23;39:9,10 PRESCOTT (42) 23:6,24;24:3,13,17,22,25; 25:3,6,15,19,21,23;26:5;56:18, 19,24;57:4,10,13,14;60:12,17; 61:12,19:62:5,10,23:63:2,5,18; 64:1,4,9,14,19,23,25;66:12,17, 19,21 presence (1) 21:8 present (5) 6:22;7:3;21:13;52:13,25 presentation (3) 6:4;19:13;53:9 presentations (3) 6:10;12:13;15:7 presented (6) 7:4;10:16,18;13:24;19:13;

22:1 presenting (1) 25:12 press (1) 57:10 pretty (1) 62:5 previous (3) 4:17;6:21;15:24 price (1) 28:23 prices (1) 66:8 primarily (3) 27:8;28:6;29:4 primary (3) 8:17;15:3;23:17 Prior (2) 43:22;44:7 prism (1) 48:16 pro (1) 31:21 probably (4) 24:11,11;45:15;48:23 problem (2) 41:14;47:10 problems (1) 41:11 procedure (1) 55:6 Procedures (2) 7:12:10:5 process (15) 3:9;4:14,14;5:4;10:18;12:21; 13:2;14:16;16:14;39:5;44:23; 47:17:55:6;67:8,15 produced (1) 45:15 Program (1) 2:25 prohibition (1) 31:25 prohibits (1) 32:23 project (9) 3:13;13:20;22:14;59:9,10,12, 14;60:24;61:3 projects (17) 9:1;12:1,3,16,17,18,19;13:24, 25;14:2;18:24;48:22;58:5,6,17; 59:22.25 promptly (1) 2:5 proper (1) 52:20 proposed (7) 13:10,10;27:25;31:23;33:22; 39:10;41:11 provide (16) 7:6;10:2;12:2;16:23;18:23; 19:6,9;20:1;21:16;27:16;50:7; 53:1;61:20,21;63:15,24

provided (7) 6:23;10:13;21:16;30:23; 43:5:55:22:63:13 provider (17) 11:9,10;15:11,13;16:5,8,8,20, 20,25;17:3,4;19:20;20:2;21:1; 32:25:35:12 providers (47) 9:5,18;10:24,25;11:1,2,17; 12:5,12,20;13:17,24;14:1,19, 21;15:10;16:9,11;17:6,14,17; 18:4;19:5,7,8,18;20:13;21:3, 15;23:9,19;24:16;27:22;28:1,6, 16;29:17,19,20;30:2;34:20; 42:11,20;43:13;47:11;48:8,21 providers' (2) 17:24;21:5 providers-installed (1) 21:3 provides (4) 17:14;28:22,25;43:14 providing (4) 3:18;11:15;33:15;62:19 **PSI** (1) 60:19 PUBLIC (34) 1:2;6:23;8:11,22;10:11; 15:16,22;16:7,10,10;28:9,22; 29:25;30:20;31:8,19,21;32:2,3; 34:1,4,9:35:2,2:38:8,8,14,22, 23;39:6;42:8;43:14,15;44:2 Public-Utilities-Commission-regulated (1) 16:7**PUC (5)** 28:19,19;29:3;30:6;41:14 purchase (3) 17:4;19:22;20:17 purposes (4) 33:6;42:11,12;43:3 push (3) 28:4;58:13,24 put (6) 18:3;36:12;45:4;46:11; 60:19;65:17 putting (3) 29:14;65:14,16 Q qualified (1) 41:16 qualify (2)

38:22;40:17

qualifying (1)

3:19;37:8

48:10;67:14

42:19

quick (2)

quid (1)

quite (2)

quo (1)

31:21

31:20

Min-U-Script®

1:14,14;2:3;55:9

PM (4)

Audio Transcription

R rabbit (1) 29:7 raise (2) 51:22;54:14 raised (3) 14:20;49:15;51:14 raise-vour-hand (3) 5:21;36:15;55:14 RAMON (8) 1:9;2:10;5:25;6:5,14;7:11; 52:10:68:5 rate (2) 20:16,18 rather (3) 9:20;11:16;65:15 reach (1) 13:21 reached (1) 68:6 reaches (1) 42:13 read (2) 31:9:39:8 ready (1) 67:17 real (2) 6:9:24:14 realize (1) 27:1 really (40) 3:9,9,14;4:7,18;5:1,7;6:20; 7:2,24;17:9;18:6;21:10,21; 22:10,17,20;25:11,20;26:16; 35:22;36:21;42:3;45:12;46:6; 48:2;49:7;52:1,16,18,23;53:3, 15,17;54:20,22;55:6;59:21; 66:22:67:25 receive (4) 13:9;14:5;15:22;18:25 received (11) 6:21;10:23;11:7;12:25; 13:13;15:19;16:3,18;19:21; 21:12:30:5 receiving (1) 68:1 recent (2) 32:9:44:11 recently (1) 58:4 Recess (1) 54:7 recognize (1) 45:21 reconstruction (1) 59:10 record (1) 23:4 recorders (1) 9:11 recoup (1)

17:3 recover (1) 16:25 redo (2) 58:9.22 reduce (2) 11:18;60:18 reduction (1) 33:12 reference (3) 4:3;7:18;55:13 references (4) 29:24;30:12;44:1;52:20 referencing (1) 44:8 reflect (1) 19:25 regard (2) 41:4:65:20 **REGARDING (15)** 1:3;2:18;13:12,17,19;15:16, 20;16:19;17:11;18:7,21;21:18; 40:11;43:22;68:7 regards (8) 11:7;14:4,8;15:6;19:14; 63:12;65:7;66:3 region (1) 21:6 regional (3) 21:7,9:46:16 regulate (1) 7:14 regulated (4) 15:14;16:10;28:18,21 regulating (1) 32:24 regulation (9) 28:22,23,24;29:1,3,6,15; 30:19.19 regulations (6) 8:7;10:19;13:11;25:5;35:24; 40:3 related (1) 4:4 relation (1) 68:11 relationship (1) 38:7 relevance (1) 30:1 relevant (1) 30:8 relocating (1) 7:16 remember (1) 25:11 remove (1) 35:3 repave (1) 47:22 repeated (2) 8:21;9:3 represent (4)

23:4,7:26:21:46:13 representative (1) 27:3representing (1) 26:23 request (3) 18:22;23:18;49:16 requested (5) 16:24;19:2,9;20:7;63:15 requesting (1) 14:5 require (2) 8:2;12:5 requirement (4) 19:10;33:23;38:17,21 requirements (7) 8:3,7;12:8;15:23;18:18,21; 24:2 research (1) 25:24 residential (1) 56:8 residential-type (1) 48:11 resolve (1) 34:7 resolved (1) 28:7 resource (14) 8:13;19:12,17,18,19,24;20:5, 12,20,24,24;31:24;32:3;33:8 Resources (1) 27:25 respond (1) 38:10 responded (1) 13:23 responses (1) 52:21 restoration (1) 48:21 restrictions (1) 24:15 result (1) 13:2 resurfacing-type (1) 59:10 rethink (1) 29:13 return (1) 16:19 revenues (1) 31:18 review (4) 5:7;19:8;42:13;55:4 reviewed (1) 40:14 Reviewing (2) 46:18;68:2 reviews (1) 56:3 ribbon (6) 62:11,15,21;65:8;66:5,7

RIGHT (34) 1:4:2:6:5:12:6:12.24:11:20: 19:11:23:24:25:9,15:26:3:31:8: 33:2;36:2;37:17,24;43:1;53:20; 54:1,9,17;55:25;57:19,20;60:5; 63:4,5,9,18;64:1,4;65:4,17;68:5 right-of-way (41) 2:19;4:1;7:14,17,22,25;8:10, 13,15,16;9:4,8,14,25;10:4,7; 11:17:13:5:14:12,21,24:15:4: 18:15;20:14;31:19;32:3;34:1,8, 20;36:21;37:11,24;40:5;42:12; 43:7,16,19;47:6;48:25;52:14; 68:8 right-of-ways (1) 46:3 rights (1) 31:21 rights-of-way (4) 30:21;31:8;43:14;45:6 rigid (4) 18:10;62:3,5,13 **Rindlisbacher (3)** 2:25;44:19,20 River (2) 27:10:60:1 road (9) 48:16,21;56:9;58:3,8,9,11, 18:60:5 roads (2) 47:7:58:1 roadside (1) 9:10 Rob (5) 22:10;23:1;35:8;44:20;53:4 Robert (12) 3:1,17;6:1;27:20;28:10; 33:21;46:7;49:10;52:5,7;67:10; 68:15 Robert's (1) 53:9 rock (4) 47:8;59:11,18,18 roles (1) 2:13 **RON** (5) 26:22,23;35:15;36:2,5 **room** (1) 59:7 round (1) 57:5 **rule** (14) 23:13;29:23;31:23;32:16,16, 18,21,22,22;33:8,11,22;44:24; 46:1 **RULEMAKING (18)** 1:2;2:18;3:23;4:14;5:13,13; 6:19;7:10,24;8:9;10:18;12:25; 13:2;15:3;44:23;54:18;68:7,12 **RULES (13)** 1:3;2:14;3:25;7:13;8:2; 13:10,11;25:5;28:7;32:7;33:10; 37:11;38:18

Public Meeting			July 20, 2021
run (1)	seems (4)	38:21	5:5;13:11;29:23;54:19;64:5
33:9	27:21;39:3,8,10	simply (1)	specifics (1)
running (3)	sell (4)	36:17	60:20
61:9;62:6,12	11:6;19:20;20:2,21	six (1)	specified (1)
rural (4)	selling (1)	3:21	20:16
10:24;11:3;13:16;14:16	63:21	size (1)	spectrum (1)
rush (1)	sense (6)	38:4	22:20
40:24	24:9;25:6;58:15;59:1;62:17;	sizes (1)	speed (1)
40.24	67:16	62:16	35:13
S			
3	separate (2)	slack (2)	spent (1)
	17:23;33:4	17:24;58:14	34:23
safety (1)	separated (1)	slide (3)	splice (1)
34:10	18:3	14:3;38:6,13	18:2
sale (1)	separately (1)	slides (3)	splicing (1)
64:8	38:22	15:24;37:9;46:19	17:25
salt (1)	separation (2)	slurry (1)	sponsored (1)
38:3	17:15:65:18	56:14	12:17
same (3)	serve (1)	SMALL (14)	sprayed (1)
12:4;38:9;53:21	9:6	1:5;8:1,4,11;13:13;14:6,10;	27:2
satisfactory (1)	service (10)	37:11,15,18;38:1;45:1,7;62:19	squarely (1)
42:15	15:20;24:15;29:10,11,19,19;	smaller (1)	41:6
saves (1)	30:23;32:24;33:5,5	62:16	stack (1)
9:2	services (14)	social (1)	65:12
savings (1)	9:20;11:3,15;12:24;16:16;	34:9	Staff (10)
11:24	21:4;29:2,5;31:6;32:19;40:12;	solid (1)	4:15;7:21;11:13;21:20;
saw (1)	46:4,16;47:1	51:25	26:10,15;43:1;48:20;52:5;67:3
59:20	serving (1)	solve (1)	stage (1)
saying (2)	24:2	29:21	4:13
28:14;37:23	session (1)	somebody's (1)	stakeholder (1)
scales (1)	2:21	47:19	67:7
9:12	set (1)	someone (1)	stakeholders (8)
schedule (1)	46:1	65:2	3:12;4:9,19;5:3;26:13;42:4;
57:25	sets (1)	soon (2)	67:20,21
scheme (1)	41:8	58:10;60:24	stand (1)
30:18	setting (1)	sort (4)	54:16
scope (3)	39:25	36:24;40:22;42:18;65:22	standalone (1)
6:17;7:23;10:17	sewer (1)	south (2)	38:16
screen (1)	13:7	27:9;59:9	standard (1)
54:17	shallow (2)	southern (1)	25:17
sealer (1)	56:12;60:14	27:9	standing (1)
65:24	share (3)	space (9)	67:17
second (8)	8:15;11:12;52:8	8:15,16;9:4;11:18;13:4;15:4;	start (6)
16:17,18;20:23;27:24;29:24;	Shared (16)	18:15;45:10;48:25	2:5;23:2;36:23;52:6;67:3,8
41:23;42:16,19	19:12,17,17,19,24;20:5,12,	space-saving (1)	started (3)
secondly (1)	20,23,24;27:25;31:24;32:3,19;	9:7	2:8;16:18;44:22
30:3	33:8;49:12	spare (2)	starts (1)
Section (6)	short (2)	19:20;20:15	30:4
7:13;10:15;29:24;31:7;	2:5;54:2	spares (1)	STATE (32)
40:20;48:14	shortly (3)	61:10	1:4;3:25;7:14,25;8:6;9:24;
sections (2)	3:18;37:2,6	Sparklight (1)	14:12;21:4;23:21;28:2,8,8;
15:8;30:8	show (3)	27:8	30:18,23;31:2,3,14;32:23;34:9,
sector (1)	2:4;12:15,18	sparkling (1)	12,15;35:16;40:11;43:19;44:4;
13:6	side (5)	27:1	46:1;48:12;52:14;56:3,18;
sectors (1)	45:16;47:8;59:6;65:16,16	SPEAKER (10)	57:13;61:24
13:8	sign (1)	22:5,9;50:5,23;51:8;53:24;	stated (5)
seeing (5)	54:11	56:23,25;57:6;68:4	23:11;33:3;57:18;58:20;
5:12;33:18;49:24,24;63:9	signed (1)	speaking (1)	60:23
seek (1)	49:17	39:22	States (3)
4:9	significant (2)	special (1)	30:11;33:22;40:10
seeking (2)	13:8;23:20	26:9	State's (4)
14:1;17:2	Signing (1)	specific (3)	2:19;34:1;43:24;68:8
seem (2)	68:21	51:4;60:13,19	State-sponsored (1)
	Similarly (1)		
28:4;38:13	Similarly (1)	specifically (5)	12:17

status (6) 38:7,14;39:3,9,21;42:2 Statute (2) 29:25:44:4 Statutes (2) 15:15;44:6 stay (1) 2:23staying (1) 36:23 step (1) 26:20 stepping (1) 22:7 stewards (1) 52:14 stick (3) 26:19;65:3,3 still (8) 4:13;23:18;26:18;31:2; 46:22;51:15;53:14;54:13 stipulate (1) 19:19 stipulated (1) 18:25 stipulation (1) 20:19 stipulations (2) 20:13,20 strands (1) 62:1 strategic (1) 9:22 strictly (1) 49:22 strong (1) 39:2 strongly (1) 4:18stuck (1) 66:24 stuff (4) 35:17;56:14;58:12,13 subject (3) 22:14;32:14;52:12 sublease (1) 20:21 submission (1) 52:2 submissions (1) 67:14 submit (4) 4:19;19:3;40:23;68:14 submitted (5) 4:16,25;46:9;67:1;68:2 submitting (1) 52:4 subsequent (1) 48:21 substance (1) 52:6 subsurface (1)

suggest (1) 41:20 suggested (1) 11:25 suggestions (1) 44:15 suited (1) 9:5 summaries (1) 21:18 summarize (2) 10:12:21:13 summary (1) 22:12 super (3) 5:14;62:10,19 supplier (1) 62:25 supply (1) 63:6 support (5) 9:14,22;13:9,14;20:2 supporting (1) 16:22 sure (15) 3:10;4:10;6:24;21:21;23:25; 35:15;37:21;38:9;40:23;42:15; 45:12,20;53:21;67:9,19 surface (1) 60:4 surplus (1) 34:18 System (3) 23:21;48:12;56:9 Т tab (1) 5:13 table (1) 57:5 talk (6) 27:18,24;28:11;30:13;36:21; 41:1 talked (1) 59:12 talking (2) 22:18:47:7 talks (1) 30:11 tall (1) 37:25 tarring (1) 60:20 team (3) 63:17;64:10,20 tear (1) 58:11 tearing (1) 47:24 technologies (5) 8:1;14:4,17;15:2;52:15 technology (6)

Audio Transcription

4:11;14:11;46:16;56:2;62:6, 17 telecommunication (2) 29:2.11 telecommunications (7) 29:4,5;30:12;35:12;40:3,21; 42:7 telephone (1) 16:9 terms (1) 53:22 Thanks (9) 36:20;43:8;48:4;52:10;54:9; 55:20;56:5;65:1;66:11 that'd (1) 59:3 That'll (2) 35:22;52:5 therefore (1) 44:12 thick (1) 62:11 thinking (3) 46:20;61:15,22 third (7) 2:17;3:22;4:22;28:4;33:19, 19;68:7 though (2) 41:6;50:9 thought (2) 36:24:37:1 thoughts (2) 39:19:55:5 three (6) 27:12,18;32:17;44:18;54:22; 68:13 throughout (1) 45:23 throw (1) 66:10 till (1) 65:23 timing (1) 12:10 Title (5) 15:15;28:22,25;29:3,6 **Today** (10) 2:20;4:17;5:24;6:16;25:9; 27:12;37:4;45:15;46:7;53:20 today's (4) 2:21;3:17;5:16;6:13 together (1) 3:20 tomorrow (1) 4:24 took (1) 15:17 tool (1) 35:1 top (6) 60:21;62:3;65:11,13,17,24 topic (3) 11:20:26:15:33:19

Re: Rules Governing Utilities on State Highway July 20, 2021

topics (1) 55:21 totally (1) 49:19 touch (5) 8:8;19:11,15;20:4;55:16 touching (1) 58:2 tough (1) 59:19 tower (3) 37:16,23,25 towers (4) 14:6,15;37:13;38:5 town (1) 57:25 track (1) 2:23 traditional (3) 18:16;59:5;62:22 traditionally (1) 59:15 traffic (1) 9:11 transactions (1) 9:21 **TRANSCRIBED** (1) 1:20 transcription (2) 2:1:68:23 transcripts (2) 6:8:53:7 **TRANSPORTATION (3)** 1:1:2:12:35:11 traveling (1) 8:22 treat (1) 39:2 treatment (3) 9:18;39:23;42:20 trench (3) 18:11,16:65:24 trenches (1) 12:2 trenching (1) 65:15 tried (1) 43:25 trigger (1) 33:12 true (2) 37:10;42:15 truly (1) 3:7 try (3) 37:3;52:17;61:19 trying (9) 35:13,18,19;43:2;44:10;45:3, 5,8;58:5 Tuesday (1) 68:9 twist (1) 31:1

Min-U-Script®

60:3

Audio Transcription

W

two (16) 4:3,8,17;6:9,21;7:4;10:11,14; 15:20;21:12,19;30:8;31:5; 38:16:41:8:43:9 two-dozen (1) 22:25 two-lane (1) 47:7 type (2) 16:24,24 types (9) 9:13;12:19;14:13;18:17; 29:1;55:7;56:12;59:4;60:1 typically (6) 11:10;19:6;37:13;56:8;65:9; 66:1 U umbrella (1) 39:7 unbiased (1) 9:17 under (25) 15:15;19:16,16;28:18,21; 29:10,14,24;38:17;39:10,13,14, 21,22,24;40:5,15,17,21;42:5,6; 43:24;44:4,7;60:5 underground (2) 8:25:47:2 underserved (2) 11:11:16:21 unfortunately (1) 27:1 **UNIDENTIFIED (10)** 22:5,9;50:5,23;51:8;53:24; 56:23,25;57:6;68:4 United (1) 30:11 un-muted (3) 50:2,21:51:6 up (19) 2:4;6:7;27:13;29:20;35:13; 36:16;41:8;44:21;47:25;48:7; 49:21:51:16:54:17.24:55:4: 57:3;59:18;60:25;65:23 update (1) 10:1 updates (1) 8:2 updating (1) 4:10 urge (1) 42.4usage (1) 9:9 use (14) 5:20;8:10;11:2,18;15:4; 20:15;30:20;36:15;38:21;43:6;

8:16:20:15,17,22 virtual (2) uses (3) 5:18:22:25 7:21,24;44:9 virtually (7) 3:5;5:23;7:6;10:12,22;21:25; using (7) 3:5;31:21;34:25;36:14;41:8; 49:15 57:16;61:11 visit (1) **UTILITIES (30)** 50:12 1:3:3:25:7:13,16,22,25:8:10, voiced (1) 10:24 15;12:4,11;13:1,4,7;15:16; 16:10,11:28:17,23:30:4,4,5: 39:22;40:12,13;42:20;43:15; 44:24;45:6;47:24;50:6 utility (75) waiting (1) 2:18;4:3,5,6;5:8,12;6:18; 67:16 7:11,19,20,23;8:19;9:18;10:1, wants (2) 2;12:24;13:6;15:6,7,11,13,15, 2:15;45:8 19;16:1,3,13;18:22;27:20,23, Washington (1) 23;28:12,24;30:1;38:7,14,19; 21:8 39:3,9,15,21;40:6,8,9,10,16,25; water (3) 13:7;26:25;27:2 41:8,9,10,12,13,15,16,17,24; 42:2,8,8,16;43:3,6,12,20,21,23, WAY (8) 23;44:2,12,24,25;46:18;54:19; 1:4;11:23;24:5;31:22;35:2; 55:2,3;68:8 39:8;45:2,8 Utility' (1) web (5) 15:21 5:6,13;50:13;54:18;68:13 utility-type (1) WebEx (4) 29:15 2:24;36:14;49:17;55:15 utilize (1) website (2) 11:17 6:7;7:8 Wednesday (3) V 51:25:67:2:68:14 week (2) Valley (1) 4:24:52:4 27:10 weeks (1) Value (10) 3:21 15:23;21:23;28:5;31:19; weigh-in-motion (1) 32:4;33:24;35:1;38:17,21;44:9 9:12 welcome (2) varies (1) 66:4 2:15:65:3 vary (1) weren't (1) 66:8 53:6 vast (1) whatnot (2) 22:20 65:15,21 what's (3) vaults (7) 17:12,23;18:3;21:2;22:18; 31:5;50:25;61:10 whenever (1) 59:16,17 vendors (1) 9:22 26:13 whole (2) vernacular (1) 29:14;67:8 who'll (1) 27:8 versus (7) 2:23 16:5,8;23:8;24:8;25:8;32:11; wide (1) 65:10 64:16 via (4) WILLIAMS (5) 49:17;50:8;67:15,21 26:22,23;35:15;36:2,5 VICTORIA (1) wins (1) 1:2111:11 Video (3) wireless (16) 30:23,24;31:6 8:4,12;13:13;14:4,7,8,10; view (1) 37:12,15,18;38:1;40:7,8,15; 47:18 45:16:46:2 violation (2) within (8) 28:2;31:24 7:17,22;10:3,7;17:13;18:10;

52:3:55:15 wonky (1) 27:16 Wood (1) 27:10 word (1) 41:5 wording (2) 38:4;41:21 words (4) 29:15,20;32:15;33:2 work (17) 5:16;14:8;19:5;23:10;24:4; 26:2;27:20;29:21;45:13,14; 52:3;57:24;58:5,16,21;67:18; 68:20 workable (2) 45:16,17 worked (1) 56:17 working (12) 12:1,6;22:13;25:25;56:20,24; 57:23;58:1,19;60:24;61:16; 68:18 works (2) 46:1,1 world (2) 30:9,25 writing (1) 25:8 written (14) 4:19;27:14;35:21;37:7;50:8, 11;52:1,19;60:21;63:9;64:11, 20:67:15:68:11 Y year (1) 32:10 years (9) 12:14:16:25:28:20:32:18; 58:2,4,8,23;64:15 Yep (1) 6:6 0 04 (1) 50:21 1 1 (4) 8:9;37:16,19,25 1,000-count (1) 66:4 1:09:20(1) 54:7 1:15:00(1) 54:7 1:32:23 (1) 68:23 10(1)

used (3)

users (4)

48:23;55:14;56:23;57:1

44:3:56:13:62:7

58:8	18:25
10-minute (1)	
54:2	36 (1) 47:2
54:2 14 (2)	39.03.43 (2)
57:17;65:11	3:24;7:13
15 (1)	4
66:5	4
15th (1)	
10:11	4(1)
18 (4)	59:6
47:23;57:16,18;66:1	4:10(1)
1984 (1)	54:1
30:16	4:20 (1)
1-and-a-half (1)	54:5
65:9	E
2	5
2	5 (10)
2 (5)	5 (10)
2 (5)	31:13,17,18,20;32:1,5,14;
22:17;30:15;53:10;59:6,6	33:13;61:1;68:6
20 (3)	5:00 (3)
1:13;32:18;67:24	1:14;54:3;55:9
2003 (3)	50 (1)
7:19;44:24;55:2	37:25
2012 (2)	50-3001 (1)
30:22;55:3	31:7
202 (1)	509 (1)
51:5	50:2
2021 (3) 1:12:54:25:68:0	5G-type (1)
1:13;54:25;68:9	14:10
208 (2)	C
50:19,20	6
20th (1)	
68.0	ϵ (3)
68:9 24 (4)	6 (2) 50:6:61:1
24 (4)	59:6;61:1
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19	59:6;61:1 60 (1)
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19 24th (1)	59:6;61:1 60 (1) 19:3
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19 24th (1) 10:11	59:6;61:1 60 (1) 19:3 60-days (1)
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19 24th (1) 10:11 26th (1)	59:6;61:1 60 (1) 19:3 60-days (1) 19:10
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19 24th (1) 10:11 26th (1) 37:2	59:6;61:1 60 (1) 19:3 60-days (1) 19:10 61 (3)
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19 24th (1) 10:11 26th (1) 37:2 288 (2)	59:6;61:1 60 (1) 19:3 60-days (1) 19:10 61 (3) 15:15;28:22;29:6
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19 24th (1) 10:11 26th (1) 37:2 288 (2) 62:7,15	59:6;61:1 60 (1) 19:3 60-days (1) 19:10 61 (3) 15:15;28:22;29:6 61-121 (2)
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19 24th (1) 10:11 26th (1) 37:2 288 (2) 62:7,15 28th (6)	59:6;61:1 60 (1) 19:3 60-days (1) 19:10 61 (3) 15:15;28:22;29:6 61-121 (2) 40:20;42:7
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19 24th (1) 10:11 26th (1) 37:2 288 (2) 62:7,15 28th (6) 4:23;33:16;51:25;64:21;	59:6;61:1 60 (1) 19:3 60-days (1) 19:10 61 (3) 15:15;28:22;29:6 61-121 (2) 40:20;42:7 61-129 (2)
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19 24th (1) 10:11 26th (1) 37:2 288 (2) 62:7,15 28th (6) 4:23;33:16;51:25;64:21; 67:2;68:14	59:6;61:1 60 (1) 19:3 60-days (1) 19:10 61 (3) 15:15;28:22;29:6 61-121 (2) 40:20;42:7 61-129 (2) 29:25;42:8
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19 24th (1) 10:11 26th (1) 37:2 288 (2) 62:7,15 28th (6) 4:23;33:16;51:25;64:21; 67:2;68:14 2-foot-to-3-foot (1)	59:6;61:1 60 (1) 19:3 60-days (1) 19:10 61 (3) 15:15;28:22;29:6 61-121 (2) 40:20;42:7 61-129 (2) 29:25;42:8 615.01 (1)
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19 24th (1) 10:11 26th (1) 37:2 288 (2) 62:7,15 28th (6) 4:23;33:16;51:25;64:21; 67:2;68:14 2-foot-to-3-foot (1) 47:16	59:6;61:1 60 (1) 19:3 60-days (1) 19:10 61 (3) 15:15;28:22;29:6 61-121 (2) 40:20;42:7 61-129 (2) 29:25;42:8 615.01 (1) 29:24
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19 24th (1) 10:11 26th (1) 37:2 288 (2) 62:7,15 28th (6) 4:23;33:16;51:25;64:21; 67:2;68:14 2-foot-to-3-foot (1) 47:16 2-inch (2)	59:6;61:1 60 (1) 19:3 60-days (1) 19:10 61 (3) 15:15;28:22;29:6 61-121 (2) 40:20;42:7 61-129 (2) 29:25;42:8 615.01 (1) 29:24 615.15 (1)
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19 24th (1) 10:11 26th (1) 37:2 288 (2) 62:7,15 28th (6) 4:23;33:16;51:25;64:21; 67:2;68:14 2-foot-to-3-foot (1) 47:16	59:6;61:1 60 (1) 19:3 60-days (1) 19:10 61 (3) 15:15;28:22;29:6 61-121 (2) 40:20;42:7 61-129 (2) 29:25;42:8 615.01 (1) 29:24 615.15 (1) 33:22
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19 24th (1) 10:11 26th (1) 37:2 288 (2) 62:7,15 28th (6) 4:23;33:16;51:25;64:21; 67:2;68:14 2-foot-to-3-foot (1) 47:16 2-inch (2) 59:6;65:18	59:6;61:1 60 (1) 19:3 60-days (1) 19:10 61 (3) 15:15;28:22;29:6 61-121 (2) 40:20;42:7 61-129 (2) 29:25;42:8 615.01 (1) 29:24 615.15 (1) 33:22 62 (2)
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19 24th (1) 10:11 26th (1) 37:2 288 (2) 62:7,15 28th (6) 4:23;33:16;51:25;64:21; 67:2;68:14 2-foot-to-3-foot (1) 47:16 2-inch (2)	59:6;61:1 60 (1) 19:3 60-days (1) 19:10 61 (3) 15:15;28:22;29:6 61-121 (2) 40:20;42:7 61-129 (2) 29:25;42:8 615.01 (1) 29:24 615.15 (1) 33:22 62 (2) 28:25;29:3
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19 24th (1) 10:11 26th (1) 37:2 288 (2) 62:7,15 28th (6) 4:23;33:16;51:25;64:21; 67:2;68:14 2-foot-to-3-foot (1) 47:16 2-inch (2) 59:6;65:18 3	59:6;61:1 60 (1) 19:3 60-days (1) 19:10 61 (3) 15:15;28:22;29:6 61-121 (2) 40:20;42:7 61-129 (2) 29:25;42:8 615.01 (1) 29:24 615.15 (1) 33:22 62 (2) 28:25;29:3 620.01 (1)
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19 24th (1) 10:11 26th (1) 37:2 288 (2) 62:7,15 28th (6) 4:23;33:16;51:25;64:21; 67:2;68:14 2-foot-to-3-foot (1) 47:16 2-inch (2) 59:6;65:18 3 3 (2)	59:6;61:1 60 (1) 19:3 60-days (1) 19:10 61 (3) 15:15;28:22;29:6 61-121 (2) 40:20;42:7 61-129 (2) 29:25;42:8 615.01 (1) 29:24 615.15 (1) 33:22 62 (2) 28:25;29:3
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19 24th (1) 10:11 26th (1) 37:2 288 (2) 62:7,15 28th (6) 4:23;33:16;51:25;64:21; 67:2;68:14 2-foot-to-3-foot (1) 47:16 2-inch (2) 59:6;65:18 3 3 (2) 59:6;68:21	59:6;61:1 60 (1) 19:3 60-days (1) 19:10 61 (3) 15:15;28:22;29:6 61-121 (2) 40:20;42:7 61-129 (2) 29:25;42:8 615.01 (1) 29:24 615.15 (1) 33:22 62 (2) 28:25;29:3 620.01 (1)
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19 24th (1) 10:11 26th (1) 37:2 288 (2) 62:7,15 28th (6) 4:23;33:16;51:25;64:21; 67:2;68:14 2-foot-to-3-foot (1) 47:16 2-inch (2) 59:6;65:18 3 (2) 59:6;68:21 3:00 (2)	59:6;61:1 60 (1) 19:3 60-days (1) 19:10 61 (3) 15:15;28:22;29:6 61-121 (2) 40:20;42:7 61-129 (2) 29:25;42:8 615.01 (1) 29:24 615.15 (1) 33:22 62 (2) 28:25;29:3 620.01 (1)
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19 24th (1) 10:11 26th (1) 37:2 288 (2) 62:7,15 28th (6) 4:23;33:16;51:25;64:21; 67:2;68:14 2-foot-to-3-foot (1) 47:16 2-inch (2) 59:6;65:18 3 (2) 59:6;68:21 3:00 (2) 1:14;2:3	59:6;61:1 60 (1) 19:3 60-days (1) 19:10 61 (3) 15:15;28:22;29:6 61-121 (2) 40:20;42:7 61-129 (2) 29:25;42:8 615.01 (1) 29:24 615.15 (1) 33:22 62 (2) 28:25;29:3 620.01 (1)
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19 24th (1) 10:11 26th (1) 37:2 288 (2) 62:7,15 28th (6) 4:23;33:16;51:25;64:21; 67:2;68:14 2-foot-to-3-foot (1) 47:16 2-inch (2) 59:6;65:18 3 (2) 59:6;68:21 3:00 (2) 1:14;2:3 30 (3)	59:6;61:1 60 (1) 19:3 60-days (1) 19:10 61 (3) 15:15;28:22;29:6 61-121 (2) 40:20;42:7 61-129 (2) 29:25;42:8 615.01 (1) 29:24 615.15 (1) 33:22 62 (2) 28:25;29:3 620.01 (1)
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19 24th (1) 10:11 26th (1) 37:2 288 (2) 62:7,15 28th (6) 4:23;33:16;51:25;64:21; 67:2;68:14 2-foot-to-3-foot (1) 47:16 2-inch (2) 59:6;65:18 3 3 (2) 59:6;68:21 3:00 (2) 1:14;2:3 30 (3) 19:4,6;28:20	59:6;61:1 60 (1) 19:3 60-days (1) 19:10 61 (3) 15:15;28:22;29:6 61-121 (2) 40:20;42:7 61-129 (2) 29:25;42:8 615.01 (1) 29:24 615.15 (1) 33:22 62 (2) 28:25;29:3 620.01 (1)
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19 24th (1) 10:11 26th (1) 37:2 288 (2) 62:7,15 28th (6) 4:23;33:16;51:25;64:21; 67:2;68:14 2-foot-to-3-foot (1) 47:16 2-inch (2) 59:6;65:18 3 3 (2) 59:6;68:21 3:00 (2) 1:14;2:3 30 (3) 19:4,6;28:20 300-foot (1)	59:6;61:1 60 (1) 19:3 60-days (1) 19:10 61 (3) 15:15;28:22;29:6 61-121 (2) 40:20;42:7 61-129 (2) 29:25;42:8 615.01 (1) 29:24 615.15 (1) 33:22 62 (2) 28:25;29:3 620.01 (1)
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19 24th (1) 10:11 26th (1) 37:2 288 (2) 62:7,15 28th (6) 4:23;33:16;51:25;64:21; 67:2;68:14 2-foot-to-3-foot (1) 47:16 2-inch (2) 59:6;65:18 3:00 (2) 1:14;2:3 30 (3) 19:4,6;28:20 300-foot (1) 37:23	59:6;61:1 60 (1) 19:3 60-days (1) 19:10 61 (3) 15:15;28:22;29:6 61-121 (2) 40:20;42:7 61-129 (2) 29:25;42:8 615.01 (1) 29:24 615.15 (1) 33:22 62 (2) 28:25;29:3 620.01 (1)
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19 24th (1) 10:11 26th (1) 37:2 288 (2) 62:7,15 28th (6) 4:23;33:16;51:25;64:21; 67:2;68:14 2-foot-to-3-foot (1) 47:16 2-inch (2) 59:6;65:18 3:00 (2) 1:14;2:3 30 (3) 19:4,6;28:20 300-foot (1) 37:23 301 (1)	59:6;61:1 60 (1) 19:3 60-days (1) 19:10 61 (3) 15:15;28:22;29:6 61-121 (2) 40:20;42:7 61-129 (2) 29:25;42:8 615.01 (1) 29:24 615.15 (1) 33:22 62 (2) 28:25;29:3 620.01 (1)
24 (4) 47:2,14;57:18,19 24th (1) 10:11 26th (1) 37:2 288 (2) 62:7,15 28th (6) 4:23;33:16;51:25;64:21; 67:2;68:14 2-foot-to-3-foot (1) 47:16 2-inch (2) 59:6;65:18 3:00 (2) 1:14;2:3 30 (3) 19:4,6;28:20 300-foot (1) 37:23	59:6;61:1 60 (1) 19:3 60-days (1) 19:10 61 (3) 15:15;28:22;29:6 61-121 (2) 40:20;42:7 61-129 (2) 29:25;42:8 615.01 (1) 29:24 615.15 (1) 33:22 62 (2) 28:25;29:3 620.01 (1)