

California Emerging Technology Fund
Analysis of Households (HHs) Eligible and Enrolled In ACP in Comparison to CDT Proposed Capacity Grant Allocations
October 2024

Region and Counties	Total HHs	ACP-Eligible HHs	% Eligible	HHs Enrolled in ACP	% Enrolled in ACP	HHs To Be Reached	% of Statewide Need	CDT Proposed Allocation	CDT Proposed Funding	Projected HH Adoptions
California (Feb. 7, 2024)	13,044,258	5,844,797	45%	2,945,281	50%	2,899,516	100.00%	~Proportionate	\$37.91	\$450
								Under Potential	Millions	\$0.00045
Redwood Coast										
Del Norte	10,751	5,275	49%	3,170	60%	2,105	0.07%	1.2%	\$0.45	1,011
Humboldt	54,679	31,132	57%	8,561	27%	22,571	0.78%	0.7%	\$0.27	590
Trinity	4,822	2,773	58%	380	14%	2,393	0.08%	0.5%	\$0.19	421
Redwood Coast Total	70,252	39,180	56%	12,111	31%	27,069	0.93%	2.4%	\$0.91	2,022
North Bay North Coast										
Marin	105,431	28,904	27%	4,816	17%	24,088	0.83%	0.6%	\$0.23	505
Mendocino	34,688	19,248	55%	4,874	25%	14,374	0.50%	1.5%	\$0.57	1,264
Napa	48,705	17,253	35%	3,318	19%	13,935	0.48%	0.5%	\$0.19	421
Sonoma	189,374	71,680	38%	14,412	20%	57,268	1.98%	1.3%	\$0.49	1,095
NBNC Total	378,198	137,085	36%	27,420	20%	109,665	3.78%	3.9%	\$1.48	3,286
Northeastern										
Butte	85,320	46,119	54%	15,613	34%	30,506	1.05%	0.6%	\$0.23	505
Lassen	12,051	5,913	49%	1,027	17%	4,886	0.17%	1.6%	\$0.61	1,348
Modoc	3,433	1,684	49%	455	27%	1,229	0.04%	0.5%	\$0.19	421
Plumas	7,271	3,567	49%	554	16%	3,013	0.10%	0.5%	\$0.19	421
Shasta	71,180	35,805	50%	19,243	54%	16,562	0.57%	1.0%	\$0.38	842
Siskiyou	17,022	8,352	49%	3,239	39%	5,113	0.18%	1.4%	\$0.53	1,179
Tehama	23,875	13,730	58%	5,495	40%	8,235	0.28%	0.9%	\$0.34	758
Northeastern Total	220,152	115,170	52%	45,626	40%	69,544	2.40%	6.5%	\$2.46	5,476

California Emerging Technology Fund
Analysis of Households (HHs) Eligible and Enrolled In ACP in Comparison to CDT Proposed Capacity Grant Allocations
October 2024

Silicon Valley										
San Mateo	263,542	75,900	29%	14,099	19%	61,801	2.13%	1.5%	\$0.57	1,264
Santa Clara	640,216	204,684	32%	57,728	28%	146,956	5.07%	3.6%	\$1.36	3,033
Silicon Valley Total	903,758	280,584	31%	71,827	26%	208,757	7.20%	5.1%	\$1.93	4,296
San Joaquin Valley										
Fresno	307,908	176,750	57%	95,774	54%	80,976	2.79%	2.3%	\$0.87	1,938
Kern	270,281	155,323	57%	111,017	71%	44,306	1.53%	2.2%	\$0.83	1,853
Kings	43,453	23,694	55%	11,698	49%	11,996	0.41%	0.7%	\$0.27	590
Madera	44,881	25,536	57%	11,972	47%	13,564	0.47%	0.8%	\$0.30	674
Merced	80,008	49,786	62%	23,827	48%	25,959	0.90%	0.8%	\$0.30	674
San Joaquin	228,567	120,249	53%	48,984	41%	71,265	2.46%	1.7%	\$0.64	1,432
Stanislaus	173,898	93,534	54%	42,764	46%	50,770	1.75%	1.2%	\$0.45	1,011
Tulare	138,238	86,787	63%	51,574	59%	35,213	1.21%	1.4%	\$0.53	1,179
SJV Total	1,287,234	731,659	57%	397,610	54%	334,049	11.52%	11.1%	\$4.21	9,351
Central Sierra										
Amador	14,945	6,288	42%	1,447	23%	4,841	0.17%	1.0%	\$0.38	842
Calaveras	18,058	7,598	42%	1,825	24%	5,773	0.20%	0.9%	\$0.34	758
Mariposa	6,960	2,928	42%	873	30%	2,055	0.07%	0.5%	\$0.19	421
Tuolumne	21,510	9,050	42%	2,600	29%	6,450	0.22%	1.1%	\$0.42	927
Central Sierra Total	61,473	25,864	42%	6,745	26%	19,119	0.66%	3.5%	\$1.33	2,949
Eastern Sierra										
Alpine	428	180	42%	19	11%	161	0.01%	0.5%	\$0.19	421
Inyo	7,253	3,052	42%	641	21%	2,411	0.08%	0.5%	\$0.19	421
Mono	5,589	2,351	42%	141	6%	2,210	0.08%	0.5%	\$0.19	421
Eastern Sierra Total	13,270	5,583	42%	801	14%	4,782	0.16%	1.5%	\$0.57	1,264

California Emerging Technology Fund
Analysis of Households (HHs) Eligible and Enrolled In ACP in Comparison to CDT Proposed Capacity Grant Allocations
October 2024

CDT Capacity Grant (\$70.2M from NTIA) CDT Proposed Allocations	>54% (or \$37.91M of \$70.2M) for Track 1: Regional / Local Digital Equity Ecosystems and Implementation (formula is not stated by CDT but appears to be a minimum .5% or \$189,550 per County and no Outcomes are set forth in CDT Draft).
	>9% (or \$6.32M of \$70.2M) for Track 2: Targeted Statewide Digital Equity Ecosystem(s) (no components or services are delineated in CDT Draft).
	<37% (or \$25.97M of \$70.2M) for Centralized Services (not delineated in CDT Draft).
~Proportionate	CDT Proposed Allocation is approximately close to share of statewide potential (only 3 Regions within same whole percentage point).
Under Potential	CDT Proposed Allocation is below the share of statewide Digitally-Disadvantaged HHs to be reached (less than fair share to achieve Digital Equity).
\$450 Per Adoption	Get Connected Call Center operates @ \$65 per Unconnected HH Enrollment + \$20 for screening and referrals to CBO synchronous Digital Literacy Training which is compensated at \$350 for 6 hours of 3 Courses (Elements) aligned to UNESCO Framework with Digital Proficiency Self- Assessment for standardization and normalization statewide. Thus, a "full Adoption" (exclusive of the cost of a computing device) currently costs <\$435 per HH. The \$450 rounds up to allow for some outreach costs. At \$450 per Adoption out of \$37.91M, 84,244 HHs can be reached. If \$500 per Adoption were allowed to increase flexibility for outreach and coordination at the County and/or Region level, then 75,820 HHs could be reached. Please note that the \$65 per enrollment + \$20 for screening-referral needs to be paid to the Call Center or CBO doing the work.
Overall Principles and Strategies	1. The Capacity Grant should be used for the most fundamental actions to achieve Digital Equity: Get as many low-income Covered Populations online with an affordable lower-cost Internet service and trained to have sufficient digital literacy skills to improve daily living (with documented verification).
	2. Outcome Goals should be established for public accountability (such as "Adoptions" per unit of funding) and to ensure fairness and equity across the state. There must be quantified Outcomes for investment of \$70.2M. Outcome Goals are essential to measure success.
	3. A Digital Equity Ecosystem provides support for CBOs at scale for cost-effectiveness to minimize duplication of efforts. It should be the heart of "centralized services" other than government oversight and administration. Investment in a Digital Equity Ecosystem without unnecessary duplication throughout the state optimizes the ability to reach more Digitally-Disadvantaged HHs.
	4. Once all low-income households are online and digitally-proficient, then development of program systems for Outcome Areas can have more impact. However, it is inefficient to invest in Outcome Areas if grant recipients are not required to achieve Adoptions in the context of the Outcome Area program implementation.
	5. Regular convenings of "Learning Communities" and grantee coaching are essential to ensure fidelity of implementation and optimize Outcomes.
Funding Adoptions to Achieve Digital Equity	Increase funding to Counties and Regions that have higher potential to deliver more outcomes by reallocating proposed funding for Centralized Services. This can be contingent on performance and/or reallocation from Counties and Regions that do not achieve obligated Adoptions--incent a "race to the top" to get as many HHs online and digitally-proficient as soon as possible. Allocation of another \$7M from Centralized Services to the under-allocated Counties @ \$450 per Adoptions (total \$7,090,200) will reach a total of 100,000 HHs.
	Support quantified Outcomes (Adoptions) for Counties and Regions by increasing the allocation for statewide Digital Equity Ecosystem funding with allowed higher amount allowed per grant (>\$2M per Grant and <\$12M for Digital Equity Ecosystem investments).
	Reduce Centralized Services by \$13M (add >\$7M for Counties and Regions and <\$6M for Digital Equity Ecosystem) = \$13M or 18.5% for overhead.