CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON TECHNOLOGY

----- X

April 29, 2025 Start: 10:15 a.m. Recess: 1:34 p.m.

HELD AT: COMMITTEE ROOM - CITY HALL

B E F O R E: Jennifer Gutiérrez, Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Robert F. Holden

OTHER COUNCIL MEMBERS ATTENDING:
Lincoln Restler

APPEARANCES

Brett Sykoff, Executive Director of Broadband and Franchise Administration for the New York City Office of Technology and Innovation

Samantha Wright, Associate Commissioner for External Partnerships at the New York City Office of Technology and Innovation

Chantel Senatas, Deputy Commissioner of Legal Matters at the New York City Office of Technology and Innovation

Neelesh Shah, Information Technology at Department of Citywide Administrative Services

Andrew Rasiej, Founder of Civic Hall

Ash Wolfson, volunteer installer and outreach leader with NYC MESH

Michael Santorelli, Director of the Advanced Communications Law and Policy Institute at New York Law School

Alex Spyropoulos, Director of Government Relations at TechNYC

Noel Hidalgo, Executive Director of Beta NYC

Susan Peters, New Yorkers 4 Wired Tech

Stuart Reid, Co-Chair of Smart Community Initiative

A P P E A R A N C E S (CONTINUED)

James Ford, self

Odette Wilkens, President and General Counsel of Wired Broadband Inc.

Keziah Sullivan, Interim General Manager of WHCR,
90.3 FM Harlem Community Radio

Jose Luis Rodriguez, Executive Director of Caribbean Preparedness and Response, Inc.

Bernard Otalora, self

Julie Martin, New Yorkers 4 Wired Tech

Sharon Brown, Rose of Sharon Enterprises

Clayton Banks, Chief Executive Officer of Silicon Harlem

Joseph Dumanov, self

Stanley Chan, self

Stephanie Robinson, Human-I-T

Tracy Appleton, self

Christopher Leon Johnson, self

Jerelyn Rodriguez, Chief Executive Officer and Co-Founder o The Knowledge House

Ari Hoenig, self

2.2

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: This is a microphone check for the Committee on Technology. Today's date is April 29, 2025. Located in the City Hall Committee Room. Recording is done by Rocco Mesiti.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Good morning, and welcome to today's New York City Council hearing from the Committee on Technology.

At this point I'd like to remind everyone to please silence their electronic devices, and at no point going forward is anyone to approach the dais or the witness table unless invited to testify.

If you would like to sign up to testify and have not done so already, you can do so by filling out a slip in the back of the room at the table with Sergeant-at-Arms. And if you have any other concerns during the hearing, please let one of the Sergeant-at-Arms know, and we will address your concerns.

Chair, we're ready to begin.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you. [GAVEL]
Good morning, and welcome. I'm Council Member

Jennifer Gutiérrez, Chair of the Committee on

Technology. Thank you all for joining us today's

oversight hearing on the City's Broadband Strategy.

2 When I asked to Chair this Committee before I was 3 even sworn in, people were surprised because my 4 background is not in tech. It is in housing, it is in organizing, it is in immigration, but not tech. And 5 during the pandemic, District 34, like so many 6 7 communities, were cut off. Families without broadband couldn't access school, jobs, or basic services. The 8 digital divide wasn't just real, it was violent in its consequences. So, I just want to be very clear 10 11 that we are not here to question OTI's commitment to 12 digital equity. I believe that you all have staff and 13 there are public servants working hard to close that gap. But this hearing is about accountability, 14 15 because after years of promises, we still don't have 16 a long-term plan. My team reviewed every transcript 17 from every single hearing since I've become Chair in 18 2022. This Committee was promised over 10 times that 19 a comprehensive strategy would be shared, some with 20 timelines under a year. It's 2025 and we are still 21 waiting. Meanwhile, the Internet Master Plan was 2.2 shelved without public explanation, a plan developed 2.3 with dozens of partners, praised globally, and designed to build long-term infrastructure and 24 25 affordability. In its place, we've seen no roadmap,

2.2

little transparency, and 40 million dollars a year
going to two major cable companies. I'm not knocking
330,000 people getting free Internet, but that is a
short-term, expensive solution and we have to walk
and chew gum at the same time. I believe we can do
both. This Committee wants to know what has been
built, what is planned, and what is the City doing to
connect all New Yorkers, not just public housing
residents, but the millions of people still left
behind? How are we innovating service delivery?

We're also considering a legislative package that includes Intros 481, 483, 486, which expands support for community broadband access, Intro. 878, which increases transparency in cable franchise agreements, and as well as two of my own bills, Intro. 198, which improves reporting on discounted internet programs, and Intro. 1122, resurrecting the Internet Master Plan, which would require the City to develop a real long-term broadband plan, much like the Internet Master Plan.

I want to thank the Tech Committee Staff,
Policy Analyst Eric Brown; Legislative Counsel Irene
Byhovsky, and my Chief-of-Staff Anya Lehr;
Legislative Associate Victoria Peters; and our

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 Legislative Fellow Josmary Ochoa-Cruz for their work 3 to prepare for today's hearing.

I want to recognize Members of the

Technology Committee who have joined us today,

Council Member Bob Holden, and I'm sure more will be

trickling in, and we're going to pass it over to

Council Member Bob Holden, who has a statement.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Thank you, Chair Gutiérrez, for the opportunity to hear Intro. 898, a bill to increase transparency and provide the public with easier access to information about broadband service and cable franchise agreements in New York City. This legislation would create a user-friendly portal featuring a navigable map updated annually that outlines where broadband services are available and what obligations franchisees have to the City and its residents. Constituents deserve to know which companies are operating in their neighborhoods, what services they should receive, and what commitments those companies have made. Just so we don't have all the advertising of these companies that say this is what we offer, and then they don't, and we've seen that a lot. So, during my time as Chair of the Council's Committee on Technology, broadband access

answer honestly to Council Member questions?

24

2.2

2.3

2		EXECUTIVE	DIRECTOR	SYKOFF:	I	do.
---	--	-----------	----------	---------	---	-----

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I do.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SENATAS: I do.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL BYHOVSKY: Thank you.

You may begin your testimony.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Thank you.

Good morning, Chair Gutiérrez and Members of the City

Council Committee on Technology. My name is Brett

Sykoff, and I am the Executive Director of Broadband

and Franchise Administration for the Office of

Technology and Innovation, or OTI. With me is

Samantha Wright, OTI's Associate Commissioner for

External Partnerships, and Chantel Senatas, OTI's

Deputy Commissioner for Legal Matters. We're pleased

to discuss our recent efforts and future plans

related to broadband and digital equity with the

Committee today.

Under the leadership of Chief Technology
Officer Matthew Fraser, OTI has spearheaded numerous
programs and initiatives focused on accomplishing
Mayor Adams' vision of bridging the digital divide.
Internet access is essential to fully participate in
our modern digital society, and we consider it akin
to a modern utility like heat or hot water. Prior to

2.2

2.3

this Administration, 30 to 40 percent of public housing residents lacked this basic modern necessity, an injustice that caused real harm to our older adults, students, families, and jobseekers during the pandemic. Today, thanks to the leadership of Mayor Adams and CTO Fraser, New York City provides more residents with free high-speed Internet than any other city in the nation. We also supply equitable access to devices, digital skills training, and support programs to ensure New Yorkers across the five boroughs are equipped to use the Internet.

Recognizing the urgent need for broadband access in public housing, we launched Big Apple Connect in the first year of this Administration. Big Apple Connect, the nation's largest municipal subsidized broadband program, provides free in-home broadband and basic cable to access to over 330,000 New Yorkers in 220 NYCHA sites. The program's popularity is demonstrated by its 80 percent citywide adoption rate, and we continue efforts to increase adoption. Last week, we sent a survey to thousands of NYCHA households enrolled in Big Apple Connect to assess the quality of services being provided and to better understand the ongoing digital needs of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

residents. Since the Federal Affordable Connectivity

Program, or ACP, ended in 2024, the City's provision

of these essential services to NYCHA residents has

taken on an even greater significance, and we are

committed to a baseline in the OTI budget.

We're extremely proud of the Big Apple Connect success, but it is important to note that it is just one piece of our digital equity efforts. Last month, we released the New York City Digital Equity Roadmap, with a 2.4-million-dollar investment designed to enhance free Internet access and the skills and support to use it. The roadmap, which is the product of extensive interagency collaboration, focuses on meeting the immediate needs of New Yorkers while also laying the foundation for future success. We're making this initial investment to upgrade technology in older adult centers, libraries, and the NYCHA Digital Van program. This month, we held our first convening of a digital equity working group that will build upon existing City government partnerships, and we will be hiring a chief digital equity officer to lead this important work.

Given the recent enactment of the New York State Affordable Broadband Act, which requires

availability of these services.

1

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Internet service providers to offer a low-cost

broadband option to eligible households, we have also

been in close coordination with the Connect All team

and plan to collaborate on efforts to amplify the

As mentioned in the Roadmap, we recently released a request for information to further explore how expanding the use of public infrastructure can improve digital equity outcomes. We look forward to hearing from a wide range of stakeholders, including elected officials, before the May 30 response deadline. The RFI seeks to build on our current franchise portfolio, comprised of non-exclusive agreements with dozens of companies that provide services such as cable television, public communication structures, mobile telecommunications, and information services. It is important to note that although the cable television franchisees Charter, Altice, and Verizon also provide broadband services, the franchise agreements are limited to the provision of cable television, subject to applicable federal law.

The Adams Administration is committed to keeping New Yorkers connected wherever they live,

2.2

2.3

work, and travel across the five boroughs. As part of our broadband offerings, LinkNYC operates about 2,200 kiosks, including Original Links and the newer Link 5G Smart Poles, that reach over 18 million subscribers. These kiosks provide free Wi-Fi, nationwide calling, device charging, and quick access to 9-1-1 and government services. 90 percent of Link 5Gs, which are built to provide the added benefit of multi-tenant 5G service, will be located outside of Manhattan's Central Business District. We continue to work with the franchisee CityBridge to expand the Link 5G network across the city.

In addition to Link 5G, my team administers mobile telecommunications franchises.

These franchises allow companies to install 4G and 5G equipment on light poles and utility poles. Through this franchise, mobile carriers enhance and densify their cellular networks, providing crucial service to anyone who owns a cell phone. More recently, we provided incentives for these companies to build their equipment in historically underserved areas of the city, ensuring that mobile coverage is equitable.

Finally, information services franchises are held by companies that install and operate fiber

2.2

2.3

optic cable in city streets for the purpose of offering voice, data, and/or business-to-business internet service across the five boroughs. In the past year, the City has entered into 13 of these franchises, and we continue to consider qualified companies on a rolling basis.

Now, I'll turn to the legislation considered today. Chair Gutiérrez's bill, Intro. 198, would require OTI to report on discounted internet service program utilization rates, and report to the Council about outreach efforts related to such programs. Currently, we do provide information through our website on eligibility for Big Apple Connect, and we intend to post a dashboard that shows the utilization rates of all eligible households citywide. As mentioned, Big Apple Connect is directly administered by Altice and Charter, and they have dedicated resources to outreach since the program launched. We can work with these companies to detail such efforts on the Big Apple Connect webpage.

Intro. 481, sponsored by Council Member
Won, would require OTI to disseminate information on
affordable internet programs and community-based
internet services to community-based organizations,

2.2

2.3

or CBOs. As written, it is unclear what the intended reach is for this dissemination, which makes it challenging for OTI to assess the resources required for such efforts. Further, while we are working to amplify information on statewide programs like the discounts provided through the Affordable Broadband Act, it is more challenging to catalog community-based internet services and target the appropriate geographic areas where such networks may be available. We'd like to discuss with the Council how we may address existing gaps.

Council Member Won's bill, Intro. 483, would require OTI to establish a program whereby City agencies provide wireless network access for the public to utilize the internet. We appreciate the spirit of this proposal, but we are unclear whether the proposal intends to provide service to agencies' walk-in customers or to the general public. Further, an agency's capability to provide this service is highly dependent on numerous factors and may require significant infrastructure investments and different network requirements, depending on the intended constituency. We'd like to discuss further what the sponsor envisions with this bill, considering the

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

2 operational and fiscal implications, as currently
3 written.

Intro. 486, also sponsored by Council Member Won, would require OTI to provide written materials about affordable internet for wide-ranging outreach to students and families. We appreciate the Council's focus on educating students and their families about the low- or no-cost broadband services available to them. In the past, we have collaborated with the Public Engagement Unit and the New York City Schools to promote Affordable Connectivity Program, which is unfortunately no longer available. Given the enactment of the Affordable Broadband Act, we are already working towards a day of action at the beginning of the school year. New York City Public Schools has advised that they can share provided information on affordable broadband by posting on their family-facing website, actively notifying students and families via enterprise digital communication tools, as well as making hard copies available. We can further discuss, with New York City Public Schools and the Council, additional strategies to better get the word out about current offerings.

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Intro. 878, sponsored by Council Member
Holden, would require OTI to post information on our
website related to the Cable Franchise Agreements.
Our website contains wide-ranging information about
all our franchises, including cable franchises, that
is easily accessible to the general public. We
welcome any feedback on how it may be improved.

Finally, Intro. 1122, sponsored by Chair Gutiérrez, would require OTI to publish a plan to make universal, affordable, and equitable internet available in homes throughout the city. The plan would be required to be published every five years, along with an annual progress report. This bill also establishes an advisory board that would review OTI's plans and make recommendations. It is laudable for the Council to advocate for a future-proof broadband plan that envisions access for all. We agree that it is important for all New Yorkers to have access to affordable in-home broadband, and we are aligned on the importance of setting goals to increase that access. However, we have concerns that the legislation, as written, does not align with our current work and future planning, could result in the duplication of efforts, and assumes future funding

2 streams that may not materialize. As we have laid out 3 above, OTI has several ongoing and planned efforts 4 with respect to broadband and digital equity. The Digital Equity Roadmap underscores many of those 5 efforts, and lays out the groundwork for both short-6 7 and long-term goals. As written, Intro. 1122 does 8 touch on many of the items we are currently working to address, including digital inclusion efforts and the incentivization for multi-tenant structures. 10 11 Other areas the legislation seeks to address, including creating opportunities for non-profit and 12 13 M/WBE ISPs and expanding Wi-Fi availability within 14 City buildings, come with unknown budget 15 implications. We are interested in discussing the 16 ways we may better align on other aspects of the 17 legislation that the Council feels have not been 18 addressed by our recently proposed plans. Finally, we 19 are aware that the aim of this bill has been 20 described as resurrecting the Internet Master Plan. 21 That plan featured data representing an outdated snapshot of the state of broadband access in New York 2.2 2.3 City in early 2020, a lifetime ago in our postpandemic world. After the Adams Administration took 24 office and Mayor Adams created OTI, we evaluated how 25

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

we could provide the best service to the largest amount of people as quickly as possible, not five or ten years down the road. This led to the creation of Big Apple Connect. Our change in course from the Internet Master Plan to Big Apple Connect has proven to be both less expensive and a more effective way to deliver high-speed broadband service to New Yorkers. We believe a pivot back to the Internet Master Plan, as it has been proposed over five years ago, would hinder the progress we've made over the past three years, cost taxpayers more money, and could harm residents of communities on the wrong side of the digital divide. That said, it is worth emphasizing that there are many opportunities for us to work towards our shared goals without holding the prior Administration's plan on a pedestal.

Thank you so much for the opportunity to testify today. We will now be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you so much.

I wanted to begin my questions today with just kind

of level setting a little bit and just ask some

foundational questions. I hope you can answer,

because they are data-driven questions. The first one

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 is, can you share how many households in New York
3 City are without any broadband or cellular access?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Based on current data, in our broadband and digital equity roadmap, we tried to set out what the universe is of broadband accessibility in New York City. As of today, there is virtually entire coverage of broadband in New York City. There is no residence where you cannot get broadband service in your home. There is a question of access versus adoption. Access is virtually 100 percent connectivity available to residents across the city, save for some areas that may be like cemeteries and around the airports where there's no residential buildings. In terms of adoption, based on recent figures, it's estimated that there are roughly about 10 percent of people that don't have the combination of home broadband and mobile service, so either one of those two things. Clearly, when the Administration took office, there was this particular constituency, public housing residents, that had very clearly, based on census data, 30 to 40 percent of New York City public housing residents did not have home broadband. That is why the Big Apple Connect program was a huge

2.2

2.3

victory for not just public housing residents, but
for the city as a whole to be able to deliver those
services to the people most in need.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: I'm sorry, you're saying every single household has access?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: How many
households has internet connectivity at home, and how
many of them, although it exists because they have
the access to it, do you have the data that says how
many households have active internet at home outside
of Big Apple Connect, and how many have cellular,
have phones?

that particular data in front of me, but what I would say is that the whole reason for the New York question, whether it's home broadband or mobile broadband, some people just prefer to use their cell phone as either their primary or only means of connecting to the internet, which is why it's part of our larger, holistic strategy to ensure that folks have broadband in the home, but if not, we want to improve cellular communications throughout the city through our Link 5G program, mobile

2.2

2.3

telecommunications, information services, all the

other programs and franchises that we offer.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: So you don't have that information?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: I don't have that specific information, but we can get that for you.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: At the time of the Internet Master Plan being released, in their plan, this is of course five years ago, nearly 29 percent of New Yorkers lacked broadband at home. Do you know what that number is today, and do you see a trend line over time?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Sorry, I don't have that number. We can get that for you based on current census data, but we've seen improvements.

Clearly, it made a huge dent by initiating the Big

Apple Connect program, so getting 330,000 New Yorkers connectivity for free has made a significant...

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Yes, you're going to keep talking about Big Apple Connect. I get it, and we've had those hearings, and the Commissioner has touted it, and I've applauded it and given him my flowers. I would love for the responses to include

2.2

2.3

2 more than the Big Apple Connect, because that's not 3 what this hearing topic is.

Can I ask, when will the City... oh, has the City... is it on a dashboard, and excuse me if I haven't seen it, have you all updated a broadband map at this point?

public asset map, which includes information on how people can either... sorry to mention, but Big Apple Connect, the locations, Link 5Gs, where public computer centers are, access to that. But in terms of a broadband map, you...

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Just to share, I mean, you said that technically every New Yorker at this point has access to broadband. Just the visualization of understanding the technicalities of, yes, broadband access is everywhere, cellular access is everywhere, but the connectivity of household to household. Is there a map that exists, or are you all using the New York State broadband map going forward?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: So, we've certainly looked at the Connect All maps and the information that they've provided. We looked at census data, but I don't know that we have that

2.2

2.3

particular information in terms of broadband adoption and the percentage and the geographic locations of those.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: And I'm sorry if you said it, so there is no map currently for New York City?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: For broadband adoption? I'd have to double check to see if there is an updated number based on current data or if we're utilizing now five-year-old information.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. So back in 2022, Finance Chair Brannan had asked for a map of all infrastructure in the city and included streets, blocks. He wanted specifics about what might not be covered, and I believe the Commissioner said that one exists and that he would provide one so that's the map that I'm referring to.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Of areas that have Internet access?

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Yeah. I think just very plainly, just being able to see where there's access, where there isn't, where people are connected, and I think for you all, as you all obviously have been working through the digital

2.2

2.3

2 roadmap, I'm assuming you would have that, right,

3 just to kind of see where areas of targeted outreach,

4 you know. So that is an ask from a little while back

5 ago, so that's what I'm referring to, so do you have

6 one or do you not have one? Is it internal?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Let's get back to your staff as to what we have and what we can provide.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. Now, I do want to ask some questions on Big Apple Connect, but just a few, okay, because we did have that hearing a couple years ago, and obviously this was when it was first announced. My first question is related to the RFP process and procurement. So, in September '22, you testified that OTI had received proposals under Big Apple Connect through an RFP and shared that there would be followup on whether bulk purchasing options were included. We have repeatedly asked for that RFP, and then obviously since the rollout of the plan, has an RFP been provided to this Committee, to your knowledge?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: I don't know exactly what was provided to the Committee, but what I can tell you is there wasn't what we would consider

2.2

2.3

an RFP in parlance of franchises. An RFP would go out broadly to interested parties generally for a non-exclusive franchise, for some sort of service that they could provide. In this case, it was more like a mini-bid that was sent out to parties, to entities that can provide the services that were being requested. In this case, it was going to be broadband, basic cable TV, and some other requirements related.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: But it is referred to as an RFP? So the question is, because in September '22, the day of the hearing I think was the same day that the announcement was made about Big Apple Connect, and so it was surprising to us at the Council, it was surprising to me as Chair of this Committee, and so we had asked for how did you decide on these two providers? And I think you said, oh, we wanted these four services, three or four services. But what you also shared, Brett, is that you would share kind of what that RFP looked like. To my knowledge, it has not been shared with the Committee, and so that is the question. If it exists, and when can we have it?

-	
2	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: It certainly
3	exists, and I believe we did share this several years
4	ago, so we can double check and confirm, but I
5	believe we did share it with the Committee.
6	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. Okay. But it
7	exists?
8	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: It definitely
9	does.
10	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: And then you just
11	said because it was not an RFP that was made public
12	at the time? Or can you just give me a little bit of
13	that, what you just shared? Chantel, come on.
14	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SENATAS: Good
15	morning.
16	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Good morning. What
17	do you got for me?
18	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SENATAS: So, the way
19	our telecom enterprise agreements are framed, when
20	that original RFP went out, we essentially wanted the
21	ability to have multiple providers who have contracts
22	with the City so that we can create competition there

25 between our existing vendors who have those telecom

mechanism where essentially we create a mini-bid

and minimize the cost to the City so there's a

23

existing mini-bid in other instances?

processes that encourage mini-bids, like say for

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SENATAS: There are

2.3

24

2	instance when you have minority and women-owned
3	businesses, and we have new provisions that MOCS put
4	out a couple of years ago that essentially allow us
5	to procure directly with M/WBEs. We also engage in a
6	mini-bid there. Like to the extent that there are
7	multiple M/WBEs that perform the same sort of work,
8	we essentially send out mini solicitations to them
9	all.
10	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. Was there an
11	RFP process for Big Apple Connect?
12	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SENATAS: It would be
13	the mini-bid process also within that context.
14	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. So that's
15	another example of a mini-bid process. Is there any
16	public record of the responses from those providers?
17	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SENATAS: I'd have to
18	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: From Charter or
19	Altice?
20	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SENATAS: Yeah. We'd
21	have to take a look and see what we actually have in-
22	house. I wasn't part of that particular process at
23	the time, so we'd have to kind of get back to you and

see what we have in the office.

_	
2	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. So you're
3	not sure if it was made public. Do you know if it can
4	be made public now?
5	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SENATAS: I'll have to
6	look into that. And we're more than happy to get back
7	to your staff with respect to that response.
8	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Say the last part.
9	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SENATAS: I'm more
LO	than happy to get get back to your staff
L1	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Oh, thank you so
L2	much.
L3	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SENATAS: With that
L 4	response.
L5	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: So on the
L 6	contract, the Big Apple Connect contract, we've also,
L7	as a Committee, we've asked several times for a copy
L8	of that contract. I don't believe we've been provided
L 9	it. We are now independently in possession of the
20	contracts for both companies for Big Apple Connect.
21	Why was it not provided to this Committee, and why is
22	it not publicly available?
23	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SENATAS: It was my

understanding that your last request for that came in

2.2

2.3

the best pricing, use the City's purchasing power to provide services to the public at the lowest price...

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Lowest cost.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Did OTI have to obtain any additional EOs or approvals from the Mayor's Office to execute this contract?

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Since I don't have the contract in front of me, was there a clause in the agreement with Altice and Charter that offers any exclusive rights to the building infrastructure or marketing?

understanding. It was intended to provide core services of the basic cable and high-speed internet, with the expectation that the infrastructure was already in place and that the other providers can provide services. There's no exclusive arrangement specified in the contract or in practice. That was not the intent, and that's not how it was rolled out.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. Are there developments where there are other providers outside

how many of them did not have cable?

2.2

2.3

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: I don't know.

Largely, just anecdotally, people generally get their cable and internet as a bundle of package from the provider, so we don't know what the breakout is. I don't even know if we have data on that in terms of specific cable connections. We obviously do, as part of our administration of the cable franchise, we know overall how many cable subscribers there are around the city, but not necessarily pinpointed by geographically.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: I see. You don't have it, or you didn't have the data of how many people had, of how many residents, or units, excuse me, it's by unit, had cable. Just curious if you can share, I guess, why? What is the agreement that makes it so that cable had to be an anchor for this program for residents?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: I think it was driven largely by the fact that the cable providers had the infrastructure in place for decades. They had their fiber or coax or a combination of the two already in place to deliver cable services, and obviously internet has come along since then, so to be able to leverage the cable infrastructure plant

2.2

2.3

that's already in place to every NYCHA property, and to be able to tack on, obviously, the internet was the major draw to utilizing the cable providers.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: They had the infrastructure already. So I'm just curious then, I guess, what was the inception of the RFP? Was it to provide, always to provide internet and cable, or was it the infrastructure's there, they're already providing cable, so let's make it so that the only providers that could respond to this RFP are the ones that are already in there providing cable?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Well,

ultimately the goal, as we mentioned already, not to
rehash it, was to get people connected immediately
when this Administration came on. We did not, setting
aside the IMP plans, we did not want to wait. We did
not want our residents to wait any longer to be able
to get connectivity. So we did see, looked around and
say, where's the infrastructure in place, and who's
providing that infrastructure, who's built it? Cable
companies, all the NYCHA developments have them, and
we were able to leverage that infrastructure in
combination with the fact that the three cable
providers, Altice, Spectrum, and Verizon, are all

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

signed up on the master services agreement. So we were able to leverage the master services agreement, existing infrastructure, and that's how we were able to get people connected so guickly.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: All three, excuse
me, all three that applied are under the MES?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Yes, master
services, yes.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: My questions are just because what it, I think this process that you're sharing, while yes, I get the intent was to get people connected as quickly as possible, I think it limited competition among some of the ISPs that probably could do it, many of who were starting that process already from the internet master plan and were booted, it limited who you all, who the City could work with, and so that's why I'm asking what came first, was it these internet providers saying like, we've got dwindling numbers, we've got the cable infrastructure, we'd love to also provide internet, versus you all having a process that's, I think, more open, more public, more competitive, and provided an opportunity to these internet service

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

providers, many of who, some of these NYCHA tenants
were already working with.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Yeah. And factored into the analysis about pivoting away from the Internet Master Plan to Big Apple, was the fact that a number of, to your point, Chair, a number of the smaller internet service providers were providing service to NYCHA residents under a pilot of sorts, what was termed the RFEI through the Internet Master Plan, and while we have tremendous relationships with these companies and we support them as much as we can and we encourage their participation in the marketplace, frankly, they didn't make a huge dent in terms of getting customers, getting folks living in NYCHA to sign up for their service, which was entirely free, thanks to ACP at the time. While ACP was in place, these smaller providers were able to sell their services, and it really didn't move the needle on new broadband connections. That's not to say they didn't do great work, and we encourage their participation, not just in NYCHA, but throughout the city, but it ultimately didn't, people just didn't want to go with the unknown guys.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: But prior to that, thank you, and prior to that, they had not been, they were not contracting with the City, right, these smaller providers?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: So, they received a permit from NYCHA to be able to occupy the space in NYCHA to run their facilities through their, through the buildings. They didn't have a permit with OTI, I can tell you that, but they did have a permit to occupy the space to be able to provide the service and to market their services to the public so they did, and as I mentioned, the numbers just were not impressive. Had they perhaps, and this is speculation that I probably shouldn't even say, but perhaps if their numbers were greater, higher percentage of adoption, that may have factored in future decisions that we had made, but the fact remains that folks just did not embrace the smaller companies at the time.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Correct. But they also didn't, I mean, I think what Altice and Charter are getting, or what it's costing us is significantly larger than what any of these ISPs had, because they were not contracted yet, right, because they were in

2.2

2.3

negotiation so I think it's not the same amount of resources obviously for the two providers in Big

Apple Connect.

exactly say that, because the smaller providers, again, I say they, the smaller providers were building out on their own dime with the expectation that the Internet Master Plan would come to fruition, and that there would be a City investment at as large scale as you know, hundreds of millions of dollars, even in the billions to complete that deployment so there was an expectation that the City would invest it, so it wasn't like private investment versus the City paying for Big Apple Connect. There was always an expectation that the City would be funding a considerable cost.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: But they were not able to access any of that City funding?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: No, they were not, correct.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: And how quickly were Spectrum and Altice able to access the City funding?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Well, again,
mind you, it's just for services. The infrastructure
was in place. We didn't have to pay for construction,
which is a significant cost and one that the smaller
ISPs would have had to incur so it's strictly for
services. As they were able to get customers online,
we were able to a very low per unit rate for services
that they provide under the Big Apple Connect
contract.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. Okay. I know that there is still a small portion of, correct me, you said 80 percent of NYCHA residents are connected?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: It's Big Apple, yes.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Big Apple, okay.

Is there any plan to, and I've asked the Commissioner this before, you know, I was like, what is the reason, and, you know, it ranges, but still like why people aren't connected? Is there any update? How are you all engaging with the remaining 20 percent to ensure that they are connected or just, maybe they are connected to the internet already and just not with Big Apple Connect? What is that data?

2	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: I'm sorry.
3	It's a great question, one that we deliberate over
4	internally to try to figure out how we can get to
5	that, you know, get to as close to 100 percent as
6	possible. Largely, the outreach efforts are the
7	responsibility of the providers, right? They're doing
8	door knocking, they're sending out flyers, they're
9	mailers. We do work with them and NYCHA to set up on-
10	site sign-up events where we set up a tent and tables
11	and computers and have the representatives of both
12	companies there with their family day events. I've
13	been to dozens of them. So, it's certainly helped
14	anecdotally from just from me speaking with the
15	residents. I can tell you a lot of them just like
16	their existing provider. Some of them are older
17	adults who, for whatever their personal reason, they
18	don't want internet at home, which is why we've seen
19	a relatively, you know, trickle, slow trickle of new
20	subscribers over the last few months. That said, 80
21	percent is pretty impressive when compared to these

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: What was it, and I'm sorry you said this already, what was it before?

types of programs that we see.

1 2 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: It was 3 probably in the 50, 60 range. CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. 4 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Maybe even 5 lower based on some numbers. 6 CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Sure. And of that 7 20 percent, do you all have a sense of how many are 8 actually connected versus like those who are not? EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: We don't. It's 10 11 hard to get that data because, again, we don't 12 regulate internet service in the city, we can't, so we don't have that level of specificity. But, just 13 14 again, given my personal anecdotes from speaking to 15 folks, it's a large part of that 20 percent have service through another provider. So, I'm relatively 16 happy to know that they are getting it. We encourage 17 18 them to take advantage of the City program, but 19 that's ultimately their choice. CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: So, they're not 20 21 connected, it's just they have their provider. I also want to recognize Council Member 2.2

I wanted to, just quickly, I'll jump back into Big Apple, I'll jump back into these questions,

Paladino, who's joined us virtually.

2.3

24

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

but I know in your testimony you shared that, I

believe last week, surveys were sent to residents

about Big Apple Connect. Can you share, what are some

of the things that you're asking, what are you

6 | looking to accomplish?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Yep. It's a short and sweet survey. We first want to confirm that they are receiving it, a kind of audit, if you will, to make sure that the folks who we're paying for to get the service are actually getting it. But then we want to know how they're using the internet, what kind of activities are they doing? Are they using it for homework, job searches, telemed, those types of things. We ask what kind of devices they have at home. We want to understand if they're using a laptop, tablet, the cellular phone for their primary means of connecting to the internet. So, it's a fivequestion survey. We just sent it out a week ago, so we hope to get some insight. We'll also be following it up with in-person surveys as soon as the weather, which is now cooperating, we'll be setting up more sign-up events and also surveying residents.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: How are people getting the survey? Is it digitally?

2.2

2.3

2			EXEC	UTI	VE D	IREC	TOR	SYKOFF:	We	did	а	mail
ر	survey.	W≏	sent	i+	011±	wia	II S	Mail				

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Oh, really?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: They're going to get a pretty postcard.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: There's a missed opportunity there.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Well, we discussed this one, whether it should be digital, virtual, through a QR code. We thought about that, and based on some research of how surveys are generally responded to, we thought that the mailer would yield the best results so we gave a lot of thought to it, for sure.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. Okay. When are you looking to conclude the collection portion?

encouraging responses by mid-May. We even have a gift card raffle drawing for folks who respond, so we'll be doing that to incentivize them to respond, but there's really no firm end date. We anticipate throughout the course of the rest of the spring and the summer, we'll be doing in-person surveys.

just wondering, like, does the data exist, because

the data does not exist because you don't have it, or you're not necessarily asking the providers to share

4 | that information?

1

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Yeah. That's not information that they would normally share, and we did not ask them to share that as part of this program.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. I feel like it's, I don't know, I feel like it's important, considering that it's two of the larger providers, for them to share with you all, with the City, kind of how this specific contract is also benefiting them outside of the contract. I don't know what the packages are. I don't subscribe to either internet service provider, but I don't know. I would feel like it's important for the City to have a good sense of how this program is also leading to, like, you know, just more revenue for these providers outside of, like, outside of the scope of what you're asking them, right, like upselling a resident. You don't have the data, but I just feel like it's an important ask to make of that provider.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Yeah. I mean we could take a look at that to see if that's useful

2.2

2.3

for it.

or relevant in terms of analyzing the impact that the program is having, both on the public and for the providers. What I would say is, ultimately, it's the customer's choice, right? If they're subscribing to HBO through the provider, that's their choice.

They're not being forced to take it, forced to pay

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Right, I know, 100 percent. I'm not trying to say that it's like a misuse, but, like, Spectrum, for example, the fact that they're in NYCHA providing this service where maybe they weren't before is because of the contract, because of Big Apple Connect. It's a pathway that the City has provided for them, and in the instance where they're upselling to tenants, I think that is an opportunity that doesn't exist for any other provider in that instance, and so I think it's important to capture that information. It's something that we are, it's a pathway that we're, a business pathway that we're creating for them that didn't exist before and that we're not providing to anybody else.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Yeah. It's a fair question. We can take a look to see if that's helpful.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you. Okay.

Can I ask about the cost of Big Apple Connect? I know you said in your testimony, and certainly before, and the Commissioner has testified that it is more affordable. It's currently funded at approximately 38 million dollars per year?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Correct.

NYCHA residents, which, again, is huge. That's not nothing. I think that's wonderful. But as noted in the Prelim hearing that we had in March, we didn't see funding for FY25 for the current budget, and wanted to make the ask. I know that the response was if the funding is restored and baselined, you said in your testimony that is the goal, that it would cost, it would be a 190-million-dollar commitment over five years?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: I'd have to do the quick math, but to your point, it was roughly like 38 million per year based on how many subscribers we get so if there's more subscribers, it'll increase the overall cost per year.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. So, I guess my question is to you, so of that, and maybe not

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 confirming the full amount, that is what the

3 Commissioner said, though, at the March hearing. All

4 | the 190 million or so would be going to Altice and

5 Spectrum with no capital investment or infrastructure

6 build-out, right? That would be funding to sustain

7 | the 330,000 residents?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Correct.

That's just expense funding to provide the services

10 to the NYCHA residents.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: So that's just to sustain the existing program, which you've said is a great program, but then there is no, so then what is the next step of build-out for Big Apple Connect? I think at this point, would you say it's safe to say that there's no plans for expansion of this program at this time?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: I would say at this time, it's about making sure that everyone in NYCHA who is eligible for it can enroll and inform those, educate those who may not be aware of the program, and make sure that they are aware of the program so they can get connected if they're not already. But we are committed to looking at ways, maybe not expanding Big Apple as it's currently

2.2

2.3

constituted, which was always focused on NYCHA, other
programs that may benefit other New Yorkers, such as
a program that was included in the Digital Equity
Roadmap that HPD is spearheading called the Internet
Pilot that similarly provides low-cost or free
internet to Section 8 residents. So, there's other

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Is that the program that came down from the State?

programs of that ilk that we can look at.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: The funding came down from the State, but the program was initiated by the City.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: By HPD?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: But the funding came down from the State. So there's no plan to expand at this point, or what can you share with me? What have you all been able to assess about the future of expanding? Because I think, and I'm so sorry to interrupt you, obviously there are NYCHA sites that are now RAD-PACT, who are still very much public housing, and tenants with the same need, and I know that in speaking with the Commissioner shortly after the announcement of Big Apple Connect was made,

you looking at right now?

2.2

2.3

that was what he shared, the intention to expand this program so we're here now. I have gotten no sense from this agency that there is a plan to expand into those developments through this program so what are

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: So

specifically with respect to the RAD-PACT, there is in the contract that NYCHA has signed with the private property managers who are taking over those developments a requirement that the property managers provide free broadband to residents. So, as they get started replacing roofs and boilers and elevators, as part of that they're also providing or will have to provide free broadband. And it's my understanding, while OTI is not intimately involved in that, that they are working with the smaller ISPs or some smaller ISPs to be able to provide that service to residents.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Is OTI in communication with those developments, those RAD-PACT developments?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: We're in touch with NYCHA to get updates on the status of it, because like I said, it's part of a large-scale

2.2

2.3

construction project to update and rehab the
developments.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: And what is some of that feedback?

well. There's some target dates for when the broadband will be available to folks, but that was always the reason why they were excluded initially from Big Apple Connect, because there was an anticipation that there would be a comparable, not identical, but a comparable broadband offering. And so those are unfortunately a little slower, but those are coming along.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Is there efforts from OTI to expand beyond the existing NYCHA sites, the RAD-PACT that you said that you're checking in with NYCHA about, and outside of this Flume project?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Yeah. So, I think it's important to note that there's other parts of the whole digital equity world, right? Not just infrastructure, not just access to the Internet. And that's really where our digital equity roadmap comes into play, that highlights some of those initiatives, the device offerings, the digital literacy training

2.2

2.3

courses that are available through City agencies across the city and libraries across the city, and that really are intended to kind of have the holistic digital equity experience. Certainly, as you acknowledge and as we talked about, Big Apple Connect is the centerpiece to the City's digital equity goals and missions in an effort to bridge the digital divide. But the digital equity roadmap, and if I may turn it over to Associate Commissioner Wright to talk a little bit about the digital equity roadmap and the initiatives there, I think that will highlight the efforts that are underway currently.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: We can definitely talk about it, but I think my questions are more focused just because I've heard different things, not different things, but I've heard the intent to expand for many years, and so I just need to know that that is not what is happening right now. The digital roadmap is something separate, and we will ask questions, but with regards to expansion of connectivity to individual households is what I'm really trying to hone in on right now so, at this point, again, you're looking to baseline it, of course, but at this point there is no commitment. You

2.2

2.3

can't make a commitment to expand beyond where you
are at right now.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: I think that's fair to say. I'll say yes to that, but what I would say is, again, part of the roadmap is new initiatives, starting with the Chief Digital Equity Officer, which we hope will engage additional communities and stakeholders in the space to identify where there may be a need for additional service so that we can make a targeted, logical decision as to where additional City resources can and should go in the future. So, sitting here today, no immediate plans to expand Big Apple Connect, but that there are efforts underway to identify those areas of the city that can benefit from additional services and to see where we can strategically deploy those.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. But beyond,

I'm speaking just specifically about connecting

residents to a free or affordable internet program,

it's Big Apple Connect. It's what exists right now in

Big Apple Connect.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: In terms of City initiatives, but not to rehash this, but there's

2.2

2.3

- 2 the Affordable Broadband Act that the State recently 3 passed, which provides low-cost broadband.
 - CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: But that's the State.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: But that's an area that the City is working with the Connect All office to get outreach out to the communities that can benefit from.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: How often are you in communication with the State for this program?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Pretty

frequently. I don't know if there's a schedule, like
a specific cadence, but we do engage with them very
often.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. I think my last question about this is at the hearing just last month, CTO Fraser said that there would be some announcements covering other large parts of the population, including Section 8. Do you have any details on that?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Commissioner
Wright can discuss a little bit some of the
initiatives in the digital equity roadmap that

2.2

2.3

2 outlines that Section 8 initiative that you referred 3 to and many others.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. So we'll hold off then. So just kind of what's in the roadmap is what you're going to...

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. All right. I have questions for the roadmap. You'll have your time in the center. Give me one second.

and PACT, and this is, I'm nervous about NYCHA, so I represent, I think, now five, four NYCHA RAD-PACT developments. Obviously. residents don't necessarily know the conversations that NYCHA is having with the City and the State, but are you able to share at this time which of those RAD-PACT management companies OTI has met with or is speaking with, and how often are you all in conversation with them?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Yeah. To be clear, OTI is not directly involved in those relationships. That's between NYCHA and the private property owners and then those ISPs. We are regularly meeting with NYCHA to get updates on the status of it because frankly, as you mentioned, it's been...

2	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Are they giving
3	you updates often?
4	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF They are

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Yeah.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: So we're in communication with NYCHA getting those numbers so I don't have the information as to specific developments. We can get that either what we have in our records or we can get it from NYCHA as well to get the latest status for you, particularly for those developments in your District.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Would you say that maybe at this point that you've heard from every RAD-PACT development?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: I wouldn't say that because, again, the conversations with NYCHA in particular, like NYCHA proper, not the individual developments so we're not speaking with the individual developments or representatives.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Right. I'm saying it to distinguish it. So, the NYCHA developments that are in RAD-PACT, would you say that you've been able to communicate with each one, I guess with NYCHA,

2.2

2.2

2.3

about each one of those developments regarding
connection?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: NYCHA has provided a schedule because they're being transitioned or converted to RAD-PACT on a schedule that's planned out in advance. So, the ones that are in the process of being converted or have recently been converted, those are the ones we're focusing in on, understanding that there's additional work that needs to happen on the ones to be converted. So, the ones that are in the pipeline down the road, we don't have much visibility into because we expect that there will be some time before those get resolved so we're focusing on the ones that will hopefully be activating the broadband service soon.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. So let me just understand. So you are in communication, OTI, excuse me, is in communication with NYCHA. NYCHA is responsible for reporting back to you or sharing with you how their negotiations are going with these ISPs. You're not working directly with ISPs.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: That's correct. And I wouldn't characterize it that NYCHA is responsible necessarily. It's just part of our

interagency relationship that we have with all
agencies, but in this case NYCHA, where we meet with
them, we get an update, and we talk to them about the

5 status.

1

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. So, I quess I'm a little unclear on what the intention or the goal was, if that's the case, to basically say early on in 2022 that Big Apple Connect had the capacity to expand into these developments. Because it seems like what you're describing is not really an active mobilization from these management companies, and again, I know them personally, they're in my district. They've never once brought this up to me. They've never once said that they are talking to NYCHA, and I can list those off to you if that'll help in your conversations with NYCHA, but it just seems like there was a little, there was not proper steps taken originally in '22 by Commissioner Fraser when he said, we have this plan to expand into NYCHA RAD because what you're saying now, it does not feel like a strong, it doesn't feel like these management companies are being held accountable. It doesn't feel like they're bought into this program in an urgent way, is what I'm saying.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Again, to be
clear, we're not expanding into RAD-PACT. There's a
pre-existing contract and arrangement between NYCHA
and those property managers to provide the broadband
service so it's not an active initiative that OTI is
involved in, but one that we're certainly given our
role with the City in ensuring that broadband is
ubiquitous and affordable and available, we are
involved in making sure that those things are, and
offering our help to make sure those things are
rolled out.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: So each one of those management companies made commitments to connectivity in their RFP?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: That's my understanding, yes, in addition to many other parts of the rehabbing, the developments.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Sure, sure, sure. But I'm referring to this exclusively. Okay.

Can you confirm that the City is currently paying Spectrum a bulk rate of 24.95 per unit for internet service through the Big Apple Connect program?

we continue to secure funding year to year until that

2.2

2.3

can be baselined. But we'll be hopefully entering
into an agreement with both providers to provide
service beyond this year.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Beyond this year.

Okay. So can you, if for some reason the City were to end their contract with Spectrum, would residents face an increase to the cost of their internet? I guess, what is the commitment from Spectrum and Altice? How can they afford that? With no baseline funding, what is that looking like?

in the Administration, we negotiated that very low price point, you mentioned 24.95 for Charter, it's about 25 and change for Altice at a very competitive price, well below the market rate for the services that we negotiated. You mentioned the cable TV, the high-speed internet, the very high-speed internet, the modem, the router, the cable box remote control, all that, which has a market rate well over 100 dollars per unit so that's what a comparable rate would be for those services that we're getting for 24 or 25 dollars. So, for those folks who are already a cable subscriber, a subscriber to Charter or Altice, their cable bills in many cases were brought down to

zero. If they only had basic cable and internet, they
started getting 0-dollars bills. For those folks who
may have had packages where they had premium
services, all those services that we negotiated that
we pay for were stricken from their bills so it went
down considerably. So, if they were paying just 190
per month for a cable package, the high-speed
internet, the basic cable, the modem, router, cable
box, all that, all those charges were removed from
their bill because the City was paying for that. So,
I think it's safe to say to answer your question,
Chair, if the program were to go away, residents will
see a sharp increase in their monthly bills, in some
cases from zero if they're only getting the base
services to something more substantial, or if they're
already getting a bill for incremental premium
services that they've signed up for, those base
services will now be added to that bill so it's in
our hope and expectation that we'll be able to fund
Big Apple Connect in the short term and for a long
time to come.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: But if we're not, for whatever reason, if the City's not able to baseline this funding in the FY25 budget and moving

2	forward FY26, what of your negotiations with these
3	providers, what is the incentive for them to maintain
4	the price for residents as low as they are?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: I can't speculate what their incentive is, but from our perspective, from my speaking personally, we would seek to secure the funding year to year. If it can't be baselined or if it's not yet baselined in the City's budget, we would just secure the funding that's necessary to keep the Big Apple Connect program in place year to year.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. I'm going to pause on the Big Apple Connect questions.

I know Council Member Holden's got some questions, and then we'll come back. Thank you.

Just a couple of questions on Intro. 878.

Are all current and past franchise agreements

publicly available and where can we find them, and
why are some agreements not available?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Thank you, Council Member. Good to see you.

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

All of our franchise agreements are on the City's website, so that's inclusive of our cable franchise agreements, mobile telecommunications, public communications, information services are all available. In some cases, they're redacted for signatures, personal signatures, but they're all available, and we hope that they're all accessible for (INAUDIBLE)

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Even some of them

that were signed on or after 2006 are available?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: All the current agreements should be... I would love to hear which one you're referring to.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: I don't think so,
so I think you have to go look at that. Also, New
York State already has a broadband map, correct?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: New York
State, yes.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: New York State.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: What would it take to utilize the publicly available map, an interactive map, because people don't know what they... Again, we're at the mercy of these cable companies, and it's muddled, and they each claim they're better than the

other. Is there somewhere we can go and look at this
and say, what covers our area with an interactive
map? That's what my bill does. Is that currently

5 available?

2.2

2.3

include maps on our website that has the franchise area for all the cable companies. So as you know, Altice and Spectrum don't overlap. They have separate geographic areas. Verizon Fios is available in most places around the city. So we do have that information. Down to the level of ISP from beyond the cable companies, we don't have that information, and that may be difficult given our limited authority in regulating, not just limited.

and look, and even on performance, because I'm always at odds with my cable provider saying, I'm not getting the speed. They come over, they find there's a wire that's not great. We have poles above ground, and the weather takes its toll on that so I'm constantly having to keep after them, and then they use outside technicians that they hire, and they complain. We're stuck in between. What I'm saying is the company will say, oh, this guy wasn't right. And

2.2

2.3

should.

this is the same company, but they're hiring out. And

I just don't know if we're regulating this as we

with respect to the cable providers, we do have provisions in our franchise agreement that require that they have certain customer satisfaction requirements and repair things in a certain amount of time. Customers, folks, residents can complain to us. They can report to us any issues they're having with the cable company, and we help to resolve them. We have a team dedicated to that, whether that's billing or service issues.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Now, you gather this information about complaints. Is there one place I can go and see how many complaints on Verizon, how many complaints on Spectrum?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: I'd have to look. Generally, they're centralized through 3-1-1, so there may be a 3-1-1 data set that can identify the source of the complaints or the category.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: This is important, because we're getting scammed by advertising all the time. You know that. And many people can't keep up

2.2

with this, where if we had an area that we can see a
comparison. Maybe it's not government. I mean, you
could argue it's not government's role to do that,
but I think if we're going to give franchisees and
we're going to give them space in the public domain,
that we should somehow decipher some of this, because
it is very muddled.

But let me just get into CityBridge.

Since CityBridge announced its partnership with

Zenfi, how many 5G towers have been installed across
the city?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: So there are just over 200 Link5Gs that have been deployed. A little less than that are activated currently.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Do you have a breakdown by borough?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: I don't have it in front of me, but we can get that right to you.

additional LinkNYC kiosks have been installed since the announcement of the partnership? Do we have a number on that? I really don't get that many in my District. It's very slow. I had two at one point.

COMMITTEE ON TECHNOLOGY

2.2

2.3

likely that since the partnership, you mean

CityBridge and Zenfi partnership? So all of the 200

plus that have been installed have been done since

that partnership so that partnership is what's

generating the new Link locations that are requested

and ultimately the installations.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: (TIMER CHIME) One other question. Is CityBridge current on all the required franchise payments of the City because we had a huge issue with that in the previous Council. Are they caught up?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Yes. They're on time with all their franchise obligations.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Great. They don't owe us anything. Great. That's good news. Thank you. Thank you, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you, Council Member. Okay. In a recent interview with City and State Commissioner Fraser said that 2 billion dollars budgeted for the Internet Master Plan was too much money. But if we break it down, he said that for a fraction of the cost of the 2-billion-dollar program, OTI provides connectivity to over 330,000 people in

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

been over years?

2 the city. If the City continues Big Apple Connect at 3 its current rate, 38 million dollars per year, like 4 we said before, the City will have spent roughly 2 billion in 22 years. That's 2 billion with no capital 5 investment, no citywide infrastructure and service 6 7 limited only to NYCHA, to public housing. Meanwhile, 8 the Internet Master Plan proposed using 2 billion over potential decades to build a citywide publicprivate broadband infrastructure that could scale, 10

- 15 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: I believe
 16 that's the case, yeah.
 - CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: And it included private investment, but the first investment was just that initial 157 million.

deliver long-term affordability. Just to clarify, are

you aware that the 2 billion cited in the Internet

Master Plan was not all City funding and would have

- EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Right, and I believe there was more to come, but yes, it was initially 157.
- CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. So what long-term investments is the City making today in

2 broadband infrastructure or sustainable

3 affordability?

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Yeah, I mean, it really goes back to the genesis of Big Apple Connect. I'm not going to belabor the point of what Big Apple Connect does, but that's the reason why we went in that direction, because there is in 2020, certainly in 2022, and for sure now in 2025, there is a ton of broadband infrastructure in the city in terms of the availability of it. We didn't think it was a good investment of City dollars, of limited City resources to invest in what could be perceived as redundant, unnecessary infrastructure. It's not to say it wasn't for a good intent, just as you acknowledge Big Apple Connect has great intent and has ensured that hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers are connected. With respect to the Internet Master Plan, there was no guarantee that this investment of City dollars, private dollars over many, many years would yield the results that we are seeing with Big Apple Connect. There's too many unknowns, and based on that, that's the reason why we went with Big Apple Connect and a lot of these very important digital equity programs.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: In the same light, there's no guarantee with Big Apple Connect. The funding that you're trying to get baselined, if you don't get a baselined, which could very realistically happen under this Administration, you'd have to try to secure year after year after year. There is no quarantee even with this existing program, correct?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: There's a guarantee in terms of the folks getting connected right away, and there's a guarantee that they're receiving those benefits immediately upon almost day one of this Administration, and for as long as, to your point, funding is available.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: There's no guarantee that you can maintain funding, maintain it?

And there's no guarantee that you're going to expand beyond NYCHA.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Correct, but as we've said, as we've maintained for years now, the expectation is that Big Apple Connect will be a mainstay, will be available just as heat and hot water is available to NYCHA residents, that Big Apple Connect will be there so we're operating under that expectation.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Has the City

conducted a cost-benefit analysis comparing the MSA
based Big Apple Connect model to the Internet Master

Plan model? So 2-billion-dollar infrastructure

investment over 20 or so years versus 2 billion bulk

purchasing 20 or so years.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: I'm not aware of a specific assessment that was done relative to those two things, but just based on the site test, we were able to see how we can make the biggest difference in the city immediately. So that was really what ultimately led us in the direction.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Can you say that last part again? We wanted to make the biggest difference to the folks who are most in need, the most vulnerable populations, the most historically underserved, which includes all of NYCHA, and we wanted to get them connected immediately. So, a cost analysis or any other analysis would have ultimately led us still to a Big Apple Connect strategy.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: But there's also...
but I mean, 100 percent, I represent about eight

NYCHA development sites door-knocked, totally
familiar with the range of needs. And again, agree

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

that the program is connecting people, and that's a huge accolade. But the needs that exist amongst NYCHA residents exist equally, not equally, but like similarly with other residents, maybe Section 8 voucher holders, maybe families that are doubled up right now so I understand that this program is working, and you're working to expand it even more to get to that 100 percent, but what is OTI's plan to expand beyond the existing target, the existing universe, because those are also communities in need, and I'm not trying to be overly critical, I'm just trying to get you all to share what the plan is, and that the Internet Master Plan, I get it, while in your testimony you shared this is like from years ago, it's the intent is to live beyond an Administration. The intent is to live beyond a fouryear, two-term mayor, to live beyond me, beyond you at this agency, and so what is, if OTI is saying Internet Master Plan is the OG, and we're not rocking with it, what are you rocking with now? What is the plan to expand actual connectivity in these other areas of need?

you're going to hate this, but Big Apple Connect, it

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Well, again,

2.2

2.3

should be 330,000 New Yorkers, right? 330,000 New
Yorkers, 150,000 households, no guarantee that the
Internet Master Plan...

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Why would I hate that? I don't hate that. Don't put words in my mouth.

get it. But that's the centerpiece of the plan. It's not the only part of the plan. As I mentioned, there's a lot of other areas that are around it, and that we can look at alternative providers that can provide service like the HPD pilot, and other areas where we could potentially expand infrastructure where it strategically makes sense, but a full-scale infrastructure deployment that's going to cost upwards of billions of dollars where there's already a ton of fiber infrastructure already available didn't seem like a wise use of the City's money, both at the time and today, and that remains true.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: But we're not doing away with the existing infrastructure. The idea of the bill, and we'll get into those questions, is to provide something that is going to have vision, that is going to be able to evolve. Obviously, the Internet Master Plan came out before the pandemic

2.2

2.3

	based on your feedback and Commissioner's feedback. A
	lot has changed. I agree. A lot of that may or may
	not apply, but I'm just trying to gauge what the
	opposition to something, just a plan. You don't even
	have to call it the Internet Master Plan, but what is
	the opposition to something that goes beyond the
Ш	

success of Big Apple Connect at this point?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: We just don't see that there's a need for a major infrastructure play, and that seems to be at the core of 1122. It's like coming up with a plan to deploy new infrastructure to provide services. While certainly we share the goal of expanding access to low-cost, free-if-possible Internet, we see that there may be other ways to do it, either by leveraging the state program, the Affordable Broadband Act, which provides very low-cost broadband service to eligible households, or other programs that we may materialize over the future. But for now, Big Apple Connect is the City's big broadband investment.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: So no need for infrastructure is the reason?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: That was the determination a couple of years ago when the

2.2

2 the cable providers, because they were the ones with 3 the infrastructure in place.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: And so, in their responses, they each included cable, just because they had the infrastructure, or was this something that...

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: I believe it was a requirement, or it was a...

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: I don't understand what came first. Was it like, the mini-bid came out, and everybody that participated also provided cable, so now it's part of this program, or was the City looking for providers exclusively that could provide cable because obviously that limits the pool.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Yeah, my understanding was that mini-bid had requirements for high-speed Internet, basic cable service, and that the infrastructure was already in place so that they can get started immediately. So that was at the very beginning, if that answers you.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: So there was no intention for a real competitive process?

2.2

2	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: It was
3	certainly competitive among those who qualified to be
1	able to provide the services that were outlined.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Oh, it's only three of them that you mentioned that applied, correct?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: One of the contingencies was that there be service available immediately to residents.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. Were there any negotiations with internet service providers, excuse me, just with Charter Spectrum, I apologize, Spectrum and Altice?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Yep, yep.

There were discussions with all three in an effort,
as I mentioned, to get the best pricing for the City.

So, we wanted to make sure that the services that
were provided were adequate in terms of the speeds,
minimum of 300 megabits per second, high-speed

Internet, and that the rates were certainly
competitive with the marketplace, and in the cases
that we ultimately negotiated, were well below those
market rates.

2	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Do you all have a
3	sense of what the City would be paying for just
4	internet versus internet and cable with these
5	providers?
6	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: I don't have
7	that offhand. It was pretty much the same. It's
8	largely the Internet that costs the bulk of that per
9	unit rate, but I don't have the breakout in front of
10	me.
11	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: So, it was almost
12	the same?
13	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: For the most
14	part. It wasn't a big difference if we were just
15	procuring internet service.
16	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. I don't know
17	if you can share that at any point.
18	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: I'll see if we
19	have that.
20	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Just what the cost
21	difference is. Yeah, we just want to know what we're
22	paying more for.
23	I think I asked this before, so I jumped

the gun a little bit, but do you know of the 330,000

2.2

2.3

2 users, how many of them have a TV set up with cable?
3 Is that information that is reported to you all?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: It's not reported to us. We don't have that visibility.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Is it something that they can provide, Spectrum and Altice.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: We could take a look at that. I don't want to commit to that. I don't know if they... we could take a look to see if that's information we can get.

that the intent was like the cable was kind of a bonus, but again, I think there's dwindling cable subscriptions, and if we're paying at all any more money for cable, I'm just curious the intention of keeping cable as part of that subscription if all these providers are seeing dwindling subscriptions, people are not necessarily watching cable. They're streaming it on their phones or their devices. Then I think it's important for you all to, as part of your contract, because the cable piece seems very crucial to this designation, I think it's important that you all ask, how many of these 330,000 units are even connecting to cable? Is there a clause or is there a

like if you're sending out surveys, I feel like it's

Council Member Won's bills, in terms of how, for

1

- 2 example, the wireless network access to City
- 3 facilities, how she envisions that being implemented.
- 4 Is it for users of a TLC licensing center, for
- 5 example? Is it for members of the general public to
- 6 come in and use the internet? And then we would have
- 7 | to do an analysis to see if the way it's set up is
- 8 even available for public access. There may have to
- 9 be a redesign of the network. There may have to be
- 10 security protocols in place. There's a lot of
- 11 questions that we have.
- 12 CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Do you know how
- 13 | many agencies would be capable of providing internet
- 14 | to the public?
- 15 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: That are
- 16 | currently providing internet?
- 17 CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: No, well, I mean,
- 18 \parallel do you have a sense of how many would be able, under
- 19 | this bill, would be able to provide internet to the
- 20 public?
- 21 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: No, I think we
- 22 would have to do that. I don't want to speak for
- 23 | other agencies that may be present, but we'd have to
- 24 ask another agency to do that assessment.

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

1 COMMITTEE ON TECHNOLOGY 86 CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Do we have someone 2 3 here from DCAS? Yes, would you be able to speak to that? About how many agencies would be capable of 4 providing free internet to the public? 5 You have to be sworn in. 6 7 COMMITTEE COUNSEL BYHOVSKY: Thank you so much. I just want you to raise your right hand. 8 9 Do you swear and affirm to tell the truth and answer honestly to Council Member questions? 10 11 NEELESH SHAH: Yes, I do. 12 COMMITTEE COUNSEL BYHOVSKY: Thank you so 13 much. 14 NEELESH SHAH: I represent IT for DCAS. 15 CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Just say your 16 name. I apologize. 17 NEELESH SHAH: My name is Neelesh Shah,

and I oversee the technology for DCAS IT. DCAS IT administers all the connectivity for our employees and custodian staff who resides in these 55 buildings. Other than those 55 buildings, we don't do or oversee anything else. We do have other agencies who are the tenants within our buildings, and they actually manage their own internet connectivity and setup.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: I'm sorry. It's really hard for me to hear in here. Currently, obviously, you don't have internet that's set up for the public?

NEELESH SHAH: Yeah, we don't, no.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. Do any of the agencies at this point, any of their infrastructure is set up for?

NEELESH SHAH: We are not sure about that.

I will say that will be more a question for OTI,

because they oversee the citywide connectivity. DCAS
only manages connectivity within the 55 buildings
that we manage.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you. Are there any risks that you can speak to that you think would exist if there was access provided by the City agencies to the public?

NEELESH SHAH: High level, I cannot think of any risk as long as it's managed and secured the right way, like public internet versus private internet. For public, there's typically a different channel open for every user. Those all kind of things, let's say when we do implementation with OTI, we would go through the cyber review, if there was a

2.2

2.3

decision made to make publicly internet accessible within our 55 buildings.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. Is there a cost, an additional cost? I guess what would change about the existing contract with OTI within these City agencies to be able to provide internet beyond for the purpose of the agency?

NEELESH SHAH: For sure, there will be cost considerations. I can give you an example. When we expanded our own private internet access within buildings, we had to install wireless routers, we had to create separate channels. If we are talking here about public internet access in DCAS' 55 buildings, then we'll actually have to work with the OTI networking infrastructure team, actually do the survey and come up with the cost analysis of what it would take to install the access points across our buildings.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. Thank you. I think that's it for the DCAS question.

For OTI, for Intro. 486, which is the bill by Council Member Won on information on affordable internet programs for students and families. I think you mentioned in your testimony,

2.2

2.3

working with New York City Public Schools, have you all had these discussions or what are some of the discussions that you've had regarding this, and what's any feedback?

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Thank you for that question. We have engaged with PEU and have initiated conversations with New York City public schools about backpack flyers. We are also planning a day of action, as Mr. Sykoff recommended in his testimony. We're hoping to do that mid-summer and then also do a back-to-school event to promote the Affordable Broadband Act with the Connect All team. We have information currently posted on our website, but also looking to make that information available to people on the street. Putting it in backpack flyers is a great idea as a way of reaching populations that currently do not have online access. We're excited to advance this over the summer.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: And what is the information that you're thinking you're going to be able to share?

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: The information would be focusing in on the ABA enrollment. Letting folks know that when they contact

2.2

2.3

their internet service provider, what are the
keywords that you need to be using in order to
register for the discounted price. Just to let people
know that this is available. I don't think that it's
something that we're going to see the internet
service providers promoting so we want to be doing
that to make sure all New York City residents know
that this is a program available to them.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Is there anything else that you would be, is there any other internet program, is there anything in your conversations with the state that you'd be able to include for families?

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I think
because of this ABA enrollment opportunity offering a
low-cost available option, 25 dollars a month, that
is such a wonderful offering for families in New York
City, we are putting our effort towards promoting
that as it just recently rolled out. The Connect All
team is sharing lessons learned that they are hearing
of folks when they are trying to register and get
signed up. We're continuing to work closely with the
Connect All team to learn any of those, to
incorporate that into any communications. I think we

2	ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I'm happy
3	to talk through in more detail for the Digital Equity
4	Roadmap, but just specifically on the investments,
5	it's a 1.1-million investment in refurbishing older
6	adult centers, and that is focusing on updating and
7	refreshing the technology; a 1-million-dollar
8	investment in the expansion of the New York Public
9	Library Tech Connect program; and then a 300,000-
10	dollar investment to grow the reach of NYCHA's
11	digital vans.
12	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. And then of
13	that original, of the 157 million, do you believe
14	it's all been redirected at this point?
15	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: I believe so,
16	yes.
17	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. Would you be
18	able to share just a breakdown, kind of what you just
19	did now, of how that money was redirected?
20	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Yeah, we'll
21	see if we can pull that together.
22	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. Thank you.
23	Now, the next series of questions, I
	1

think, are a little bit very specific about the

25

Internet Plan, because I know that in that September

- 2 2022 hearing that you were there for, and then I 3 think later with the Commissioner, I was curious, 4 obviously as a sponsor of the bill, what wasn't working, right? What was it that this Administration 5 just didn't agree with? Based on kind of your 6 previous response, you all felt there was no need for 8 further investment in infrastructure, but I think the Internet Master Plan did have other aspects of it. Obviously, it brought a ton of stakeholders together, 10 11 a ton of experts, internet service providers, one of 12 whom is my understanding is Flume, is that designee 13 for that State program, so I think it's great to see 14 that they are being integrated into the City's 15 broader vision and the reality of the value that 16 these smaller ISPs bring. So if you're able, I would 17 love to know just kind of, because I feel like you're 18 not going to be able to answer these, but just specifically, are there specific parts of the 19 20 Internet Master Plan, and I can go through them with 21 you, that you feel are worth integrating or parts of 2.2 the plan besides the infrastructure piece that you're 2.3 like, this is just not going to work?
 - particular comes to mind, which is leveraging City

25

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: One in

assets, so whether it's city buildings or other types
of public infrastructure, that's certainly an area
that was referenced in the Internet Master Plan, and
there was extensive engagement with City agencies at
the time to catalog those potentially available sites
where, whether it's a fiber provider or a wireless
carrier can site telecommunications equipment on City
facilities, so that's one of the reasons why we
recently published a request for information, which
is also referenced in the Roadmap, which puts out a
request for information from tech companies, the
general public, elected officials, community boards,
wide range of potential respondents so we can learn
how best to use public infrastructure to serve the
public for digital equity purposes. So that's just
the one thing that comes to mind, but there are
certainly other elements of it that are worth
considering.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Was there an evaluation done? I believe at one of the hearings, the Commissioner said that there was an internal evaluation of the plan, of the Internet Master Plan. Does that exist?

2.2

2.3

that there's a formal paper evaluation, but there were certainly many, many discussions early on in the Administration as to how best to proceed with both with the Master Plan and ultimately what turned out to be the Big Apple Connect program so there were many evaluations. I don't know that there's a physical document.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Really?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: I don't know.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: You don't know that it exists? I mean, I would be very disappointed if there's not something more formal. It was a really big document. It was brought together by a major coalition. Obviously, some of the members of that coalition felt like it was a slap to the face to abandon this plan, and so that process was really formalized so if you can confirm that there was no formal evaluation, and if there is one, if you could share, but if there wasn't, I would be really, really disappointed considering the time it took to put together, it would be really, I think, disrespectful if OTI didn't formally provide something to, especially the providers that were on the hook

2.2

2.3

originally, just out of respect to the coalition
members.

hope it goes without saying, but we do have a tremendous amount of respect for all those providers, not just the ones who are initially contracted with, but the entire industry who seeks to do a whole lot of good in the city. We did at the time, I do recall, we made personal phone calls to representatives, to the chiefs, the CEOs of each of those companies, letting them know of the City's intent to move away from the IMP in another direction so there was considerable effort to ensure that they were communicated with once a decision was arrived at.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: That communication was to say, we're scrapping it.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Right. My next question, I guess, is to understand, was OTI ever able, and I'm just going to break down some parts of that, you let me know yes or no, break down some parts of the Internet Master Plan to the best of your ability, you let me know what you all did, didn't do. In phase one, which is coordinating City processes,

2.2

2.3

did OTI ever convene a full intra-agency broadband
City asset task force after 2021?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: I don't believe so. Again, that's a core element of the Digital Equity Roadmap is to convene just that, a roundtable of City experts who will ultimately help arrive at decisions that are made for broadband and digital equity that will eventually lead to bringing in external stakeholders as well.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: It's in the Roadmap, but I'm asking, this also, this existed in the Internet Master Plan so are you just saying that you kind of redid it up?

there's certainly parallels to what was in the original plan to what we're doing now so when we talk about the pivot away from the Internet Master Plan to Big Apple and other initiatives, it was not just because we don't believe that every element of the plan was not helpful. It was really about the core investment in infrastructure. That was the concern.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: I understand. I'm just trying to make the distinction of, now the bill that I'm trying to work with you all to pass, I'm

2.2

2.3

just trying to make the distinction piece by piece because you're saying you don't know if there's a formal evaluation. I've been talking about this since I started. I'm just trying to understand phase by phase where the decision was made so that's what I'm doing with you now. So, I understand there are parallels, but obviously the Internet Master Plan did call for this interagency task force. It exists now under the Digital Roadmap. Okay. And you all had a meeting already?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: (INAUDIBLE)

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Yeah? Okay. Well, the Commissioner said that I would be made aware of it, and I was not at that fall hearing. Just want to let you know so I would love to be made aware. I get it. Maybe I won't be invited for many reasons, but I would love to be made aware so that we can stay in communication so that I know how this is moving along.

For phase two, optimizing public assets, it outlined a universal solicitation for broadband using City-owned buildings. Did the City ever complete the public asset inventory that the plan called for?

2.2

2.3

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: I don't know that it was... so we have an inventory of public assets. I don't know that it specifically mirrors the one that was in the Internet Master Plan.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: City-owned buildings, rooftops, poles, and rights of way.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Yeah, a lot of that is unchanged so that can be leveraged for future, and that's what I mentioned earlier about potentially repurposing elements of the Internet Master Plan that could be utilized in the future so having a comprehensive inventory of City facilities, City assets, that can be utilized.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: So you have that, OTI has that?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: We certainly have the remnants of the original plan, but I'm certain that over time it's been updated with respect to new buildings that have come and gone over time.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. Phase three was infrastructure, not just subsidized service. It was about infrastructure and not relying on subsidized service. The plan states the City will invest in new infrastructure and can be shared by

that nearly the entire city is covered, maybe not

with fiber, but with coax or a hybrid of broadband
infrastructure that's necessary so we'd be hard-
pressed to identify the locations where there's no
broadband infrastructure. There may not be fiber
everywhere. That's something that we're ultimately
trying to get to by making our information services
franchise available at extremely low cost to small
providers. I'm not sure if you're aware, but we do
encourage small providers or incentivize them to
build out in the city by deferring payments for five
years when they build outside of the core of
Manhattan.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Build out...

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Outside the core of Manhattan, so above 96th Street and the outer boroughs, there's no payments to the City for five years for fiber that's deployed.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. Thank you. Thank you for that.

Okay. So, it doesn't sound like you have it, though, but there's no areas where infrastructure is missing. It ranges.

1

3

4

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Where there's no broadband infrastructure whatsoever, virtually nowhere in the city.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. And do you agree with the premise that public infrastructure creates long-term affordability?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: That's really the debate, right? That's what the core of the Internet Master Plan was intended to do, was build out public infrastructure owned by the City with the intention of getting people connected, giving them choice, and hopefully driving down costs. We did not see... that was the old Administration's plan and policy. This Administration came in with a concerted effort to make sure that people got connected without the eventuality or possibility that it would materialize into any actual connectivity for folks or that it would drive down prices. So based on that assessment that we made, it was determined that the best way to go forward was connecting people with the infrastructure that's already available.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Okay. Phase four, which is the final phase, was enabling service delivery in underserved areas, which is obviously Big

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 and installation of LinkNYC kiosks and 5G Link
3 towers?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Yeah. Thanks, Council Member. So we, OTI, working with CityBridge, CityBridge identifies sites that work for them from a business perspective where there's a 5G need, where there's a wireless need, where they can bring fiber to, where the site may fit within the very extensive siting criteria that our franchise agreement requires them to fit within, and then OTI undertakes a very substantial community engagement role so we have a 60-day process by which we reach out to Council Members, to community boards, borough presidents, BIDs, seeking comment from those entities and from their constituents. It's during that process that we routinely attend community board meetings, meet with members, and then we ultimately try to address any concerns that we have regarding siting of kiosks. After that process, if there's no issues and the site passes the compliance review, it passes the State Historical Preservation review, which is another requirement, we then issue a notice to proceed to the franchisee. Once that notice to proceed is issued, the company can get permits to start building, and

2 then we do another round of outreach to the

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

3 communities, to all those entities to let them know,

4 hey, the site was approved and construction is about

5 to begin.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Have there been examples where it wasn't installed because the community board objected or the homeowners?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: Where there's substantive response in terms of like, it's hard to say. There haven't been many cases where we've relocated a site based on community feedback where there's something that we just wouldn't know from not living there. If someone who's been living for 40 years on that block knows that there's a particular building, I'll give you an example. There's a case where there's a medical clinic where folks hang out after going to the medical clinic and they hang out near the Link. That's an example of some feedback that's substantive that we can take back to the provider and say, hey, maybe pick another site or see if you can provide the coverage objectives by going across the street or around the corner because we don't want to add to the community.

important objective to get more of these 5G towers up

certainly more to it.

and to improve our internet reliability, but I am
totally dismayed by the complete lack of community
engagement by OTI. I think it's disgraceful,
actually, and I don't use that word lightly. I have
examples in my community where these towers are built
directly in front, on private property, directly in
front of people's homes, looking out the window, as
far away as I am from Bob right now, closer than you
and I sitting here today, and there's no
communication with the property whatsoever. That just
one day, you all start digging up the ground in front
of their home without thinking that it was relevant
to communicate with them at all so the extent of the
communication as far as I understand it was an email
to my office letting us know that you were moving
forward, and an email to the community board letting
them know you were moving forward. I believe you're
familiar with the site that I'm talking about on the
Northside as an example. Is that accurate, that that
was the full extent of the community engagement that
occurred for this siting? Yes or no?
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF. No. There was

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Sorry?

1 COMMITTEE ON TECHNOLOGY 109 2 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: There was more 3 to it, the community engagement process. And you just walked in as I was answering Council Member... (CROSS-4 TALK) COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Emailed the 6 7 community board, and you emailed my office, and that 8 was the extent of your community engagement. Two oneoff emails, and no other communication, and no conversations transpired whatsoever about this 10 11 siting. Is that correct? 12 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: So there's 13 notifications that are sent to every Council Member 14 in who's District (CROSS-TALK)

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Sorry. This is a yes or no question. The extent of the community engagement that you all did for this siting, as an example, just picking this site as an example, was

20 board. No other communication, no other conversation,

one email to me, and one email to the community

21 no other community engagement whatsoever. Yes or no?

22 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: No.

15

16

17

18

19

23

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Okay. What else did you do? It was also a letter that's sent out to the Borough President, and I'm not sure if there's a

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 BID in that area, but it was sent out to the Borough 3 President's office, all with an effort to...

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Okay. So, you sent three emails to us, me, the Borough President, the community board, and that was the extent of the community engagement about the installation of a 30plus foot tower directly in front of somebody's property. That inherently means that my job is to raise the alarm, flag concerns, and impose, right, and make noise about every potential siting so that people in my community are aware and organized. I don't want to make your life impossible, but if you're not going to talk to the property owners, the people that are most impacted by a siting, then I'm going to have to pursue legislation to impose a much more meaningful community engagement process. I've worked on siting human service facilities and sitings of all kinds of different facilities, infrastructure. Some of it's welcome, some of it's not welcomed when I've worked in the Office of the Mayor, and never have I encountered a process that is so completely inconsiderate and lacking as what you all do. Citi Bike, which is a privately operated entity. DOT talks to every single property owner whenever they're

2.2

2.3

your job?

putting a dock into a potential site. Sometimes they listen to what the property owner's concerns are, sometimes they don't, but they talk to them. Why do you not think OTI needs to talk to the property owners that are directly impacted? Why is that not

extensive engagement with property owners, with concerned residents at community board meetings.

Myself, my colleagues, the franchisee have attended countless, Council Member, countless community board meetings, meetings with individual members to talk about specific sites (CROSS-TALK)

board or the Council Member sounds an alarm and makes a lot of noise and gets everybody worked up and opposed, so instead of you taking the responsibility to constructively thoughtfully have conversations and engage the stakeholders who are directly impacted, you're saying it's up to the Council Member to scream and shout and cause issues or it won't happen at all.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SYKOFF: In those cases

I described, it wasn't a case of anyone screaming and shouting. It was we send a letter, they disseminate

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

2 it to their constituents, they say, hey, we'd like to

3 have more, we have questions, who can we talk to.

4 They call us up, say, can you come to a community

5 board meeting, and we sit there for hours on

6 weeknights addressing questions.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: I've been to community board meetings. I've served on community boards. I attend every single community board meeting in the Council District I represent every single month. I know what community boards are like. But what I don't understand, like genuinely don't understand, is how a City agency could be so completely inconsiderate and completely lacking in doing any meaningful community engagement around a process unless you're absolutely forced to. That is a failure. So, I am drafting legislation today that is going to make this... that is going to regulate every single step of the community engagement process. We are going to force OTI to, in time-specific ways, talk to every single impacted stakeholder, get every single piece of feedback, jump through every single hoop that you can possibly imagine to make sure that this is done the right way, because you're not

believe, a side letter to the cable franchise

25

all the bills, particularly the Internet Master Plan.

today, what I know, what I've read from the Digital

Road Map, there are so many elements that you all

have thoughtfully put together that I think were

It sounds based on kind of what you shared here

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

included. There could have been an opportunity to run parallel to the Internet Master Plan. And the intention and the reason that it has the support and the reason that the bill has even been endorsed by, outside of my Colleagues, but just stakeholders that you already work with, is because it provided a vision and longevity that outlived administrations, egos, visions, all of that. And I think I understand that there is this assessment from the agency about the realities of the need for infrastructure, but what we are trying to achieve is guaranteed to the best of our ability connectivity, devices, internet for every single New Yorker. Obviously, you know this. This is a necessity. And I'm hearing from more and more people about how they are making the difficult decision of not paying for internet, letting their phone contracts lapse because the cost of food is so high, the cost of public health care, of child care is so expensive, and I think it's an opportunity for New York City to shine because those are what our values are. So, to say that there is an absolute abandonment of an Internet Master Plan, but then run this Roadmap that in many ways highlights a lot of what was in there, I think is disingenuous.

2.2

2.3

And I hope that we can work together to really create something that has longevity beyond an administration, beyond a mayor, beyond a Council Member, because that is really what we deserve.

for that, Council Member. I would just sum up by saying our goals are certainly aligned. Everything you just described is very much at the forefront of what we're trying to do, not only with Big Apple Connect, but with all the initiatives. I don't want to minimize the impact that the Roadmap has already and will continue to have at ultimately bridging the digital divide. It addresses everything you talked about in terms of access to devices and affordable access to the internet, digital literacy training, digital education. All those things are addressed, but there's certainly more that... (CROSS-TALK)

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: And those are all things that were in the Internet Master Plan.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: I'm just trying to distinguish what is real and what is like ego of this Mayor to say, this is my thing, I don't want to hear

2.2

2.3

anything from the previous Administration, and he can do whatever he wants, any Mayor can do whatever they want, but there is value in that plan. There is value in the hours spent that every single stakeholder and expert put into that plan is what I'm saying.

that there are certain elements of it that should and is being considered, and you see it in the... as you acknowledge, you see it in the Roadmap, so we do look forward to sitting down with you and seeing if there's ways that we can help accentuate some of the already existing initiatives and maybe come up with some new stuff going forward.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: I thank you all for being with us. Thank you.

We are going to take a quick two-minute bathroom break before I'm switching over to public testimony. Thank you all so much.

Okay. Thank you. I now open the hearing for public testimony. I remind members of the public that this is a formal government proceeding and that decorum shall be reserved at all times. As such, members of the public shall remain silent at all times.

2.2

2.3

The witness table is reserved for people who wish to testify. No video recording or photography is allowed from the witness table.

Further, members of the public may not present audio or video recordings as testimony but may submit transcripts of such recordings to the Sergeant-at-Arms for inclusion in the hearing record.

If you wish to speak at today's hearing, please fill out an appearance card with the Sergeant-at-Arms and wait to be recognized. When recognized, you will have two and a half minutes to speak on today's hearing topics, broadband access or related legislation, Intro. 198, 481, 483, 486, 878, and 1122.

If you have a written statement or additional written testimony you wish to submit for the record, please provide a copy of that testimony to the Sergeant-at-Arms. You can also email written testimony to testimony@council.nyc.gov within 72 hours of this hearing. Audio and video recordings, once again, will not be accepted.

Our first panel, we have Professor

Michael Santorelli, Andrew Rasiej, and I apologize,

ANDREW RASIEJ: Rasiej.

2 CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Rasiej? I

1

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

apologize. Ash Wolfson and Alex Spyropoulos. And I apologize for the mispronunciation.

Anybody can start, whichever. Andrew, do you want to start? Okay, yes, go for it.

ANDREW RASIEJ: Councilwoman, it's a pleasure to be here. Thank you for inviting me. Very important hearing on a very, very important topic. My name is Andrew Rasiej, and I'm the Founder of Civic Hall, the city's and the country's largest digital skills training center focused on providing underestimated populations with the skills they need to compete for jobs in New York's growing technology ecosystem. I'm also the founder of mouse.org, which began wiring New York City public schools to the internet all the way back in 1997 at a time when even if a single teacher in a school had an AOL account, Vice President Al Gore would have considered that school wired to the internet. Suffice to say, bridging the digital divide has been my life's work. A quality education, safe and secure housing, and access to essential infrastructure are pillars that lift up marginalized communities, and today broadband access must be recognized as essential

2 infrastructure. Thanks to years of both public and 3 private investment, virtually every New Yorker now 4 lives in an area where reliable broadband service is available. But availability alone isn't enough. The 5 real challenges we face are adoption, ensuring 6 7 seniors and low-income families have the digital 8 skills they need, and making sure every household has a computer or tablet to actually access the internet. Irrespective of some of the criticisms today, we have 10 11 made some important strides with programs like Big 12 Apple Connect, which are providing free internet to 13 more than 300,000 New York City Housing Authority 14 residents, and that number continues to grow. Big 15 Apple Connect shows what's possible when the City works hand-in-hand with existing providers to deliver 16 17 fast, affordable service, leveraging infrastructure 18 that's already in place. Another important tool is 19 the State's requirement that broadband providers 20 offer a 15-dollar-a-month service to low-income 21 families who qualify through programs like SNAP, 2.2 Medicaid, and National School Lunch Program. Many New 2.3 Yorkers are eligible today. The challenge is getting the word out and helping them enroll. As we move 24 forward, we must be careful about investing in 25

2.2

2.3

but also thoughtful about the ways some of those
resources could be directed towards bridging other
parts of the digital divide, including funding
digital skills training and providing devices so that
all New Yorkers can fully participate in the
opportunities of broadband access. The good news is
broadband is more affordable and more accessible than

duplicative infrastructure in ways that make sense,

begun with broadband and moving on to ensure that every New Yorker can use it effectively and meaningfully to participate in the digital economy of

ever before. Now is the time to finish what we've

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you. You want to go next?

our city. (TIMER CHIME) Thank you for your time.

ASH WOLFSON: Council Member, thank you for holding this. My name is Ash Wolfson. I'm a volunteer installer and outreach leader with NYC MESH. Since our founding 10 years ago, we have served as an affordable and accessible option for thousands of New Yorkers who don't have any other option. I can testify personally that I've installed internet for people who have never had home internet before, and for those families, internet means access to jobs,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

training, public resources, education, and community. Internet is a necessity, and we wouldn't tolerate these disparities in other essential services. Yet the City has not made sufficient investments to reach many families across New York City. It is clear that the major internet service providers have no intention of correcting this despite having the resources to do so. We are a small team working on a shoestring budget, and despite that, we've been able to connect thousands of New Yorkers. Every dollar we receive goes right back into the community, and we provide a number of public benefits, including providing hotspots in public spaces and rooftops across New York City. Our volunteers are extremely dedicated, showing up to spend their evenings and weekends installing internet for people. We also work with many communities, educating them on the use of their technology. I can testify that we are overwhelmed by the need for digital literacy programs, especially among non-English-speaking populations, and it's really a struggle to empower people to use the technology available to them when they don't even know how to work with it. We are eager to work with City government to improve our

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

ability to reach these families and make affordable and accessible internet available to all families.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you. We're going to reset the time, and then, you want to go next?

MICHAEL SANTORELLI: Good afternoon. My name is Michael Santorelli. I am the Director of the Advanced Communications Law and Policy Institute at New York Law School right up the street, a program that focuses on all things broadband here in New York City, at the State level, and across the country. I'm going to make many of the same points that Andrew made, but in a different way. Getting back to the Internet Master Plan, that is a supply-side solution to a demand-side problem. You can't build your way out of broadband adoption issues. The data shows that the Internet Master Plan is even more unnecessary now than when it was released in 2020. We do know broadband availability in New York City and where there's no service is 99.98 percent availability across the city. The State has released new data on that, and it shows where the 740 or so unserved and underserved locations are across the city. That's great progress. That should be celebrated. At the

2 same time, broadband adoption rates in recent years 3 have increased, according to the Census Bureau, but 4 they've plateaued over the last few years, even with 5 widespread subsidies available, making it free or very low cost to get online. Respectfully, these 6 7 discussions need to focus on what the data are 8 telling us, and that more attention is needed to focus on convincing the digital holdouts to get online, the final 10 or 25 percent that are not 10 11 online, because the conditions for broadband adoption 12 seem pretty ideal with universal availability and the 13 wide availability of subsidies and low cost or free 14 options. Just making cheap or free broadband 15 available is not enough, and we've seen that. There's 16 significant data showing that these subsidies move 17 the adoption needle only so much. To bring the rest 18 of the unconnected households online, more needs to 19 be done at the very hyper-local level to show why 20 broadband is relevant to digital holdouts and why 21 they need to take the necessary steps to get a 2.2 computer, sign up for a subscription, and, if needed, 2.3 get a subsidy to help pay for it. This is very hard work, very resource-intensive work, but fortunately, 24 25 New York City is home to many organizations,

2.2

2.3

including Civic Hall and others, that have great experience in doing this and have shown results in doing this, and so, respectfully, the City is best positioned to lift those organizations up with more funding and assistance to help scale them out, and to the extent that more planning is needed, there's more thinking and strategizing needed to figure out how the City can strategize (TIMER CHIME) and come up with a plan for harnessing all the great work that's happening and spreading it out across all the boroughs. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you.

ALEX SPYROPOULOS: Madam Chair and Members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify today. My name is Alex Spyropoulos, and I'm the Director of Government Relations at TechNYC, an organization representing more than 550 technology companies. Our membership includes hundreds of innovative startups, as well as some of the largest tech companies in the world. We are committed to ensuring that the tech sector remains a leading driver of the city's overall economy, and that all New Yorkers can benefit from innovation. We are here to express our strong support for Intro. 1122, which

2 will require OTI to create and publish a 3 comprehensive plan for achieving universal, 4 affordable, and equitable internet access across New 5 York City. This legislation addresses one of the most critical issues facing our city today, digital 6 7 equity. In an increasingly connected world, access to 8 the internet is not a luxury, it is a necessity. It affects how residents find jobs, access education, communicate with government services, and participate 10 11 in civic life. Gaps in broadband access continue to 12 reinforce existing disparities in income, geography, 13 and opportunity. We applaud the legislation's 14 comprehensive and forward-looking framework. By 15 focusing on multi-agency coordination, public-private 16 partnerships, and targeted outreach, this bill sets 17 the stage for a citywide effort to close the digital 18 divide. It recognizes that addressing infrastructure 19 alone is not enough. We must also consider 20 affordability, accessibility, digital literacy, and 21 trust in the system. We also believe that the collaboration this legislation envisions between City 2.2 2.3 government, internet service providers, communitybased organizations, and private sector partners can 24 25 serve as a model for how to tackle large-scale,

cross-cutting challenges in an inclusive and
equitable way. TechNYC stands ready to be a partner
in that effort. Our members are deeply invested in
New York City's future. A more connected population
helps build stronger workforce pipelines, fosters
innovation, and ensures all communities can
participate in and benefit from the City's tech-
driven economy. This legislation is not just good
policy, it is a critical investment in the long-term
health and equity of our city. We thank the City
Council for continued leadership in advancing digital
inclusion and urge the swift passage of 1122. I
appreciate the opportunity to testify today and am
happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you. Thank you, Andrew. I was a student in 1997. Our one tiny computer in the back of my classroom. Thank you for connecting us.

ANDREW RASIEJ: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: It was a slow process.

I had a couple of, just like one or two questions based on your testimony. Ash, thank you for your testimony and for your work with MESH NYC. Have

2.2

2.3

you or any of the other volunteers at MESH reviewed

the City, OTI's Digital Roadmap? Anything, I guess

from today's hearing and considering that the

Administration's response and many of my questions

was like, we're doing it and we're trying to do it in

the Digital Roadmap, where do you think some of the

holes are, potentially, that are not covered by the

9 Digital Roadmap, for example?

ASH WOLFSON: I think there's a lot of communities where, you know, there's been a lot of talk about how extensive coverage is, and that's important, but what a lot of this conversation has failed to address is the quality of those connections. In much of the city, even if broadband is technically available, the advertised speeds often don't match the speeds that are available, and there are frequent outages, which, especially if you're someone who is using it for something like education or for your job, that can be a significant burden. I believe that in large parts of the city, there has not really been an effort to address this lack of quality and that the OTI hasn't really presented a plan to reach out to significant parts of the city on

2.2

2.3

2 that basis. They've really only addressed this very
3 binary question.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you so much, Ash.

Michael, in your testimony, you said that more effort should be focused on the holdouts, the people that are not necessarily connected, or, yeah, the people that are not connected. In your opinion, do you think that there is something more specific that OTI should be focused on? Some of the things that Mr. Sykoff focused on today in NYCHA, for example, is leaving that outreach to the internet service providers through Big Apple Connect. They're door-knocking. What is something that OTI can be doing, the City should be doing? I asked for data. They don't have it. What are some of the reasons people aren't connected? A lot of it was anecdotal, but in your experience, what do you think we need to be doing? How can we be even more targeted?

MICHAEL SANTORELLI: Well, I think as a first step, it's helpful to, like you said, try to figure out why people aren't online, and the best information we have are just general surveys from national surveys that always seem to come back to the

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

same sort of reasons. Affordability has been one, but also tied into that is this notion of relevance or seeing that a connection might not be worth the investment of your resources. Again, if you're trying to weigh that against groceries or an electric bill, then broadband, if you don't view it as something that's essential to your life, then you might cut that off of your budget. But at the same time, there are lots of other nuanced barriers across lots of different communities, and just trying to understand what those are, and they differ from older adults to low-income households, low-income households with children, and it goes on and on. The only way to get that data at a large scale is just to go into the communities, and there are programs that are working at the local level across the city in these communities, trying to get them online. So arguably, the City could be trying to reach out to those groups and engage them and get information from them. Just figuring out what the landscape is of those providers, because again, there's Civic Hall, which is great, but there are so many others across the five boroughs that are doing this at a much smaller scale that arguably need to be recognized and get

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 more resources if they're proving to be successful.

3 So the Roadmap that I read that the Mayor put out

4 seems like a good first step, but it seems like

5 | there's a lot more work that could be done to bring

6 it all together into a more ground-up strategy to try

7 to get more people online.

ANDREW RASIEJ: Council Member, do you mind if I add to that, answer that question? So for years, we've been focusing on the physical infrastructure and the distribution. I remember when Mike Bloomberg was Mayor, he announced that 97 percent of the city was covered by broadband, and that was considered a win, but 40 percent of the city's population couldn't afford it, but he didn't highlight that particular detail. The digital divide is actually now worse than it's ever been, not because of the infrastructure, but because of the ability to use it is not in the hands of the people who need it the most. And now, with the advent of AI, we are now approaching even a larger digital divide, not only between the citizens of New York and this technology, but the institutions that support those citizens also are not able to take advantage of the technology, because the skills that they need to

navigate these networks are not easily accessible. So
the funding that's focused on infrastructure, and
your criticism of OTI or the City's policies are
great, but what we really need is a holistic plan
that looks at the digital divide holistically, not
just as physical infrastructure, whether it's mesh
networks or whether it's broadband providers, but
rather are we actually training New Yorkers to be
able to use the technology at whatever cost or
ability or even the quality of the connection. If we
don't get people to understand the potential of its
use, there's no point in talking about the
infrastructure

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you. Thank you all so much. Thank you for your testimony. Thanks for sticking around.

Our next panel, Noel Hidalgo, Susan Peters, and Stuart Reid.

Anybody want to start? Would you like to go first?

NOEL HIDALGO: Great. Ready? Great. Thank
you, dear Chair Gutiérrez and fellow Council Members
and staff. Beta NYC is a public interest technology
non-profit dedicated to helping New Yorkers access

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

information and use technology. I want to preface by saying digital literacy must be viewed as critical infrastructure. We are, for transparency purposes, we're recipients of the State's digital equity technical assistance grant. And since 2008, we have taught a diverse group of people to learn, earn, and grow their networks. We have trained and employed this Committee Staff. We have taught over 50,000 New Yorkers how to use their data and mentor a new generation of civil servants to whom we depend on. Our work has equipped New Yorkers with digital and data literacy tools to hold government accountable. Additionally, I'm a father of a brilliant 33-monthold boy who was born with profound hearing loss and many, many medical complications. We've been dependent on telehealth and virtual therapists since his birth. Twice a week, my wife, son, and I leverage virtual meeting tools to meet with his teacher at Lexington School for the Deaf in Queens. We use the same technology to meet with representatives from the Department of Education and Early Intervention who are scattered across the city. Every day, we use Signing Time, Signing Savvy, PBS Kids, YouTube, and a handful of digital media tools to entertain and learn

2 American Sign Language. At home, I have used every conceivable network connection, cable, DSL, cell 3 4 phone modems, and it took 10 years for Fios to come to my small Greenpoint apartment. By the way, I'm 5 delighted, but I wish there was more competition. 6 7 Your Internet Master Plan would ensure bi-8 directional, high-speed internet connections, fueling my work, my education, and my son's future. About the bills that you proposed today, we have some critical 10 11 comments, actually more like constructive critiques. 12 I will submit that in written testimony, but just to 13 speak highly is that we love your bill. We love that 14 it has an advisory board. We propose that your bill 15 should be the foundation for helping OTI execute its 16 Digital Equity Roadmap, while ensuring that digital literacy is, once again, written as critical 17 18 infrastructure. In 17 seconds, the high-level idea is 19 that, really, we need a lot more funding. I think 20 that the previous panel was articulating that very clearly. We have lost all of the federal research 21 2.2 funding, the education funding, any (TIMER CHIME) 2.3 equity funding, and now we're in a situation where we need to ensure that we can baseline our level of work 24 and be invested in as foundationally as we are 25

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 investing in critical infrastructure. I have many 3 more thoughtful written comments. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you. I look forward to reading them. Thank you.

SUSAN PETERS: Hi. I'm Susan Peters. I'm a member of New Yorkers 4 Wired Tech, and I'm a consulting party to the National Historic Preservation Act for Manhattan Community Board 7. I am negatively replying to these bills that expand wireless and not wired communication. Our federal regulator, the FCC, acts outside the rule of law. In August 2021, the FCC was told by a federal court to return to court after looking at 11,000 pages of scientific research and testimonies that they ignored. These 11,000 pages showed biological effects from electromagnetic energy below the FCC's 1996 guidelines, published in 1996 and never changed. The FCC has ignored the court for four years. This is a flagrant disregard of the rule of law. Every day, more and more evidence is published validating the damage done by wireless. Here is one such study published last month of this year concerning damage being done by cell phones to male fertility. The title, The Effects of Radiofrequency Radiation on

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Male Reproductive Health. Based on an analysis of 90 2 3 scientific articles, it highlights the risk of young 4 men keeping cell phones in their trouser pockets for hours every day. You see it on the street all the time. Some of the risks of cell phones being kept in 6 7 trousers includes disrupting the development of sperm 8 cells, cell oxidation stress damaging sperm DNA, harmful cell inflammatory processes, changes in hormonal levels, decreased sperm mobility and 10 11 vitality. In sum, don't put your cell phones in your 12 pockets anymore and wire your devices at home. And 13 I'm going to show this. I hope it gets into the 14 record. You see this all the time. (TIMER CHIME) Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you.

SUSAN PETERS: You're welcome.

STUART REID: Madam Chair and honored Council Members, thank you for this opportunity to speak about the Internet Master Plan and the City Council's plan for its resurrection. My name is Stuart Reid and I'm the Co-Chair of the Smart Community Initiative, a resident-led not-for-profit organization focused on providing free internet applications and services to public housing

24

25

2 communities. First and foremost, I have to thank the 3 many elected officials, organizations and individuals 4 that have made it possible for me to speak with you today on this topic. Council Member Jennifer Gutiérrez has been a tireless and fearless advocate 6 7 of community-controlled technology initiatives and I thank her and your staff for your dedicated work. 8 Brooklyn Borough President Antonio Reynoso, Congresswoman Nydia Velázquez, NYCHA CEO Eva Trimble, 10 11 the St. Nick's Alliance, the City College of New 12 York, including President Vince Boudreau, WHCR 13 General Managers Angela Hardin and Keziah Glow, the 14 Internet Society New York Chapter, Diana Blackwell, 15 TA President at Fred Samuel Apartments, Deborah 16 Benders, Resident Council President at Cooper Park 17 Houses, and Nathaniel Green, NYCHA Manhattan North District Chair and TA President at Dyckman Houses. 18 Thank you all for your support. And finally, Ethel 19 20 Velez, may you rest in peace knowing that your tireless efforts as NYCHA Manhattan North District 21 Chair, James Weldon Johnson TA President and Co-Chair 2.2 2.3 of the Smart Community Initiative were not in vain.

Community Initiative, or TSCI, was among those

As the Council is well aware, the Smart

organizations selected to receive funding from the 2 3 initial 157 million dollars that the City Council set 4 aside and designated to fund the Internet Master Plan. Here we are some three years after that and the current Administration decided it had a better 6 7 solution and paused TSCI's community-operated and 8 controlled project. And OTI efforts to bring broadband equity, opportunity equity, or communityled and operated stimulation to our public housing 10 11 and lower income communities have been underwhelming 12 and financially lugubrious at best. Where is the 13 community opportunity in the current iteration of the 14 City's plan? Certainly, it is not in anything we have 15 seen. The Administration currently pays millions 16 annually to (TIMER CHIME) broadband incumbents, 17 Spectrum Optima. While our group was told by the 18 current Administration that we would be included, we 19 have seen nothing in follow-up to what only can be 20 described as a hollow promise. It is critical that 21 the City Council not abandon its plan to provide significant funding for out-of-the-box innovative 2.2 2.3 solutions and organizations that address the chronic distress in our public housing and other low-income 24 communities. TSCI's Internet Master Plan project... 25

sake of brevity, I'd just like to refer to Dr. James

25

2 Giordano. If you're unaware, he has a lecture at West 3 Point, the War College, called The Brain, the Battlefield, and the Future, and Giordano talks about 4 dual-use technologies. And I think it's important to have on the table, at least as a part of the 6 conversation, that a lot of the technologies that are 8 part of this infrastructure have these capabilities. He tells the cadets, he says, you will, now these are the cadets at West Point. This is Dr. James Giordano. 10 11 He tells the cadets, you will encounter the 12 weaponization of neuroscience in your personal lives 13 and in your careers. They are valuable, viable, and they are in play now. And he also says, know these 14 15 two acronyms. And I've heard the word access today, 16 which kind of, not that it's good or bad, it just 17 reminded me of the conversation they were having at 18 this lecture. He says, WMD squared, know this 19 acronym, weapons of mass destruction and disruption, 20 and AAA, assess, access, and affect. They're talking about the weaponization of neuroscience. And I'm not 21 2.2 suggesting that this is the intent, but I think it's 2.3 important to have on the table that we should understand that all these technologies have these 24 capabilities, and that, in fact, some of them have 25

- 2 been invented with the intent to have these
- 3 capabilities so I think it's... I guess what I'm here
- 4 to share is I think it's an important thing to put on
- 5 | the table for any kind of conversation regarding this
- 6 type of infrastructure. Thank you.
- 7 CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you.
- 8 Whichever order.
 - Can you just turn on your mic, please, so
- 10 we can hear it? The red light should be on.
- 11 ODETTE WILKENS: Thank you very much. I am
- 12 Odette Wilkens, President and General Counsel of
- 13 | Wired Broadband Inc., a non-profit advocating for
- 14 safe telecommunications, and am part of the New York
- 15 | City Alliance for Safe Technology. I am also a
- 16 | technology transactional attorney, and recently
- 17 served on the Federal Communications Commission's
- 18 | Communications Equity and Diversity Council along
- 19 | with Chair Gutiérrez. We at Wired Broadband are
- 20 keenly interested in digital equity and inclusion,
- 21 | but the bills do not adequately address these issues,
- 22 neither does the Master Plan. The bills say nothing
- 23 of how to make internet affordable, how to identify
- 24 where the access gaps are, or how to safely deploy
- 25 telecom infrastructure that preserves the health of

the communities. It also leads to the discretion of 2 3 unelected administrators at OTI, who work in 4 partnership with the telecom industry, but not in partnership with the communities. I have witnessed OTI's participation at community boards, and OTI's 6 7 track record has been abysmal, with a complete 8 disregard for community input on the irresponsible deployment of wireless telecom infrastructure, especially the 5G towers, in our communities, 10 11 threatening our health, especially our children and property values. What OTI has not told this Committee 12 13 is that 16 community boards, representing 25 percent 14 of New York City residents, over 2 million people, 15 oppose the 5G cell towers in their Districts. It is 16 in writing, it has been sent to the Mayor, it has 17 been sent to OTI. They want wired broadband. The 18 message is clear. They don't want the 5G towers, and 19 they don't need them. Residents also don't want the 20 pole-top antennas or pods or utility poles outside 21 their windows, or rooftop antennas directly above 2.2 their apartments. I know of the stories that people 2.3 have suffered from this. Studies have shown that children are more susceptible to wireless's adverse 24 biological effects, including cancer. The World 25

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

you.

2 Health Organization just published a review, citing 3 wireless' high cancer risk. 5G has never been tested 4 for safety. No federal agency is testing wireless for safety. 5G is likely to exacerbate the digital divide, according to the U.S. Government 6 Accountability Office. New York City should have a 7 8 cohesive and sustainable plan, not patchwork. New York City should have municipal broadband, where it owns the telecom (TIMER CHIME) infrastructure, and 10 11 then leases it out to providers. May I conclude? 12 CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Yes, please. Thank

ODETTE WILKENS: Thank you. That means connecting everyone with fiber, for which Verizon got ratepayer subsidies to do, but didn't. That will provide affordable broadband now and in the future. That would provide what Intro. 486 seeks to achieve, providing internet to students and families.

Chattanooga, Tennessee, is a model with 600 square miles of fiber connected to every home, business, and school. It has the fastest Internet in the United States, offering symmetrical one gigabit download and upload speeds at affordable prices, and one of the fastest in the world.

2.2

2.3

2 CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Odette, can you 3 conclude, please?

ODETTE WILKENS: Yes. Just one more. With their windfall of profits, they are providing free internet to every household that has a school-aged child. That is, I think, what the bill is trying to do.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you. Thank you for the reference. We have your testimony. I'll take a look at it.

The next panelist, please.

Member Gutiérrez, Staff, and fellow New Yorkers. My name is Keziah Sullivan-Norman, also known as Keziah Glow, and I serve as Interim General Manager at WHCR 90.3 FM, Harlem Community Radio. It is an honor to appear before you today to share an important initiative that strengthens our City's emergency communications infrastructure and ensures that every voice, especially those most vulnerable, are heard. WHCR 90.3 FM is a community radio station housed on the campus of City College, CCNY, one of the country's leading public research and engineering institutions. Our station has long embodied CCNY's

spirit of innovation, public service, and commitment 2 3 to uplifting underserved communities. In that spirit, 4 shortly following Superstorm Sandy in 2012, we collaborated with local community organizations, technologists, including Digital Divide Partners to 6 form the WHCR Emergency Broadcast Team, which 7 developed precisely to respond to the clear need for 8 localized, reliable communications during crisis. The urgency of this work is personal for us. During 10 11 Hurricane Sandy, one of WHCR's veteran engineers experienced the collapse of normal communications 12 13 systems firsthand. From far Rockaway, he heard 14 heartbreaking calls for help over the radio. He 15 described it being like a war zone, but the enemy was 16 the weather. During the critical window, even the 17 police precincts, the National Guard's posts were 18 overwhelmed. This story is not an outlier, it is a 19 warning. WEBT's response has been to train local 20 residents in emergency communications and protocols, including emergency preparedness and mitigation 21 preparedness, and to collaborate with others to 2.2 2.3 create innovative ways to communicate with our communities before, during, and after emergencies and 24 disaster events. For the past 10 years, WEBT has 25

2.2

presented the Harlem Emergency Preparedness Day event at City College, a forum that brings together emergency preparedness professionals, community organizations active in disasters, co-eds, and community residents for demonstrations, presentations, and discussions around emergency preparedness, mitigation, and recovery, working in collaboration with the SMART Community Initiative, that would be (TIMER CHIME) TSCI, and their Streaming University Project. May I please finish?

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Yes, please wrap up. Thank you.

KEZIAH SULLIVAN: Thank you. WEBT has developed a 24/7 streaming platform for community content, integrated with radio and emergency alerts, training programs for the public, and real-time emergency response systems. WEBT empowers residents not just to consume information, but to control the emergency platforms and restoring connectivity to communities. It is our heart. We are trying to bring WEBT. We are proud of what we created, and we ask for the Master Plan to be reinstated.

1 CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you. I know 2 3 you were trying to speed. I have your written testimony here. Thank you so much for testifying. 4 The last panelist. Just make sure the light is on. 6 7 JOSE LUIS RODRIGUEZ: Good afternoon. CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Is it on? Can you 8 9 just touch the button? Thank you. How are you? JOSE LUIS RODRIGUEZ: Good afternoon, 10 11 Chair Gutiérrez and Members of the Committee. My name 12 is Jose Luis Rodriguez, and I serve as Executive 13 Director of the Caribbean Preparedness and Response, 14 Inc., CPR. CPR is a not-for-profit organization 15 dedicated to resilience and digital participation for 16 Caribbean and Latino communities, both here in New 17 York City and across the broader region, including 18 other parts of the state. Puerto Rico, Connecticut, 19 and Pennsylvania are also parts that we service. 20 Since our inception, responding to emergencies, what a coincidence, in the Caribbean, our mission has 21 focused on the role of communications and 2.2 2.3 connectivity in disaster preparedness and recovery

involving diaspora communities. Today, we're leading

efforts to expand access to broadband in under-

24

resourced communities through satellite-based
solutions, digital navigation programs, digital
community centers, youth-centered digital learning
initiatives, and workforce development, among others,
with the goal of continuing operating and growing as
a not-for-profit internet provider for our
communities. We believe that any legislative effort
to bolster access to broadband is not only noble but
essential. These bills reflect a shared understanding
that connectivity is a lifeline for education,
employment, health, and civic participation. We
support these bills. However, I want to raise an
important gap. The City's digital equity framework
does not reference the State's Digital Equity Plan,
nor does the current Internet Master Plan
meaningfully integrate digital equity as a guiding
principle. We urge the Council to ensure future
versions for both plans center this concept more
explicitly and coordinate across all levels of
government.

Finally, with regard to Intro. 1122, we believe this bill is critical. A comprehensive and regularly updated broadband expansion plan, including the use of alternative technologies as defined by the

2.2

State, such as unlicensed (TIMER CHIME) fixed—
wireless, low-Earth-orbit, LEO, satellite services,

paired with an advisory board, it is exactly the kind
of strategic infrastructure we need. CPR will be
honored to support this effort in any capacity that
might be helpful. Additionally, the City should
include provisions to incentivize and support
alternative interstate providers like CPR...

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Please wrap up.

 $\,$ JOSE LUIS RODRIGUEZ: As part of the broadband expansion. Thank you.

much. I do have some questions, but I think maybe we'll, if it's okay if I can, we have your contact information. I know, Odette, I just want to touch base with you, and I want to touch base with you, just because we do have another hearing. I thank you for your testimony, and I'll email with questions. Thank you, and thank you so much for testifying and sticking around.

Our last in-person panel, I'd like to call up, I believe this is Julie Martin, Otalora, and Sharon Brown.

2.2

2.3

Hi, how are you? Thank you. You all can start. Whoever can start can go ahead. Just make sure the button is on. It's a red light.

BERNARD OTALORA: Good afternoon. My name is Bernard Otalora. I come here to talk about the 5G tower that is already installed on Juno Street in front of public, I mean an historic elementary school, PS144, and I want to say what I don't like about it. Wait, I wrote it last night, but excuse my English.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: That's okay. This is your testimony that you're submitting though, right?

BERNARD OTALORA: And then you can ask me questions, and I will give you my point of view.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: You got it.

BERNARD OTALORA: The argument that the community needs this tower because there is a gap in service is baseless. People do not need free internet access. They never asked for it. PS144 does not have any need for it. They are fully equipped also. Contrary to what was said, there was no tall building, because this was an argument of theirs, that there was a tall building with more people on

2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

the street. Who is this tower going to help? And I ask the birds. Nothing else. It's flat. The site of the tower does not take into account the risk young children of PS144 will be exposed to daily. I want to stress that there is a sidewalk, and after the sidewalk there is a distance from me to you, and this is a playground for the kindergartners who go there every day to breathe a bit of fresh air, and they will be under the umbrella of electromagnetic waves year-round, and this is not good. Since it is also a charging station, it will attract people who do not belong around an elementary school. A school should be a place kept free of any bad influences. The company that is behind this 5G tower is not going to tell you about the health risks they cause, cancer to cite only one, and this is documented, but when this (TIMER CHIME) company talks about past studies, we have more recent studies that say that this is really a health hazard. The reason why I am so vocal about that, all of my life I helped children build their own health. (INAUDIBLE) I taught physical education all of my life.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you. We need to wrap up.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- BERNARD OTALORA: Okay. I know I need to
 wrap up but I don't have a stopwatch.
 - CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: We have your written testimony, sir.

BERNARD OTALORA: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: I'm sorry. We need to move on. Thank you.

BERNARD OTALORA: Would you want a 5G tower to be installed by your children's school? I doubt it. No one in our community needs this tower. Children do not need it. The tower must go.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you.

BERNARD OTALORA: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you.

JULIE MARTIN: Thank you for this

opportunity to speak today. My name is Julie Martin.

18 I'm a lifelong New Yorker and have been volunteering

19 for the grassroots group called New Yorkers 4 Wired

20 Tech. As the name implies, we believe wired

21 technology is superior to wireless for health,

22 privacy, and for speed so I'm appreciative that these

23 | bills are trying to diversify New Yorkers' options

24 and focusing in on cable franchises as well. But

25 there is a major asset that has fallen into the

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

memory hole. In the 2000s in New York, it was Verizon which took up the task of transforming our copper phone lines to fiber optic. They obtained many concessions and the ability to charge extra fees on their regular phone customers for years in order to do so. And yet what we ended up with is a partially built out system, which basically became the backhaul for their private cell phone services. I need to thank Bruce Kushnick and the Irregulators, a group of technology and consumer advocates, for shining a light on this period of history. I will admit I was attached to my old copper landline. It was the only thing that worked during 9/11 and during Sandy while everyone else was huddling around wi-fi hotspots. But I was one of the lucky ones who got fiber to the premises. Especially lucky as I had heard from other New Yorkers that they were being forced to go directly to wireless so this is where the true digital inequity lies. Those neighborhoods that did not get fiber to the premises but only to the corners are the ones that are not getting proper service today. And so if we could focus on having that last mile to the premises finished, then I think a lot would be accomplished. If Verizon cannot do it or

that. Thank you.

2.2

2.3

2	will not do it, then let a smaller local company
3	finish the job. I think this is one of the most
4	important and meaningful tasks before our tech
5	officials today. And there is still that question of
6	the infrastructure that Verizon did build out. Since
7	it was built with Title II public utility status,
8	does it not belong to the public? I hope that these
9	bills, especially 1122, can get to the bottom of

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you, Julie.
Our last panelist, Sharon.

SHARON BROWN: Hello, my name is Sharon Brown. Before I begin, remember Israel, release the hostages, let Yahweh's people go, defend Israel.

Okay. We need the internet access for all New Yorkers on cell phones, in homes. People use it for searching for housing, filling out applications, going to school online, working jobs online. That takes up a considerable amount of time so they need to connect with the community, attend hearings such as this via the internet. And some people need unlimited internet access for some of these things. There should be covered internet kiosks or rain-resistant, weather-resistant kiosks throughout the

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

city that people can use when their devices, the batteries die, so that they can use internet, they can make calls if there's some kind of emergency. We need public phones back with internet and charging stations and kiosks everywhere so people won't be stranded. We need to make sure that the internet is available for everyone, students, people taking tests, people applying for college, different things like that. The children really need the internet. We need to make sure that it's safe for the children, but they do need the internet. And also, phones should not be taken away from children in school because of all of the sensitive things that occur at school, shootings, different things like that. They need to have access to their phone and the internet when they are in class. When there are things, they're being bullied or any kind of thing is going on in school, they need access to their phone and internet. It should be something where all students should have access to the internet on their phone so that if something occurs in school, they can reach their parents, the police, or someone that they can trust. Thank you.

_	COMMITTEE ON TECHNOLOGI
2	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you all so
3	much. Thank you for this panel. Thank you for
4	waiting.
5	We're now going to move on to the virtual
6	panel. Did we miss anybody?
7	BERNARD OTALORA: (INAUDIBLE)
8	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Sir, I'm so sorry.
9	I'm talking about new panelists. You already
10	testified. Thank you.
11	Okay. We're going to move on to the Zoom
12	panel. First panel is Clayton Banks, Joseph Dumanov,
13	Stanley Chan, and Stephanie Robinson.
14	CLAYTON BANKS: Hi, can I go first? This
15	is Clayton Banks.
16	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Yes, you can
17	start.
18	CLAYTON BANKS: Well, first of all, good
19	afternoon. Good afternoon, Chair Gutiérrez and
20	distinguished Members of the Committee on Technology
21	I got to say hi to Holden and Irene. My name is
22	Clayton Banks, and I am the CEO of Silicon Harlem, a
23	community-driven company dedicated to advancing
2.4	digital equity and broadband aggoss for all I'm bore

in strong support, strong support for the Bill 1122

2 and the package of all the bills that are aimed at 3 closing the digital divide and expanding broadband 4 access to every home in New York City. I want to express my deepest thanks to Council Member Gutiérrez for her leadership on this critical issue and her 6 7 commitment to ensuring that no New Yorker is left 8 behind in this digital age. Too many New Yorkers still do not have access to reliable, affordable internet. This digital divide has held our community 10 11 back, and we must change that. Intro. 1122 is a 12 pivotal step forward in this fight. This bill would 13 task developing a comprehensive plan to expand 14 broadband access to all homes in the city. One of the 15 most crucial aspects of this bill is the creation of an Internet Advisory Board, which will involve key 16 17 stakeholders from diverse sectors, including 18 technology experts, community organizations, and 19 residents. This Advisory Board will play a vital role 20 in refining the broadband expansion plan and ensuring 21 that it meets the needs of every community. We cannot have a one-size-fits-all solution. The challenges 2.2 2.3 faced by communities require targeted solutions that prioritize the needs of the residents who have been 24 historically underserved. 25

2	In conclusion, I want to reiterate that								
3	broadband access is not just about providing								
4	internet, it's about providing opportunity. It's								
5	about ensuring that every New Yorker, regardless of								
6	where they live or where their income is, has equal								
7	access to the opportunities of the digital age. Than								
8	you for your time, for your leadership, and certainl								
9	I look forward to working with all of you to make								
10	this vision a reality and to create a more connected								
11	equitable New York City. Thank you.								
12	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you so much,								
13	Clayton. Good to see you.								
14	Joseph?								
15	SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Starting time.								
16	JOSEPH DUMANOV: Hello, yes. The video is								
17	turned off here. Can you turn the video on?								
18	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Joseph, we're								
19	having difficulty hearing you.								
20	JOSEPH DUMANOV: Okay. Can you hear me								
21	now?								
22	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Yes, barely, but								
23	yes, we can hear you. You can get started.								
24	JOSEPH DUMANOV: Okay, let me just give								

you a little bit of my background. I'm an IBEW

- 2 | Electronics and Communications Engineer. I got my
- 3 licensing from IBEW 1430 out of Larchmont back in the
- 4 | 70s. I went to RCA Institute and Sarnoff Laboratories
- 5 to work on communications and electronic systems.
- 6 That was early on in my career. I had a long
- 7 extensive career in technology, and 25 years ago,
- 8 because of a cancer in my family, I got into the
- 9 | field of medical mycology. I did eight years of
- 10 | medical schooling nationally and internationally

11 (INAUDIBLE)

- 12 CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Joseph, I'm sorry,
- 13 can you just speak a little bit louder?
- JOSEPH DUMANOV: Anyway, I got into the
- 15 | field of clinical molecular biology, which is about
- 16 | causation. Everything is about causation, and here's
- 17 | a big challenge that everybody has. We're reading
- 18 | things on the internet that are out of context,
- 19 | they're being misinterpreted, and the research is not
- 20 | fully integrated for their claims. I'm going to share
- 21 | one other thing with you. I'm a Peer Review Associate
- 22 | Editor with Elsevier. I've reviewed about over 200
- 23 manuscripts pre-publication in oncology, toxicology,
- 24 | immunology. Everything works on a molecular level,
- 25 and what you're seeing is the studies that you're

2	reading and the reports of these building bio people
3	that just showed up overnight. They actually imitated
4	my work about 15 years ago or so. I look at these
5	papers, and I say to myself, they're not showing you
6	any real mechanisms of causation. I know what the
7	mechanisms of causation are. About 18 years ago, I
8	started doing clinical environmental studies for EMF,
9	EMR, RF. What does that mean? My studies are based
10	upon the clinical indicators that my clients and
11	patients are discussing. They're talking to me.
12	They're feeling this. They're feeling that. I have
13	seen many, many cancers. I've seen malformed births.
14	I understand exactly how this works. I have a paper
15	that's almost done that's going to be quite
16	revolutionary. The point I want to make is there's a
17	lot of unnecessary fear. (TIMER CHIME)
18	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Joseph, I'm sorry.
19	Can you wrap up? Your time is up. Can you wrap up?

JOSEPH DUMANOV: The point is it's not as serious as it looks. It's on a case-by-case basis. I hate to see all this alarmist, and people need to really understand that there's much more to it.

Your time's up.

community member, a homeowner, and most importantly a

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- 2 father in Forest Hills, Queens. The reason why I'm
- 3 here is I want to speak about the same tower that
- 4 | went up on Juno Street, right outside of PS144. Can I
- 5 share my screen because I have a photo, just to
- 6 | illustrate my point. Is that okay?

7 CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: I don't think that

8 we can share screens. I don't think we can.

STANLEY CHAN: Okay, so essentially this tower, it went up last Thursday, and there was feedback from the community, and most people are deeply unhappy about it. We feel as if OTI did not take our input into consideration. If the mission is to serve digital equity, Forest Hills is lucky to be an affluent community, and I don't believe that it's a place where this tower is best placed. If there's only 200 of them, I feel like it's better placed somewhere else. People are unhappy when it's placed outside of their homes. This is a school with 830 children. There's 830 families. Some of them as young as three years of age, and we don't know what the health effects of 5G are. I can't say that I do, but it's not something that we know conclusively. So even if it were to be placed maybe 200 feet down a block, that'd be a better location, because this is a place

2	where it's right outside the main entrance of the
3	school. There's hundreds of kids which walk past.
4	It's actually a place where buses will drop kids off,
5	and I don't understand how OTI made the choice to
6	place the tower in this particular place. I don't
7	think it serves the community. We're not a place that
8	is suffering from digital equity, and it literally is
9	just physically in a place that is obstructing
10	students and parents who are walking past the school,
11	not to mention health concerns. So how does OTI do
12	this? I think the Council Member that spoke from
13	Brooklyn earlier perfectly captures how we feel about
14	this tower. We feel as if there was no chance for the
15	community to give feedback on this tower being placed
16	there, and is there any way we can maybe even move it
17	down a block or somewhere else where it can be needed
18	more? That's what I wanted to say, and I thank you
19	for having the chance to express myself.
20	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you,
21	Stanley Thank you so much

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: You may begin.

followed by Tracy Appleton.

Our next panelist is Stephanie Robinson

22

23

2 STEPHANIE ROBINSON: Hi. I represent 3 Human-I-T, a leading digital equity practitioner 4 focused on expanding access to devices, digital skills training, and affordable broadband access. And I'm here today because I think with the right 6 7 supportive policies, I believe we can significantly 8 bolster programming and outreach efforts to New Yorkers still stuck on the wrong side of the digital divide. Human-I-T fully supports Intros 198, 481, 10 11 486, and 1122, because they directly align with our 12 mission to connect low-income New Yorkers to 13 affordable internet devices and digital skills. 14 Essentially, we know that our programs work, right? 15 When we implement them, 83 percent of students see an 16 improvement in academic achievement, 57 percent are 17 now able to access social services, 47 percent are 18 able to better manage their health care and utilize 19 telehealth services, and one-third end up applying 20 for new jobs. And I think with the City backing work like this, we're confident we can scale these 21 positive results across all boroughs. Human-I-T 2.2 2.3 stands ready to participate in the design, development, and rollout of City initiatives related 24 to digital equity. This is a pressing issue in the 25

2.2

2.3

- city, especially as new developments like the rapidly
 heightening presence of AI in everyday life continue
 to deepen the existing digital skills gap, but it is
- a problem we can solve. So, thank you for your attention to the matter. We appreciate it.
 - CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you,
 Stephanie. Thank you so much.
 - Next, we have Tracy Appleton followed by Christopher Leon Johnson, and finally, Jerelyn Rodriguez.

12 SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: You may begin.

TRACY APPLETON: Thank you so much to the Committee for your time. Thank you, Chairperson Gutiérrez. My name is Tracy Appleton. I just want to echo what Mr. Chan said. I believe he captured it perfectly about how the community feels. Mr. Restler is my representative, and I really appreciate him speaking out. We live at 54 Norman Avenue. My husband, Ari Hoenig, is here as well. Outside of our window, they've built one of these 5G towers. To be more precise, outside my daughter's window, who's 12 going on 13. The tower is supposedly 10 feet away. It sure doesn't look it. It has a sticker on it that says, don't come in within 7 feet of this. That's for

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

people who work at it for an hour, for a few minutes. She lives in that room. I fully believe that if you show these systems to be healthy, or to be okay for people, or there were studies done, I would have no problem. But as was mentioned before, the FCC, these very rules that are being applied now, were up for debate in 2019. There's a case, I read, 9F4893, that's Environmental Health Trust v. FCC. That's the case it was referred to before, where the FCC was told in 2021 to update their rules. They have done nothing in the last four years. Chairwoman Gutiérrez, you started this discussion about how angry you were that you had to wait two or three years for something to change. They haven't done anything in four years. So we have regulations that were based on science 20 years ago. They don't know what these towers do. And one of them is right outside my daughter's window. And as Mr. Chan said, if they'd spoken to us, if you look from our corner, you go one corner over, there's a building that is only a first-floor building. There's nothing above it. This tower is right outside my daughter's window, directly outside. I don't think there was any thought to where it was put. I'm not saying let's tear down this whole system. I'm saying

- 2 | let's put these things in places where we're not
- 3 putting people at risk. I do want everyone to have
- 4 utilities. I do think that that's important, but it
- 5 | shouldn't be run over people who are innocent and
- 6 have no chance to defend themselves.
- 7 CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you so much,
- 8 Tracy. Yes, thank you. I appreciate it.
- 9 Finally, we have Christopher Leon Johnson
- 10 | followed by Jerelyn Rodriguez, and the final
- 11 panelist, one name only, Ari.
- 12 SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: You may begin.
- 13 CHRISTOPHER LEON JOHNSON: Hello. My name
- 14 | is Christopher Leon Johnson. I'm on a train. I just
- 15 got off the train, so I'm walking right now. Thank
- 16 you for having this hearing. I just got off the
- 17 | train. These trains are horrible. They need to have
- 18 | wi-fi on these. I'm on the 4 train right now. I'm
- 19 | calling for wi-fi everywhere. We need wi-fi on these
- 20 damn trains, pardon my language, but we need internet
- 21 access on these trains, man. I'm on the 4 train right
- 22 now, Hello.
- 23 CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Christopher, we
- 24 | can hear you, but you're shouting.

2	CHRISTOPHER LEON JOHNSON: We need
3	internet access on these trains, all the trains,
4	because if we had this on these trains, I would not
5	have <u>(INAUDIBLE)</u> this right now. I could just be on a
6	train at the <u>(INAUDIBLE)</u> , the 42nd <u>(INAUDIBLE)</u> on the
7	Port of Lexington. And it's funky right now. It's on
8	the train. We need to have this. Like I said,
9	(INAUDIBLE) advocating in support for these bills and
10	these regulations like that, we need this. We need it
11	for the poor. We need it for people like me that are
12	broke. People that are broke, man. Do it for the
13	broke people.
14	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you.
15	CHRISTOPHER LEON JOHNSON: Do it for the
16	broke people, please.
17	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you.
18	CHRISTOPHER LEON JOHNSON: But yeah, we
19	need internet access for all. So yeah, we need
20	internet access for all (INAUDIBLE) We need to make
21	this happen.
22	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you.
23	CHRISTOPHER LEON JOHNSON: Make this
24	happen. Thank you.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you,
3 Christopher. Thank you.

Next panelist, Jerelyn Rodriguez.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: You may begin.

CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Jerelyn.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: You may begin.

JERELYN RODRIGUEZ: Okay, great. I was waiting. Thank you. Good afternoon, Chair Gutiérrez and Members of the Technology Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today. My name is Jerelyn Rodriguez, the CEO and Co-Founder at The Knowledge House. We are a non-profit with proud roots in the South Bronx who deliver tech workforce development programs throughout New York City, Newark, Atlanta, L.A., and Washington, D.C. Our mission is to empower and sustain a talent pipeline of technologists and digital leaders who will uplift their communities. 41 percent of households with incomes below 30K per year don't own a computer. And 43 percent are without broadband access. Historic underrepresentation in STEM workforce continues to persist with only 11 percent of Blacks and 9 percent of Hispanic workers in STEM roles, and we work to change that. Having impacted over 2,500 students

through fellowships, The Knowledge House is committed 2 3 to changing the career trajectory of young men and 4 women across New York City and breaking the cycle of poverty by providing high-paying fellowships for 5 students in the tech space. We operate three 6 7 programs, the Innovation Fellowship, Focus on Job Training in Data Science, Web Development and 8 Cybersecurity, which ends in certification, job placements, and we also offer our high school 10 11 program, the Karim Kharbouch Fellowship, which trains high school students in foundational coding and 12 13 design, and we help them explore STEM careers and 14 provide college prep or opportunities for industry-15 facing internships. And our newest program, Digital Literacy, helps any New Yorker, regardless of their 16 17 age or background, develop basic digital literacy 18 skills and provide employable tech knowledge, which 19 helps participants understand how to use AI 20 responsibly. Our students have an average of 20K in 21 individual income, which then skyrockets to 76K after taking our program. Affordable Internet connection is 2.2 2.3 a critical piece of our work. We are so grateful to the Council Member Gutiérrez, Won, Holden, Menin, 24 Restler, and Brewer for championing legislation being 25

Hoenig. I'm sorry that I missed the last name there.

I am a homeowner in Greenpoint, Brooklyn, and several 2 months ago, without any warning or information, a 5G 3 4 tower was constructed on the corner right outside of my house. This unit is seven feet from my property line. It's 12 feet from the window of a bedroom, and 6 this is also the bedroom where my daughter sleeps. After it was constructed, I noticed a small yellow 8 sign on the box, which is the unit, and I photographed it and zoomed way in, and I could read 10 11 this message. This message says, it's a warning sign, 12 a yellow caution sign. It says, keep back seven feet 13 from this antenna, FCC RF, which stands for radio 14 frequency, public exposure limits may be exceeded 15 within this distance. Okay, this is, again, 12 feet from the window. There is no reason why this unit 16 17 should be so close to residential buildings. I get 18 that everybody in the city needs access to broadband. 19 I get that the City needs revenue and needs to rent 20 out space. But this is a health concern. There are 21 studies that are showing that 3 and 4G do increase 2.2 risk of cancer, and that children are especially 2.3 susceptible to that. There are no studies or no accurate studies with 5G. We can't rely on that. We 24 are essentially the test here, and I don't want to be 25

2	the test, and I don't want my kids to be the test. We								
3	already had very, very good coverage with broadband								
4	and also 4G in this neighborhood before this tower.								
5	It was excellent. It's a quite affluent neighborhood,								
6	in fact. It's not needed in this area. It's needed								
7	somewhere else, and it shouldn't be so close. And I								
8	just want to end this to be able to show the panel								
9	here, the view from my window so that you can								
10	actually see it for yourselves. That's the tower, and								
11	this is the box.								
12	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: We see it. Thank								
13	you.								
14	ARI HOENIG: Okay. Thank you very much for								
15	your time.								
16	CHAIRPERSON GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you, Ari.								
17	Thank you for testifying. Thank you so much.								
18	Okay. If we have inadvertently missed								
19	anyone who has registered to testify today and has								

anyone who has registered to testify today and has yet to have been called, please use the Zoom hand function, and you'll be called in that order that your hand was raised.

Okay. No hands. I want to thank everyone for your testimonies today.

1	COMMITTEE	ON	TE	CHNOLOGY					174
2		Т	he	hearing	is	now	adjourned.	Thank	you.
3	[GAVEL]								
4									
5									
6									
7									
8									
9									
10									
11									
12									
13									
14									
15									
16									
17									
18									
19									
20									
21									
22									
23									
24									

World Wide Dictation certifies that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. We further certify that there is no relation to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that there is interest in the outcome of this matter.



Date June 23, 2025