

**AGENDA**  
Eau Claire County  
Broadband Committee  
Thursday, March 25, 2021  
4:00 P.M.  
Remote Meeting via Webex Events

Those wishing to make public comments must submit their name and address no later than 30 minutes prior to the meeting to [rod.eslinger@co.eau-claire.wi.us](mailto:rod.eslinger@co.eau-claire.wi.us). Comments are limited to 3 minutes; you will be called on during the public comment section of the meeting. Written comments will also be accepted and should be submitted to the e-mail address listed above.

**Public Access:** Dial in Number: 1-415-655-0001 Access Code: 145 754 3095

Meeting Link:

<https://eauclairecounty.webex.com/eauclairecounty/j.php?MTID=mbe1b3665d3a3b7827e6565fa3dbe44bb>

Password: TkfwMJUi657

*\*mute your device upon entry*

1. Call to order and confirmation of meeting notice.
2. Roll Call
3. Public Comment (limit to 3 minutes per person)
4. Review/Approval of February 18, 2021 Committee Minutes – **Discussion/Action**
5. America Recovery Act Fund - **Discussion/Action**
  - a. Evaluate the Broadband Committee goals, policies, and objectives to ensure there is guidance on allocation of funds for future broadband infrastructure within Eau Claire County.
  - b. Partnership opportunities between the county, school districts, libraries, and local municipalities.
6. PSC Grant Announcements – **Discussion/Action**
  - a. Ideas for supporting future PSC Broadband grant applications.
- 7.
8. SpaceX Starlink Pilot Project Update – **Discussion/Action**
  - a. Survey results
  - b. Healthcare Collaborative Partners
  - c. Fundraising
  - d. WEDC Grant
  - e. Next Steps...
9. FCC Emergency Broadband Program – **Discussion/Action**
10. Next Steps and future meetings – Discussion/Action
  - a. Future Meeting: April 15, 2021
11. Adjourn

## MEETING MINUTES

Eau Claire County

Broadband Committee

Thursday, February 18, 2021

4:00 P.M.

Remote Meeting via Webex Events

Those wishing to make public comments must submit their name and address no later than 30 minutes prior to the meeting to [rod.eslinger@co.eau-claire.wi.us](mailto:rod.eslinger@co.eau-claire.wi.us). Comments are limited to 3 minutes; you will be called on during the public comment section of the meeting. Written comments will also be accepted and should be submitted to the e-mail address listed above.

**Public Access: Dial in Number: 1-415-655-0001 Access Code: 145 471 5248**

*\*mute your device upon entry*

Members Present: Lynn Thompson, Donald Mowry, Tom Lange, Tim Laubach , Collin Pomplun (joined at 4:29), Luke Hanson (joined at 4:38).

Staff Present: Rodney J. Eslinger – Director of Planning and Development, Dave Hayden – Director of Information Systems

Others Present: John LeBrun, Bob Nelson, Doug Carlson

Press: Ryan Patterson

1. Call to order and confirmation of meeting notice.

Chairperson Mowry call to order the meeting at 4:08 p.m. and he confirmed that the meeting was properly noticed.

2. Roll Call – Members present are noted above. NOTE: Quorum was present at 4:29 p.m.
3. Public Comment (limit to 3 minutes per person)

Doug Carlson, Town of Brunswick citizen, thanked the committee for their direction and support in moving ahead with the SpaceX Starlink pilot project. He asked if the committee a few questions; If they had a forecast of availability of Starlink? Where else is Starlink implementing the pilot? How does the Eau Claire County project fit within their beta project? Dave Hayden replied to Mr. Carlson's questions. Bob Nelson shared his experience with Starlink, associated costs, and the set up process.

4. Review/Approval of February 18, 2021 Committee Minutes – **Discussion/Action (4:58 p.m.)**

The committee reviewed the meeting minutes of February 18, 2021. Lynn Thompson motioned to approve the minutes as presented, Tom Lange seconded the motion; motion carried on a voice vote with all in favor of the motion.

5. SpaceX Starlink Pilot Project Update – **Discussion**

Dave Hayden presented the updates to the committee on the survey, allocations, fundraising efforts, and the WEDC grant application process.

The committee also discussed other funding opportunities; CVTC Foundations and the medical collaborative partnership.

The survey and pilot project letter are nearing completion and will be sent out to 527 addresses within the beta test area. Results to be shared with the committee at its next meeting.

6. Starlink Beta Test – **Discussion**

Dave Hayden explained that he was aware of another Starlink Beta Test in Allen Township, Ohio. He explained how Eau Claire County was recommended as a potential Starlink pilot partner.

7. Next Steps and future meetings – Discussion/Action

- a. Future Meeting: March 18, 2021.

Adjourn Action: Meeting adjourned by unanimous consent at 5:03 p.m.

Respectively submitted by,

Rodney J. Eslinger  
Director of Planning and Development

# **PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF WISCONSIN**

## **Memorandum**

March 9, 2021

### **FOR COMMISSION AGENDA**

TO: The Commission

FROM: Kristy Nieto, Administrator  
Tara Pray, Deputy Administrator  
Alyssa Kenney, Director of Digital Access  
Dennis Klaila, Program & Planning Analyst  
Division of Digital Access, Consumer & Environmental Affairs

RE: FY 2021 Broadband Expansion Grants 5-BF-2021

Award of Broadband Expansion Grants for Fiscal Year 2021

### **Suggested Minute:**

The Commission reviewed the applications for broadband expansions grants and [determined which applicants should receive a grant award in Fiscal Year 2021 / remanded the matter back to Commission staff for additional investigation].

### **Introduction**

The Broadband Expansion Grant program is authorized by Wis. Stat. §§ 20.155(3)(r) and 196.504. The purpose of the Broadband Grant program is to encourage the deployment of broadband service in underserved and unserved areas of the state. This is the eighth year that the Commission has awarded grants under this authority. To date, the Commission has awarded a total of \$44.2 million in grants for 210 grant projects.<sup>1</sup>

On September 1, 2020, the Commission announced it would make \$24.0 million available for Broadband Expansion Grants in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2021 grant cycle.

---

<sup>1</sup> This does not include the \$5.4 million awarded to 12 broadband grant projects that were part of the federal CARES program.

Applications were due at 4:00 pm on December 1, 2020. The Commission received 124 grant applications from 57 different applicants, requesting a total of \$62,628,813. This memorandum provides a comparative evaluation of the grant applications that have been submitted for the Commission's review.

The Commission provided a six-week period in which the public could comment on the filed applications. For this grant round, the Commission limited the comment period to comments opposing a grant application. The Commission required that applicants include supportive comments as an attachment with the application. The opposition comments were due no later than 4:00 pm on January 14, 2021. Responses to filed comments were due by 4:00 pm on January 21, 2021. The Commission offered a second comment period, with comments due no later than 4:00 pm on February 17, 2021, for parties that wished to comment on the overlap of the state broadband grant applications and the recent awards under the federal Rural Digital Opportunity Fund (RDOF). Responses to those comments were due by 4:00 pm on February 22, 2021. The opposition comments and responses are discussed below in the section on eligibility.

The Commission staff reviewed each application for eligibility. The discussion of that evaluation is in the section below. A four-member screening panel evaluated the merit of each application.<sup>2</sup> The screening panel's evaluation is included as Attachment 1 to this memorandum. [DL: 1786626](#). A map illustrating the locations of the 124 grant applications and the technologies the projects will employ is included as Attachment 2. [DL: 1782417](#). A map illustrating the locations of the grant applications recommended by the screening panel, and the other applications as well is included as Attachment 3. [DL: 1786628](#). A table listing

---

<sup>2</sup> Alyssa Kenney, Peter R. Jahn, Jason Kuhn and Dennis Klaila, all members of the Commission staff.

the overlap between the 124 grant applications and recent federal awards from the RDOF auction is included as Attachment 4. [DL: 1786627](#).

This memorandum and the screening panel's evaluation are provided as a useful opinion regarding the eligibility and relative merits of the grant applications. The Commission is not bound by the comments of staff or the evaluation of the screening panel. The screening panel evaluation is simply one alternative among many choices the Commission may consider.

### **Funding Available for this Grant Cycle**

As of February 1, 2021, there is \$28,431,738 in available funding for Broadband Expansion Grant awards. In 2017, the state removed the spending cap that previously limited annual expenditures. Therefore, this entire amount is available for grants in the current grant cycle.

In its August 31, 2020 letter announcement of the commencement of the current grant round, the Commission announced that it would make available approximately \$24 million for broadband grants in FY 2021. ([PSC REF#: 396101](#).) If the Commission awards exactly \$24 million and no more, \$4,431,738 in available funding will remain in the appropriation and carry over into FY 2022 for future use.

### **Discussion of the Grant Applications Submitted for FY 2021**

The discussion below provides an overview of the grant applications in this year's cycle. The first section provides general comments on the eligibility of the applications. The second section provides staff's comments and background information regarding the merit evaluation of the applications. The third section provides an additional decision option that the Commission may wish to discuss before completing its list of approved grant awards.

## **1. Eligibility.**

### **a. Filing Matters**

The Commission released application instructions on August 31, 2020 stating that applications were due by 4:00 pm on December 1, 2020. All 124 applications were filed on time.

### **b. Statutory Eligibility Criteria**

To be eligible to receive a grant, a proposed project must satisfy four statutory requirements that generally address the types of entities that may receive a grant, and the areas of the state in which a project may be located.

First, to be eligible to receive a grant an applicant must be either an organization operating for profit or not for profit, a telecommunications utility, or a political subdivision (i.e., a city, village, town, or county) that has entered into a partnership with a telecommunications utility or an organization operated for profit or not for profit. Staff found that all 124 applications met this requirement.

Second, the purpose of a project must be to construct broadband infrastructure in an area of the state that the Commission has designated as underserved. While the term “underserved” is defined by statute under Wis. Stat. § 196.504(1)(b) to mean an area that is served by fewer than two broadband service providers, the statute does not prescribe the transmission speed or the technology required for a service to qualify as broadband service. Because “broadband” is generally understood as internet service provided at a speed sufficient to enable a user to conduct activities of an advanced nature, the speed and technology standards used by the Commission have changed over the years, in accordance with technological advancements and industry standards. Currently, the Commission designates

areas as underserved by determining whether an area delimited by a census block boundary is served by fewer than two providers providing wireline or fixed wireless service at a minimum speed of 25 megabits per second (Mbps) for download and 3 Mbps for upload, which is the current standard designated by the Federal Communications Commission.<sup>3</sup> For purposes of evaluating the eligibility of a grant application, the Commission has, in previous grant cycles, also permitted an area to be designated as underserved if an application demonstrates that a proposed service area is served by fewer than two broadband service providers, notwithstanding the fact that the proposed service area lies within a census block that is served by two or more broadband service providers.

Finally, the third and fourth requirements, respectively, are that a project may not have the effect of subsidizing either the expenses of a telecommunications service provider or the monthly bills of customers.

### **Opposition Comments**

On January 14, 2021, 12 entities submitted comments in opposition to 17 of the 124 proposed projects.<sup>4</sup> On January 21, 2021, the Commission received 14 comments in response to the objections. On February 17, 2021, the Commission received one additional opposition comment objecting to 42 grant applications that overlap an RDOF service area. On February 22, 2022, the Commission received 17 comments in response to the RDOF-related objection.

Commission staff reviewed the comments to determine whether they addressed one or

---

<sup>3</sup> Inquiry Concerning Deployment of Advanced Telecommunications Capability to All Americans in a Reasonable and Timely Fashion, GN Docket No. 20-269, FCC 21-18, Para. 12 (FCC January 19, 2021).

<sup>4</sup> The objections of Bug Tussel Wireless to the applications of US Cellular Iowa County and La Crosse County projects, the objection of the Town of St. Germain, the objection of Bertram Communications, and the response of CTC Telcom, Inc. were all filed after the respective filing deadlines and are not part of this record.



more of the statutory eligibility requirements discussed above. None of the opposition comments asserted that an application in this proceeding was ineligible. In its own review of the grant applications, staff did not find any ineligible applications.

The Superior Connections Bad River fiber project (# 98) is eligible to receive a grant award. Superior Connections is an organization operated for profit or not for profit, and is not owned by any political subdivision of the state. This classification is consistent with the action the Commission previously took with the FY 2015 grant application of the Forest County Potawatomi Community.

Thus, all 124 applications are eligible to receive a broadband grant.

Opposition comments that did not address the eligibility of a specific grant application were reviewed as part of the merit evaluation process. The merit ranking presented in Attachment 1 has taken those opposition comments and corresponding reply comments into account.

Commission staff would bring three opposition comments to the attention of the Commission that may impact the Commission's decision in this proceeding.

1. Reedsburg Utility Commission objection to the application of WIconnect.

Reedsburg Utility Commission comments that its application to serve locations north of Highway 14 in the Bear Valley region of Richland County overlaps a similar proposal from WIconnect. The issue of overlapping projects is discussed in the merit evaluation below.

2. Bevcomm objection to Pierce Pepin Cooperative Service (PPCS) Trimbelle project.

Bevcomm objects that PPCS is proposing to serve locations that Bevcomm already serves with a comparable fiber to the premises facility. PPCS responded to the

Bevcomm objection by agreeing to modify its project. That modification is discussed in the merit evaluation below.

3. Village of Luxemburg. The Village objects to the Spectrum application because the project would not extend service to all locations within the Village. About 100 locations within the Village would not have access to the Spectrum service. This objection has been taken into account in the merit evaluation below.

## **2. Merit Evaluation of the Grant Applications.**

Wisconsin Stat. § 196.504 gives the Commission authority to establish criteria for evaluating grant applications. The statute requires that the criteria adopted by the Commission give priority to applications that include any of seven factors:

- Matching funds
- Public-private partnerships
- No existing broadband service
- Scalability
- Promotes economic development
- Size of the underserved population served
- Affect that a grant project may have upon the broadband service availability in adjacent service areas

The Commission issued application instructions at the beginning of the application period that informed prospective applicants that the seven priority factors will be the central piece of the Commission's review and decision regarding which applications should be funded.

Attachment 1 lists the 124 grant applications in order of merit as assessed by the screening panel. For purposes of ranking the applications in Attachment 1, the screening panel gave additional weight to applications that proposed to serve unserved areas and that offered a better value or impact for the grant dollars requested. Other specific departures from this

weighting scheme are discussed below.

In its review, the Commission is not required to give the priority factors equal weight. The Commission may select from among the priority factors and other information provided in the applications and public comments to decide which applications should be funded.

A. Matching Funds.

The first factor that is given priority consideration is the amount of matching funds contributed or pledged by the project partners.

Comparing the significance of matching funds from one application to the next can be difficult. On one hand, the willingness of a local government to contribute a sizable amount of matching funds in the form of cash is perhaps the best measure of the local government's commitment to acquiring adequate broadband service in the community. On the other hand, some applications propose in-kind contributions that include salary expense for individuals whose salary would have been paid in any event, or equipment expense for items that have already been purchased and would have been used for a variety of construction projects regardless of the proposed grant project. Commission staff does not believe that in-kind contributions can be disregarded altogether. In some instances, a cash and in-kind contribution indicates a company or corporate decision to commit its own funds to advance a promising project. The company may be willing to forego possible earnings in the near term in order to secure better earnings down the road, or to achieve other non-monetary goals such as expanding internet access in a particular community.

In its evaluation, the screening panel counted all the matching funds proposals in the same manner and did not give greater weight to cash contributions. In addition to the total amount of matching funds committed, the screening panel also considered the variety of

sources of matching funds. The amount of the match contribution for each application is listed by dollar amount in Attachment 1. In its consideration, the Commission may give greater weight to applications where the project partners have pledged to contribute a significant portion of the cash needed to pay for the proposed project construction.

**B. Public-Private Partnerships.**

In this grant cycle, 91 of the 124 applications propose a public-private partnership. Most of these partnerships demonstrate a level of participation beyond just an expression of support for the grant proposal. In some instances, the broadband service provider is the principal partner. In other instances, it is the local government or an Economic Development Corporation that organized the application and has advocated for approval of a project.

The following applications are noteworthy because the local government has offered to contribute a significant amount in matching funds:

- (# 2) 24-7 Telcom, Inc. Town of Drammen project  
Town of Drammen offers \$363,500 (26 % of total project cost)
- (# 11) Bayfield Wireless project  
Bayfield County and 3 towns offer \$111,000 (14% of total project cost)
- (# 15) Bug Tussel Wireless Towns of Castle Rock and Beetown project  
Grant County and 2 towns offers \$92,488 (15% of total project cost)
- (# 16) Bug Tussel Florence County project  
Florence County and 7 towns offer \$185,298 (20% of total project cost)
- (# 25) Bug Tussel Wireless Wood County project  
Wood County offers \$563,415 (20% of total project cost)
- (# 26) Bug Tussel Wireless Southwest Wood County project  
Wood County and 7 towns offer \$387,888 (19% of total project cost)
- (# 33) CenturyLink Boulder Junction project  
Town of Boulder Junction offers \$2,333,718 (47% of total project cost)

- (# 36) ChoiceTel St. Germain phase II project  
Town of St. Germain offers \$598,925 (50% of total project cost)
- (# 40) Dodge County Fixed wireless phase II project  
Dodge County offers \$200,000 (14% of total project cost)
- (# 47) Hilbert Communications Kewaunee County fiber route  
Kewaunee County offers \$2,203,986 in loans (55% of total project cost)
- (# 64) Somerset Telephone Co. Star Prairie project  
Town of Star Prairie offers \$30,000 (9% of total project cost)
- (# 65) Northwoods Connect Marathon County fixed wireless project  
Marathon County offers \$150,000 (25% of total project cost)
- (# 72) Oneida County EDC Minocqua fixed wireless project  
Town of Minocqua offers \$22,500 (10% of total project cost)
- (# 89) Spectrum Mid-America Town of Holland project  
Town of Holland offers \$45,000 (23% of total project cost)
- (# 92) Spectrum Mid-America Village of Rochcester project  
Village of Rochcester offers \$20,760 (4% of total project cost)
- (# 99) Taylor County fixed wireless project  
Taylor County offers \$351,055 (31% of total project cost)
- (# 107) Thrive EDC Jefferson County fixed wireless phase II project  
Jefferson County offers \$250,000 (14% of total project cost)
- (# 108) Town of Liberty Grove fixed wireless phase II project  
Town of Liberty Grove offers \$75,000 (25% of total project cost)
- (# 109) Tri-County Communications Coop Drammen East project  
Town of Drammen offers \$236,500 (16% of total project cost)
- (# 124) Wittenberg Telephone Marathon County phase I project  
Marathon County offers \$72,275 (20% of total project cost)

This level of public investment continues a trend evident in recent broadband grant cycles. Some local governments are willing to invest significant amounts of public funds to prompt providers to build out broadband service in their community.

C. No Existing Broadband Service.

In this grant cycle, 72 of the 124 applications claimed the proposed project would serve areas without an existing internet service meeting the 5 Mbps / 600 Kbps service standard, in whole or in part. Together, the 72 applications propose to serve 39,525 unserved locations, or 29.1% of the total locations grant applicants offered to serve in this grant cycle. The application instructions in this grant cycle included a new requirement that applicants identify the number of unserved locations in their proposed project. In Attachment 1, the panel recommended funding 30 of the 72 applications in the initial group. The recommended projects may reach 25,195 unserved locations as reported on the applications. In the additional group that the panel has recommended, five of 12 applications would extend service to unserved locations. The five recommended projects may reach an additional 510 unserved locations.

The screening panel did not recommend some projects containing some unserved locations, primarily due to the panel's assessment of unserved estimates and probable subscribership based on the experience of past projects. The panel recommended fixed wireless in counties where the pace of fiber deployment is slower and where the county provided vigorous support for a fixed wireless project. These results are based on the panel's assessment of the likely number of unserved individuals and areas that would be served by the proposed project. Fixed wireless proposals tended to count the largest possible population that could be served by an antenna assuming the tower and antenna are actually built in the preferred location proposed in the application. This tends to greatly overstate the actual service subscription rates. The wireline project applications also overestimate the number of locations that the project will actually serve once it is built. However, these estimates are usually closer to the actual service subscription rates results on average.

In this grant round, Bug Tussel Wireless and Spectrum Mid-America submitted estimates of the number of unserved locations for some grant proposals. The screening panel found that the estimates of these two providers were difficult to follow or lacked sufficient supporting information to verify. This means it is difficult to compare grant applications on the basis of service to unserved areas.

The screening panel did use the estimates of unserved locations in its ranking. The panel adjusted the merit ranking of specific projects where it found the estimate to be problematic.

Staff proposes to address this problem in the application instructions for the next grant round. Staff envisions providing specific guidance on how to calculate the estimate of unserved locations in range of a given proposal. Staff would also provide a list of additional information that should be provided to buttress an estimate that is not reflected on the broadband map grant eligibility layer.

D. Scalability.

This priority factor is intended to consider the longer-term growth potential of the project facility once construction of the proposed project is complete. However, over time the Commission and other observers of broadband expansion have learned that growth happens in a variety of ways. Projects that utilize fiber are often built with a substantial amount of spare capacity because it costs significantly less to install that spare capacity in the initial build out than at a later point in time. Projects that utilize other technologies may not need spare capacity because spare capacity can be added at a later point in time without facing the same cost increases. Thus, while this factor favors fiber routes and fiber to the premises projects, the panel gave nearly all grant applications some credit for scalability in its evaluation.

E. Economic Development.

Economic development comes in a variety of forms. It is not often clear whether one application is superior to another in this respect. For example, some applicants in northern counties have stressed that excellent broadband service allows seasonal residents to spend more time in their summer homes, benefitting the local economy (retail, restaurants, etc.). Other applications have cited studies about the relationship between broadband access and home values. All applications are required to include the number of businesses that will be served by the project. In total the 124 applications propose providing or improving internet service to 8,811 business locations. The recommended projects reach 4,111 business locations as reported on the applications. In the additional group the panel has recommended possibly funding above the initial \$24 million, the projects would reach an additional 297 businesses. In this grant round, the panel gave at least partial credit to every application that discussed a specific business-related goal. The following applications are noteworthy because of significant contribution of two industry groups made to the projects:

1. Electric Cooperatives.

- Pierce Pepin Cooperative Services applied for three grants to build out fiber service in Pierce County (# 73, 74, 75).
- Chippewa Valley Electric Cooperative is a partner in four applications to build out fiber service in Chippewa, Rusk and Taylor Counties (# 68, 69, 70, 71).
- Washington Island Electric Cooperative is a partner in an application to build out fiber service on Washington Island (# 67).
- Adams Columbia Electric Cooperative is contributing matching funds to a fiber project in Waushara County (# 52).
- Eau Claire Energy Cooperative is contributing matching funds to three applications to build out fiber service in Eau Claire County (# 1, 2, 109).

2. Marshfield Clinic. Marshfield Clinic continues its practice of contributing

\$15,000 each to broadband projects in its service area. Marshfield Clinic is building a



telehealth facility in its Marshfield campus to connect with satellite clinics and patients by broadband connection. The projects that Marshfield Clinic would contribute to are:

- CenturyLink Town of Boulder Junction phase II fiber project. (# 33).
- Dodge County phase II fixed wireless project (# 40).
- Bug Tussel Wireless Wood County fixed wireless project (# 25).
- Bug Tussel Wireless Southwest Wood County fixed wireless project (# 26).

F. Project Impact/Size of Underserved Population Served.

The screening panel compared the applications based on grant dollars expended per locations served by the project as well as the proposed speed of service. A new requirement for this grant cycle application required applicants to list minimum and maximum speeds available for purchase by consumers. The screening panel considered the number of facilities with access, the performance of the internet service and the anticipated adoption rates. This type of evaluation identifies proposals that are a good value for the grant dollars requested, while also taking into consideration speed of service and planned subscription rates.

G. Affect a Grant Project may have upon the Broadband Service Availability in Adjacent Service Areas.

The statute gives priority credit to applications that assert that the subject project would not have an adverse impact on the broadband service in an adjacent area. The panel did not find any applications that posed an inappropriate potential for adverse impact on the broadband service availability in an adjacent service area.

H. Other Factors.

The statute permits the Commission to apply additional criteria in the evaluation of grant applications. In the section below, the screening panel discusses additional information suggested either by the applicants, commenting parties, or by the grant decisions of the Commission in prior cycles.

## 1. Prior Applications.

In the past, the Commission has on occasion taken notice that an applicant has resubmitted an application that the Commission denied in a previous grant cycle, typically due to lack of available funding. In a situation where all other factors are roughly equal, the Commission has given a slight preference to repeat applications. In this current grant cycle, there are 14 repeat applications.

- (# 23) Bug Tussel Wireless Rock County West fixed wireless project.
- (# 56) Midcontinent Ellsworth cable project.
- (# 60) Mount Horeb Tel Co Town of Blue Mounds fiber project
- (# 61) Mount Horeb Tel Co Town of Perry fiber project
- (# 62) Mount Horeb Tel Co Town of Springdale fiber project
- (# 28) Brown County C-LEC, LLC d/b/a Nsight Telservices Washington Island phase II fiber project.
- (# 84) Siren Tel Co Sand Lake fiber project.
- (# 95) Starwire Technologies Spencer Lake and Indian Creek fiber project.
- (# 96) Starwire Technologies Old Highway 35 fiber project.
- (# 97) Starwire Technologies West Sweden fiber project.
- (# 100) Badger Telecom, LLC d/b/a TDS Telecom Chili telephone exchange DSL project.
- (# 102) Central State Tel Co, LLC d/b/a TDS Telecom Necedah telephone exchange DSL project.
- (# 105) Scandinavia Telephone Company d/b/a TDS Telecom Scandinavia telephone exchange DSL project.
- (# 112) UpNetWI, LLC Town of Bristol fiber project.

The panel recommended six of the 14 projects for a grant award.

## 2. Multiple Applications.

In prior grant cycles, the Commission has taken notice that some broadband providers have submitted more than one application. The Commission has on occasion limited the number of grant awards a single provider has received in a single grant cycle. The Commission has chosen to spread awards amongst the proposed projects which may lead to a more equitable result.

In composing its merit list, the screening panel did keep track of the number of applications recommended for each multiple applicant. The panel’s merit list recommendation with respect to multiple applicants is as follows:

24-7 Telcom, Inc.	5 out of 6
Amery Telcom, Inc./Somerset Tel. Co.	1 out of 2
Bevcomm	2 out of 2
Bug Tussel Wireless/Hilbert Communications	6 out of 13
CCI Systems, Inc. dba Astrea	2 out of 6
CenturyLink	1 out of 3
Chibardun Telephone Cooperative, Inc.	3 out of 3
Clear Lake Tel. Co.	1 out of 2
e-vergent.com, LLC	0 out of 2
LaValle Telephone Cooperative, Richland-Grant Telephone Cooperative, Inc., Tech Com, Inc.	3 out of 4
Marquette-Adams Telephone Cooperative, Inc.	3 out of 4
Mount Horeb Telephone Company	0 out of 3
Nsight Telservices	1 out of 2
Ntera, LLC	2 out of 4
Pierce Pepin Cooperative Services	2 out of 3
Reedsburg Utility Commission	4 out of 4
Siren Telephone Co.	2 out of 2
Spectrum Mid-America, LLC	1 out of 6
Starwire Technologies	3 out of 4
TDS Telecom	0 out of 6
Tri-County Communications Coop	2 out of 2
UpnetWI, LLC	2 out of 3
Vernon Communications Cooperative	2 out of 2

### 3. Overlapping Project Areas.

In this grant round there are several sets of proposals that overlap the same project area. Some of this overlap is related to the edges of fixed wireless projects, other overlap is substantial and is discussed below. In prior broadband grant cycles in which there has been overlap, where this has occurred, the Commission has taken the view that only one grant applicant should receive funds for a project area. The Commission is free to fund multiple grant proposals in an area, but the screening panel followed the Commission’s prior practice in

formulating its merit list. The discussion below explains the choices the screening panel made.

a. Whitewater Lake in Walworth County.

The Whitewater Wideband LLC d/b/a Edge Broadband Whitewater Lake project (# 42) proposes to build a fiber to the premises service past 52 businesses and 1,015 residential locations near Whitewater Lake southeast of the City of Whitewater. The Spectrum Mid-America, LLC Town of Whitewater project (#93) also proposes to build a Fiber to the Premises service past seven business and 825 residential locations near Whitewater Lake.

The two projects differ. The larger Edge Broadband project includes the homes in the Spectrum project area. It also includes homes northwest of the lake between the Whitewater Lake and the City of Whitewater. Both projects provide internet access over a fiber-optic connection. The transmission speeds are comparable, up to 1 Gbps for both services. The grant request for the Edge Broadband is smaller, \$537,093, compared to \$1,000,000 for the Spectrum project. The Edge Broadband project will extend service to 273 unserved locations. The Spectrum project reports that it will extend service to 932 locations, although the manner in which Spectrum has calculated its unserved locations in all of its grant applications is difficult to follow and was adjusted by the screening panel in the review of the projects.

The panel recommended the Edge Broadband proposal because the Edge project area is larger, the Edge project provides a better value (at \$503 per location served compared to \$1,202 per location for the Charter proposal), and the Edge Broadband will reach more unserved locations.

b. Bear Valley/Highway 130.

The Reedsburg Utility Commission (RUC) d/b/a LightSpeed Highway 130 and Bear

Valley fiber project (# 77) proposes to build a fiber to the premises service past 10 businesses and 123 residential locations adjacent to Highway 130 north of the Village of Lone Rock in Richland County. The RUC project will connect to a fiber project, approved in the FY 2020 grant round, that will build along County Road JJ between County Road G and Highway 130. The WI Connect Wireless LLC Bear Valley project (#122) proposes to build a fiber to the premises service past 66 business and 366 residential locations along Highway 130 from the Village of Lone Rock to Highway 154, along County Road JJ from County Road G west to Highway 14 near Gotham, and other adjacent rural roads in the area. The US Cellular Corporation Iowa County project (#115) proposes to upgrade three wireless towers in Iowa County to provide a fixed wireless service in portions of Iowa, Sauk and Richland Counties.

The FY 2020 RUC River Valley Phase II fiber project (already approved in FY 2020) proposes to build fiber to the premises service past 15 business and 290 residential locations from the Town of Spring Green, west of the City of Spring Green, to County Line Drive just east of Lone Rock. The FY 2021 RUC proposal would extend the FY 2020 project north from Lone Rock. The two projects together will build past 438 locations. WICconnect proposes to build past 432 locations. Nearly all of the WICconnect locations are also in the project areas of either the RUC FY 2020 or 2021 projects. The transmission speeds are comparable, up to 1 Gbps for both services. The grant request for the RUC FY 2021 proposal is \$327,000, or \$2,459 per location passed. The grant award to RUC for the FY 2020 project was \$542,500. This compares to \$370,000 for the WICconnect proposal, or \$856 per location.

The US Cellular (USCC) fixed wireless project is quite different from the two fiber projects described above. Where the UCCC fixed wireless overlaps fiber service, the speed

the USCC service offers (25 Mbps down) is substantially less than the fiber projects. However, the USCC service, particularly the 5G mobile service, offers a degree of convenience and flexibility that the fiber projects will not have. It is conceivable that some residents would subscribe to both the USCC and fiber services in order to obtain the advantages of each service.

The panel recommended the RUC Bear Valley project. While WIconnect offers a project at a substantially better cost per location, the FY 2020 grant award to RUC is executed and is not open for reconsideration. RUC has already started the FY 2020 project and plans to finish by October 2022. [PSC REF#: 399042](#). The fiber facility that the two providers would install are roughly comparable in quality. The panel concluded there was not adequate reason to overbuild a project that is already partially funded and for which construction has already begun.

c. Town of Trimbelle in Pierce County.

The Pierce Pepin Cooperative Services (PPCS) Trimbelle project (#75) proposed to build fiber to the premises service past 18 business and 294 residential locations in the Towns of Oak Grove, Trenton and Trimbelle, all in Pierce County. Hager Telecom d/b/a Bevcomm objected that the proposed PPCS project would overlap locations that already have Fiber to the Premises service funded in part by the Hager City Telecom Diamond Bluff fiber projects (Phases II and III). [PSC REF#: 402693](#). Bevcomm also submitted a grant request in the current round to build a fiber project in the Towns of Hartland and Trenton, also in Pierce County. The current Bevcomm proposed project does not overlap the PPCS proposal.

In response to the Bevcomm objection, PPCS proposed to reduce the scope of its project to avoid the overlap with the Bevcomm Hager City service area. [PSC REF#: 403154](#).

The panel recommended the PPCS Trimbelle project as revised. The merit list in Attachment 1 reflects the revised PPCS project.

d. Highway 65 between Ellsworth and River Falls.

The Baldwin Telecom, Inc. d/b/a Baldwin Lightstream Town of Warren fiber project (#10) proposes to build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 19 business and 243 residences in three discrete project areas: along Highway E in the Town of Warren in St Croix County, along Highway 65 between Ellsworth and River Falls in Pierce County, and along Highway N between Baldwin and Roberts in St Croix County. The overlap issue discussed here concerns the route between Ellsworth and River Falls.

A map in the Baldwin application indicates there 75 locations to be passed by the fiber route. The PPCS Beldenville fiber project (#73) proposes to build fiber to the premises service past 13 business and 229 residential locations in the Town of River Falls in Pierce County, therefore both projects propose fiber to the premises service. The transmission speeds are comparable, up to 1 Gbps for both services. The Baldwin grant request is \$872,746 for all three project areas, or \$3,331 per location passed. The grant request for PPCS is \$473,273, or \$1,956 per location. PPCS proposes to build a combination of aerial and buried fiber deployment while Baldwin would bury its fiber.

The panel recommended the PPCS Beldenville project. While the project areas are dissimilar, the PPCS offers greater coverage in the Beldenville area. The PPCS proposal also offers a better cost per location.

e. Town of West Sweden East of Spirit Lake.

The Farmers Independent Telephone Company d/b/a Grantsburg Telcom Spirit Lake Phase II fiber project (#46) proposes to build fiber to the premises service past two business

and 203 residential locations east of Spirit Lake in the Towns of Daniels and Trade Lake in Burnett County and the Town of West Sweden in Polk County. The Starwire Technologies West Sweden fiber project (#97) proposes to build fiber to the premises service past nine business and 79 residential locations in the Towns of Clam Falls and West Sweden in Polk County.

The Grantsburg Spirit Lake project proposes to build fiber service to 205 locations (four unserved locations) from its FY 2020 CARES project adjacent to Spirit Lake. The Starwire West Sweden project will build fiber service past 88 locations (66 unserved locations) from its FY 2019 Town of Clam Falls and FY 2020 Cares projects. The technology choice and transmission speeds for the two projects are comparable, fiber to the premises service with up to 1 Gbps for both services. The grant request for the Grantsburg proposal is \$552,497, or \$2,695 per location passed. The grant request for the Starwire proposal is \$297,950, or \$3,505 per location.

The panel recommended the Starwire West Sweden project, though the panel thought both were strong proposals. Starwire proposed to reach more unserved locations. The panel also found the lower grant request of the Starwire proposal better fit the funds available given the other applications in this grant cycle.

#### 4. Project Areas that Overlap RDOF Project Areas.

In its comments of February 17, 2021 [PSC REF#: 405056](#), Spectrum Mid-America, LLC (Spectrum) objected to 42 grant applications in this grant cycle because they overlap areas for which Spectrum has been awarded RDOF support. Spectrum states it has committed to offer Charter's 1 Gbps connections to locations in the census blocks that it has been assigned. Spectrum intends to complete this construction over a six year period ending in



2027. Spectrum argues that the state would be better served by using its grant funds in other areas that have not received RDOF support.

The Commission received 17 responses to Spectrum's objection filing, replying to Spectrum's arguments related to a variety of projects.

The Commission is not restricted by either state statute or federal rule from awarding grant funds to projects that overlap RDOF areas. This is similar to the situation the Commission encountered with the Connect America Fund CAF II and A-CAM programs. In prior grant cycles, the Commission has approved several grant projects that overlapped CAF II and A-CAM areas. The Commission did so with care, approving projects that offered superior broadband service to the service available through the federal programs. In a few instances, the Commission approved grant awards to the CAF II and A-CAM recipients, finding that doubling up state and federal funds would result in quicker deployment of the service and in some cases, fiber to the premises service instead of DSL.

The Commission may follow the approaches taken in previous dockets with respect to RDOF funded areas. The Commission may wish to consider whether it wants to fund proposals where RDOF funds were awarded. Based on past experiences with the other federal broadband program, staff indicates there has been varying degrees of success in the outcomes related to the completion, reliability, and quality of the resulting service. Another consideration is the six year project timelines of the RDOF awards as compared to the two year project timeline for state funded projects.

a. Overlap with Spectrum Areas.

Spectrum has been awarded over \$168 million in federal funds to extend 1 Gbps service in a large number of census blocks throughout the state. This is part of a larger award

of funds to providers for construction projects in Wisconsin. See Attachment 4 [DL: 1786627](#). Staff believes it may be difficult to spend out the Wisconsin funds appropriated for broadband grants based on the statutorily required project merits that if the Commission avoids all of the RDOF award areas in approving broadband grants. Commission staff analysis shows 94 of the 124 proposed grant projects have at least partial overlap with RDOF locations. Another consideration is that several of the projects to which Spectrum objects are already funded in part by the Broadband Expansion Grant program. The projects under consideration now are extensions or later phases of earlier projects that are underway or completed.

As with the prior federal programs, Spectrum is not asked to make any commitment to individuals or communities. Spectrum is obligated to meet the milestone objectives set forth in 47 CFR § 54.802. The timing or schedule of service improvements within that framework is under Spectrum's discretion but also depends on the build milestone requirements. For example, two carriers that were awarded support for locations in CAFII have notified the FCC and the Commission that they did not meet their build milestones in Wisconsin for two consecutive years.<sup>5</sup> Both carriers automatically received a one-year extensions and opted to receive additional funding to complete a 10/1 Mbps build out to locations in Wisconsin by December 31, 2021. This 10/1 Mbps build out is significantly lower than the current broadband standard of 25/3 service.

In order to receive RDOF funding, a provider must be designated an eligible telecommunications carrier (ETC) by the Commission. Spectrum has requested ETC designation for the RDOF census blocks in docket 5-TI-2827. As part of an ETC designation

---

<sup>5</sup> CenturyLink Not Meeting CAF II deployment milestones 2020: [PSC REF#: 382740](#) 2021 [PSC REF#: 403295](#)  
Frontier Not Meeting CAF II deployment milestones Letter 2020: [PSC REF#: 382566](#) 2021 [PSC REF#: 403064](#)

application, a provider is generally required, pursuant to Wis. Admin. Code § PSC 160.13 to submit a 5-year plan. Spectrum, as part of its application to the Commission for ETC status, requested a waiver from the requirement. If the Commission approves the Spectrum ETC designation request in docket 5-TI-2827, the Commission may consider requiring additional information regarding the timing of the replacement project and when Spectrum will offer service to businesses and residents based on the RDOF milestone requirements.

b. Overlap between RDOF recipients and State Grant Projects.

As noted above, in some proceedings, the Commission has awarded grants to projects that were also receiving support from the federal programs. However, these previous decisions were related to the CAF II and A-CAM programs and not the RDOF program. This has included projects submitted by Amery Telcom, Mount Horeb Telephone Company, and TDS Telecom. The Commission did so in instances where it was clear that it could obtain a benefit for the residents in a project area. With the additional state funds, Amery Telcom is building Fiber to the Premises service instead of the DSL service contemplated by the federal program. Amery hopes to complete construction in 2022, well ahead of the deadline of 2026 for the federal program. Similarly, Mt. Horeb completed Fiber to the Premises service to the farms and other rural locations in the Town of Brigham in Iowa County. TDS Telecom has been able to accelerate its deployment of improved broadband service in Dane, Green and Grant Counties, and is working on similar improvements in Marathon and Taylor Counties.

In this current grant round, there is a partial overlap of state projects with federal RDOF awards to Marquette Adams Telephone Cooperative, Reedsburg Utility Commission, Tech Com Inc., Richland Grant Telephone Company and Somerset Telephone Company.

The Commission may provide grant funds to projects that are also eligible for federal support under RDOF. The Commission may want to consider whether it is a prudent use of state grant funds under the circumstances. The benefit the Commission may obtain in approving the grant awards is that the award can accelerate completion of the project. The RDOF program will complete all construction six years after final approval of the awards, in 2026 or 2027. Staff will propose grant agreements for the FY 2021 grant cycle that expire at the end of October 2023. The Commission may find that this improvement in the schedule for the grant projects is sufficient to warrant a state broadband grant in addition to the support the providers may otherwise be eligible for under the federal program.

### **3. Decision Options in Funding the Grant Applications.**

As noted above, the actual available balance in the broadband grant account is \$28,431,738. In Attachment 1, the screening panel created a merit list to recommend 46 projects that would spend out the \$24.0 million originally announced as available for this grant round. The panel also recommended an additional 12 projects in the event that the Commission elects to spend the remaining balance in the broadband grant account.

The decision to spend out the full amount of the appropriation for broadband grants is a matter within the discretion of the Commission.

Staff offers two comments with regard to the merit list presented in Attachment 1. First, the screening panel decided to recommend funding the grant application submitted by Superior Connections. It is an expensive grant project, with low match and in some respects did not score well compared to other projects. The panel recommends this project ahead of others because it extends fiber service to 343 locations in the Bad River Tribal Reservation including a number of community anchor institutions in great need of better service. Staff

believes this will always be an expensive area to serve. The panel recommends this project because this may be the appropriate grant round to begin this build out, as this proposal is part of a multi-year, multi-million dollar project and the Commission may have the ability and interest in considering this project competitive due to the level of funding proposed for near-future grant rounds. The panel positioned this project as last in part due to score but also because there would be a need to reduce the funding of an award by \$11,335 and this amount would reduce this award by less than 1%, an amount that seems likely to have a small impact on the overall project.

Second, with the exception of the last award the screening panel did not recommend any partial awards. Partial awards have proved to be complex and administratively burdensome. The furthest edges of a project are most likely to be the unserved locations, when a project award is reduced it may result in fewer unserved locations getting service. This may result in the actual project being built as a less desirable project than an unfunded project on the merit list. Most applicants have taken care to scope a project that meets the grant eligibility requirements and puts forth the maximum amount of match. Many applicants have already completed the pre-engineering work for their proposed project. Partial awards may be an opportunity to spread limited resources or increase the number of projects that the Commission funds, but partial awards often add unnecessary complexity, increase engineering costs and reduce service to unserved locations.

## Commission Alternatives - Awards

**Alternative One:** The Commission reviewed the applications for broadband expansion grants and awarded a FY 2021 Broadband Expansion Grant to each named applicant in the amount indicated on the attached list.

**Alternative Two:** The Commission reviewed the applications for broadband expansion grants and remanded the matter back to Commission staff for additional investigation.

KN:TP:AK:DK:kle DL: 01785342

Attachment 1: A table listing the 124 grant applications in descending order of merit. [DL: 1786626](#).

Attachment 2: A map illustrating the location of the 124 grant applications by technology. [DL: 1782417](#).

Attachment 3: A map illustrating the location of the grant applications recommended by the screening panel. [DL: 1786628](#).

Attachment 4: A table listing the degree of overlap between the 124 grant applications and the recent federal RDOF auction. [DL: 1786627](#).

#	Applicant Project Name	Description	Grant Amount Requested	Match Amount Pledged
36	<b>ChoiceTel LLC</b> Town of St. Germain Phase II fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 185 business and 2,000 residential locations in the Town of St. Germain in Vilas County. This project extends the FY 2019 ChoiceTel St Germain build out to about 90% of the locations in the township.	\$ 598,925	\$ 598,925
67	<b>Brown County C-LEC, LLC d/b/a Nsight Telservices</b> Washington Island Phase II fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 73 business and 143 residential locations on Washington Island in Door County. This project builds on the FY 2019 Nsight Washington Island fiber route connecting Gills Rock, Plum Island and Washington Island.	\$ 297,603	\$ 446,404
79	<b>Reedsburg Utility Commission d/b/a LightSpeed</b> Town of Lyndon fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 2 business and 27 residential locations along County Road HH in the Town of Lyndon in southern Juneau County.	\$ 40,000	\$ 65,350
124	<b>Wittenberg Telephone Company, Inc. d/b/a Wittenberg Wireless LLC</b> Marathon County Phase I fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 3 business and 85 residences along County Road Y south of City of Hatley, west along Townline Road, and south along County Road Q, in the Towns of Reid and Ringle, in Marathon County.	\$ 172,872	\$ 187,275
16	<b>Bug Tussel Wireless</b> Florence County fixed wireless project	This project will build one new wireless tower and upgrade the fixed wireless service on 6 existing towers in seven sites within Florence County. Five sites will use a Cambrium product providing a maximum 100 Mbps down, and 2 sites will use a MIMO LTE product also offering a maximum 100 Mbps down. The project will potentially reach 71 business and 3,377 residential locations.	\$ 227,248	\$ 681,743

Attachment 1

26	<p><b>Bug Tussel Wireless</b> Wood County - Southwest (Pittsville SD) fixed wireless project</p>	<p>This project will build six new wireless towers and upgrade the fixed wireless service on one existing tower, located in Jackson and Wood Counties. The seven sites will use a MIMO LTE product providing a maximum speed of 100 Mbps down. The project will potentially reach 1,293 business and 23,654 residential locations.</p>	\$ 499,233	\$ 1,497,702
64	<p><b>Somerset Telephone Company, Inc. d/b/a Northwest Communications</b> Town of Star Prairie fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 6 business and 470 residential locations west and south of Cedar Lake in the Town of Alden in Polk County and the Town of Star Prairie in St. Croix County.</p>	\$ 168,000	\$ 168,000
18	<p><b>Bug Tussel Wireless</b> Iron County fixed wireless project</p>	<p>This project will build one new wireless tower and upgrade the fixed wireless service on 8 existing towers within Iron County. The nine sites will use a MIMO LTE product offering a maximum 100 Mbps down. The project will potentially reach 175 business and 6,131 residential locations.</p>	\$ 511,627	\$ 625,322
25	<p><b>Bug Tussel Wireless</b> Wood County fixed wireless project</p>	<p>This project will build eight new wireless towers and upgrade the fixed wireless service on three existing towers, located in Wood County. Nine sites will use a MIMO LTE product providing a maximum 100 Mbps down, and two sites will use a Cambrium product, also providing a maximum speed of 100 Mbps down. The project will potentially reach 1,742 business and 34,884 residential locations.</p>	\$ 492,988	\$ 2,168,587
94	<p><b>Starwire Technologies</b> Town of Clam Falls - North Phase III fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 8 business and 94 residential locations in the Town of Clam Falls in Polk County. This project completes the fiber build out in Clam Falls begun with the FY 2019 and FY 2020 CARES projects.</p>	\$ 282,294	\$ 432,442



42	<b>Whitewater Wideband LLC d/b/a Edge Broadband</b> Whitewater Lake fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 52 business and 1,015 residential locations near Whitewater Lake, in the Towns of Richmond and Whitewater in Walworth County. This project builds on the FY 2020 Edge Broadband Lake Lorraine fiber project. <b>Note: This project overlaps (# 93) Spectrum Town of Whitewater.</b>	\$	537,093	\$	537,093
120	<b>Vernon Communications Cooperative</b> Vernon County Phase V fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 17 business and 127 residences in the Towns of Freeman, Franklin, Jefferson and Viroqua, in Vernon County.	\$	395,415	\$	483,285
119	<b>Vernon Communications Cooperative</b> Crawford County fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 8 business and 130 residences in the Village of Ferryville in Crawford County. This project would replace the DSL facilities constructed with the FY 2015 CenturyLink Ferryville project.	\$	172,900	\$	179,950
37	<b>Clear Lake Telephone Company</b> Clear Lake telephone exchange fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 17 business and 405 residential locations in the Towns of Blackbrook and Clear Lake in Barron County, and in the Town of Forest in St. Croix County. This project builds on the FY 2020 Clear Lake Telephone Company within the Village of Clear Lake.	\$	400,000	\$	1,296,021
1	<b>24-7 Telcom, Inc.</b> Town of Brunswick fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 3 business and 31 residences along County Trunk Hwy Z and State Highway 37 in the Town of Brunswick in Eau Claire County. This project area is about 1 mile east of the FY 2018-2 Caryville project and about 1 mile north of the proposed Drammen West project.	\$	105,725	\$	105,725
12	<b>Hager Telecom d/b/a Bevcomm</b> Towns of Hartland and Trenton fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 13 business and 155 residences in the Towns of Hartland and Trenton in Pierce County. This project area is immediately east of the FY 2020 Bevcomm Hager City grant project.	\$	307,686	\$	571,416

52	<p><b>Marquette-Adams Telephone Cooperative, Inc.</b> Towns of Dakota and Wautoma fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 11 business and 109 residential locations in the Towns of Dakota and Wautoma in Waushara County. This project will also provide the local electric utility, Adams-Columbia Electric Cooperative, with broadband connections to electric substations in the project area.</p>	\$ 162,543	\$ 345,404
59	<p><b>Chibardun Telephone Cooperative, Inc. dba Mosaic Technologies</b> Towns of Sand Creek and Otter Creek fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 23 business and 615 residential locations in the Towns of Sand Creek, Otter Creek, and Grant in Dunn County, and the Town of Sioux Creek in Barron County.</p>	\$ 960,218	\$ 4,093,559
106	<p><b>Tech Com, Inc.</b> Richland County Phase II fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 5 business and 150 residential locations northwest of Richland Center along County A from Hwy 80 to County Road Z, and from Hwy 56 to Hwy 14, in the Towns of Dayton, Marshall, Richland and Rockbridge, in Richland County. This project builds on the FY 2020 Tech Com Richland County fiber project.</p>	\$ 342,000	\$ 343,000
57	<p><b>CTC Telcom dba Mosaic Technologies</b> Town of Cedar Lake fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 78 business and 1,133 residential locations in the Towns of Cedar Lake in Barron County, in the Town of and Village of Birchwood in Washburn County, and in the Town of Edgewater in Sawyer County.</p>	\$ 1,263,791	\$ 2,948,845
110	<p><b>Tri-County Communications Cooperative, Inc.</b> Newcomb Valley fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 1 business and 49 residences in the Town of Arcadia in Trempealeau County.</p>	\$ 151,100	\$ 151,100

78	<b>Reedsburg Utility Commission d/b/a LightSpeed</b> Town of Fairfield fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 9 business and 299 residential locations in the Towns of Delton and Fairchild in northeast Sauk County.	\$	355,000	\$	758,600
97	<b>Starwire Technologies</b> West Sweden fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 9 business and 79 residential locations in the Towns of Clam Falls and West Sweden in Polk County. This project extends the FY 2019 Clam Falls and FY 2020 CARES projects west to the adjacent township of West Sweden, north of Frederic. <b>Note: This project overlaps (# 46) Grantsburg Spirit Lake project.</b>	\$	297,950	\$	446,925
58	<b>Chibardun Telephone Cooperative, Inc. dba Mosaic Technologies</b> Towns of Prairie Farm and New Haven fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 27 business and 788 residential locations in the Towns of Prairie Farm and Vance Creek, in Barron County, and Towns of New Haven and Sheridan, in Dunn County.	\$	946,819	\$	4,970,802
13	<b>Indianhead Telephone Company d/b/a Bevcomm</b> Potato Lake fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 7 business and 146 residences in the Towns of Rusk, Big Bend and Stubbs, in Rusk County. This project area is west of the FY 2018-2 Indianhead Island Lake grant project.	\$	461,929	\$	857,869
81	<b>Richland Grant Telephone Cooperative, Inc.</b> County Road Z fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 6 business and 139 residential locations along County Road Z between CTH 14 and CTH 56 in the Towns of Dayton and Marshall in Richland County.	\$	500,000	\$	750,000

68	<p><b>Ntera, LLC</b> Chippewa County fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 10 business and 90 residential locations along three routes: the Dutch Creek addition in the Towns of Anson and Goetz, the Pike Lake addition in the Towns of Arthur and Colburn, and the 260th Avenue in the Town of Birch Creek. These routes are extensions from the FY 2019 Ntera Birch Creek project, the FY 2020 Ntera Andersen &amp; Estella project, and fiber routes funded from other sources.</p>	\$ 242,138	\$ 363,206
112	<p><b>UpNetWI, LLC</b> Town of Bristol fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 11 business and 210 residences along County Highway V in the Town of Bristol in Dane County, and north along County Road N in the Town of Hampden in Columbia County.</p>	\$ 182,656	\$ 182,656
73	<p><b>Pierce Pepin Cooperative Services</b> Beldenville fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 13 business and 229 residential locations in the Town of River Falls in Pierce County. <b>Note: This project overlaps a portion of (# 10) Baldwin Town of Warren project.</b></p>	\$ 473,273	\$ 1,105,806
118	<p><b>US Internet</b> Light the Lake Phase II</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 45 business and 515 residences in the Towns of Omro, Poygan and Wahau in Winnebago County. This project extends the FY 2020 US Internet Light the Lake Phase I project.</p>	\$ 1,526,618	\$ 1,524,418
77	<p><b>Reedsburg Utility Commission d/b/a LightSpeed</b> Highway 130 and Bear Valley fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 10 business and 123 residential locations adjacent to Highway 130 in the Town of Buena Vista in southeast Richland County. <b>Note: This project overlaps (# 122) WIconnect Bear Valley and (# 115) US Cellular Iowa County projects.</b></p>	\$ 327,000	\$ 533,300

47	<b>Hilbert Communications, LLC</b> Kewaunee County fiber route	This project will build a 61.7-mile fiber route through Kewaunee County. The route will provide improved broadband support for wireless service to 1,752 business and 20,434 residential locations in Kewaunee County.	\$ 1,402,537	\$ 2,604,711
80	<b>Reedsburg Utility Commission d/b/a LightSpeed</b> River Valley Phase III fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 10 business and 166 residential locations in the Town of Spring Green in southern Sauk County. This project is an extension off of the FY 2019 and FY 2020 RUC River Valley projects.	\$ 334,300	\$ 652,000
95	<b>Starwire Technologies</b> Spencer Lake and Indian Creek fiber project	This project will build a Fiber to the Premises service past 14 business and 92 residential locations in the Town of Lorain in Polk County. This project extends the FY 2019 Clam Falls project east to the adjacent township of Lorain.	\$ 315,202	\$ 472,803
76	<b>Price County Telephone Company</b> Soo Lake fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 70 business and 1,446 residential locations in the Phillips and Soo Lake telephone rate centers, in Price and Sawyer Counties.	\$ 1,590,410	\$ 4,954,480
2	<b>24-7 Telcom, Inc.</b> Town of Drammen - West project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 6 business and 110 residences in the east central portion of the Town of Drammen in Eau Claire County. This project area is adjacent to and immediately west of the project area that the Tri-County Town of Drammen project proposes to serve.	\$ 709,700	\$ 709,700
33	<b>CenturyTel of Northern Wisconsin, LLC d/b/a CenturyLink</b> Boulder Junction Phase II fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 19 business and 585 residential locations in the Town of Boulder Junction in Vilas County.	\$ 2,225,032	\$ 2,733,808

109	<b>Tri-County Communications Cooperative, Inc.</b> Town of Drammen - East fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 6 business and 156 residences in the east portion of the Town of Drammen in Eau Claire County. This project area is adjacent to and immediately east of the project area that the 24-7 Telcom Town of Drammen project proposes to serve.	\$	739,400	\$	739,400
75	<b>Pierce Pepin Cooperative Services</b> Trimabelle fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 18 business and 294 residential locations in the Towns of Oak Grove, Trenton, and Trimabelle, in Pierce County.  <b>Note: This grant request has been revised and is dissimilar from the amount requested in the application.</b>	\$	316,189	\$	737,774
70	<b>Ntera, LLC</b> Gilman fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 14 business and 200 residential locations along Highway 64 in the Town of Aurora in Taylor County. This route is an extension off of a fiber route funded by a USDA ReConnect Grant.	\$	320,966	\$	481,449
82	<b>Richland Grant Telephone Cooperative, Inc.</b> Highway 80 Corridor Phase II fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 5 business and 220 residential locations adjacent to CTH 80 between Boaz and Richland Center, in the Towns of Dayton and Eagle in Richland County. This project is an extension off of the FY 2020 Richland-Grant Highway 80 project.	\$	690,000	\$	1,035,000
4	<b>24-7 Telcom, Inc.</b> Town of Menomonie Irvington West project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 4 business and 66 residences in the Town of Menomonie in Dunn County. This project area is just west of the FY 2018-1 24-7 Telcom Irvington project and just north of the FY 2018-2 24-7 Telcom Town of Weston project.	\$	335,160	\$	223,440
71	<b>Ntera, LLC</b> Sheldon fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 7 business and 71 residential locations along Highway 64 in the Village of Sheldon and in the Town of Marshall in Rusk County, and in the Towns of Lake Holcombe and Estella in Chippewa County.	\$	194,469	\$	291,704

14	<b>Bloomer Telephone Company</b> Town of Colfax Phase II fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 5 business and 470 residences in the Towns of Colfax and Elk Mound, in Dunn County. This project area is west and south of the FY 2020 Bloomer Tel Town of Colfax Phase I fiber project.	\$	947,548	\$	947,549
91	<b>Spectrum Mid-America, LLC</b> Town of Lyons cable internet project	This project will build a cable internet service past 41 residential locations along Steele Road southwest of Burlington, in the Town of Lyons in Walworth County.	\$	142,500	\$	67,194
84	<b>Siren Telephone Company</b> Sand Lake fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 249 residential locations near Green, Mallard and Sand Lakes, in the Town of Jackson, in Burnett County.	\$	320,061	\$	320,061
Total amount of grant requests for the recommended projects with the original \$24.0 million in funding				<b>\$ 23,986,118</b>		
5	<b>24-7 Telcom, Inc.</b> Town of Red Cedar project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 6 business and 140 residences in the Town of Red Cedar in Dunn County. This project area is southeast of the City of Menomonie and immediately south of the Menomonie regional airport. The project area is just northeast of the FY 2020 24-7 Telcom County Highway J project.	\$	467,250	\$	467,250
3	<b>24-7 Telcom, Inc.</b> Town of Menomonie Highway BB project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 6 business and 85 residences in the Town of Menomonie in Dunn County. This project area is immediately northwest of the City of Menomonie and is just west of the FY 2020 24-7 Telcom Town of Sherman project.	\$	320,300	\$	320,300

17	<b>Bug Tussel Wireless</b> Fond du Lac County fixed wireless project	This project will build two wireless towers and install a fixed wireless service in the southwestern portion of Fond du Lac County. The service will use a Cambrium product providing a maximum 100 Mbps down, and will potentially reach 97 business and 1,913 residential locations.	\$	213,472	\$	396,448
27	<b>CCI Systems, Inc. d/b/a Astrea</b> Towns Solon Springs and Gordon fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 8 business and 244 residential locations in the Towns of Gordon and Solon Springs in Douglas County.	\$	326,858	\$	326,880
113	<b>UpNetWI, LLC</b> Town of Cottage Grove fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 5 business and 81 residential locations near the intersection of Buckeye Road and Femrite Drive, in the Town of Cottage Grove in the Town of Bristol in Dane County.	\$	86,609	\$	86,609
56	<b>Midcontinent Communications</b> Ellsworth cable project	This project will build a cable internet service past 5 business and 49 residential locations in two neighborhoods, one is west of Ellsworth in the Town of Trimbelle and the second is south of Ellsworth in the Town of Ellsworth. Both areas are in Pierce County.	\$	83,169	\$	83,169
55	<b>Marquette-Adams Telephone Cooperative, Inc.</b> Town of Newport Phase II fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 5 business and 43 residential locations in the Town of Newport in Columbia County. This project builds on the FY 2020 MATC Town of Newport Phase I fiber project.	\$	94,064	\$	153,473
11	<b>Bayfield Wireless</b> Bayfield County fixed wireless project	This project will build a fixed wireless service in the Towns of Barksdale, Bayview and Washburn in Bayfield County. The service will use CBRS and LTE small cell architecture, and will reach 80 business and 1,003 residential locations.	\$	472,539	\$	321,622



53	<b>Marquette-Adams Telephone Cooperative, Inc.</b> Towns of Harris and Westfield fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 24 business and 59 residential locations in three project areas, east and west of the Village of Westfield in the Towns of Harris and Westfield, in Marquette County.	\$ 164,242	\$ 217,718
83	<b>Siren Telephone Company</b> Green Lake to Voyager Village fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 47 work-at-home and 185 residential locations near Voyager Village, on the northwest side of Birch Island Lake, in the Towns of Jackson and Scott in Burnett County.	\$ 278,406	\$ 278,007
28	<b>CCI Systems, Inc. d/b/a Astrea</b> Green Lake fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 1 business and 78 residential locations in the Town of Mountain in Oconto County.	\$ 66,897	\$ 66,897
98	<b>Superior Connections</b> Bad River Communities Essential fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 13 business and 330 residential locations in the Bad River Tribe Reservation, within the boundaries of Ashland County.	\$ 1,883,149	\$ 99,113
Total amount of grant requests for the recommended projects with the additional \$4.431 million in funding			<b>\$ 4,456,955</b>	
93	<b>Spectrum Mid-America, LLC</b> Town of Whitewater fiber project	This project will build a Fiber to the Premises service past 7 business and 825 residential locations near Rice Lake and Whitewater Lake in the Towns of Richmond and Whitewater in Walworth County. <b>Note: This project overlaps (# 42) Edge Broadband Lake Whitewater project.</b>	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,302,707

108	<p><b>Town of Liberty Grove</b> Liberty Grove Phase II (2021) fixed wireless project</p>	<p>This project will build and equip 2 wireless towers in Door County. The broadband service providers would be Door County Broadband. The project would potentially reach 34 business and 718 residential locations within range of the new antenna sites. This project builds upon the infrastructure built with the FY 2018-2 Town of Liberty Grove project.</p>	\$ 145,666	\$ 152,000
96	<p><b>Starwire Technologies</b> Old Highway 35 fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 23 business and 206 residential locations in the Towns of Siren, Meenon, and Lincoln, in Burnett County.</p>	\$ 304,406	\$ 456,608
22	<p><b>Bug Tussel Wireless</b> Rock County - East fixed wireless project</p>	<p>This project will build three new wireless towers and upgrade the fixed wireless service on one existing tower, located in the east side of Rock County. The four sites will use a Cambrium product providing a maximum 100 Mbps down. The project will potentially reach 1,267 business and 25,033 residential locations.</p>	\$ 392,626	\$ 588,939
15	<p><b>Bug Tussel Wireless</b> Beetown and Castle Rock fixed wireless project</p>	<p>This project will build two wireless towers and install a fixed wireless service in the Towns of Beetown and Castle Rock in the west central and northwest areas of Grant County. The service will use a Cambrium product providing a maximum 100 Mbps down, and will potentially reach 14 business and 266 residential locations.</p>	\$ 213,472	\$ 396,448
86	<p><b>Spectrum Mid-America, LLC</b> Town of Clayton cable internet project</p>	<p>This project will build a cable internet service past 85 residential locations along Fairview Road and Oakwood Avenue, west of Neenah in the Town of Clayton in Winnebago County.</p>	\$ 236,326	\$ 135,301

122	<p><b>WIconnect Wireless LLC</b> Bear Valley fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 66 business and 366 residences in southeast Richland and Southwest Sauk Counties. <b>Note: This project overlaps (# 77) RUC Bear Valley and (#115) US Cellular Iowa County projects.</b></p>	\$ 370,000	\$ 408,000
40	<p><b>Dodge County Land Resources and Parks Department</b> Dodge County Phase II fixed wireless project</p>	<p>This project will build 9 new wireless towers and install a fixed wireless service on existing 10 structures in rural Dodge County. The service will potentially reach 147 business and 2,020 residential locations.</p>	\$ 658,610	\$ 741,050
23	<p><b>Bug Tussel Wireless</b> Rock County - West fixed wireless project</p>	<p>This project will build five new wireless towers and upgrade the fixed wireless service on two existing towers, located in the west side of Rock County. The seven sites will use a Cambrium product providing a maximum 100 Mbps down. The project will potentially reach 309 business and 6,388 residential locations.</p>	\$ 663,268	\$ 994,901
19	<p><b>Bug Tussel Wireless</b> Marathon County fixed wireless project</p>	<p>This project will build six new wireless towers and upgrade the fixed wireless service on 3 additional towers currently under construction. The nine tower sites are located in Marathon County. All of the sites will use a Cambrium product providing a maximum 100 Mbps down. The project will potentially reach 360 business and 6,353 residential locations.</p>	\$ 632,884	\$ 1,476,729
21	<p><b>Bug Tussel Wireless</b> Town of New Denmark fixed wireless project</p>	<p>This project will build two new wireless towers in the Towns of Humboldt and New Denmark in the Eastern side of Brown County. The service will use a Cambrium product providing a maximum 100 Mbps down, and will potentially reach 198 business and 3,350 residential locations.</p>	\$ 243,968	\$ 365,952
9	<p><b>AT&amp;T Corp.</b> Door County fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 7 business and 1,023 residences in five discrete project areas in the Towns of Egg Harbor, Jacksonport, Sevastopol, Nasewauppee, and Clay Banks. All locations are in Door County.</p>	\$ 1,560,388	\$ 668,738

88	<p><b>Spectrum Mid-America, LLC</b> Town of Gibraltar cable internet project</p>	<p>This project will build a cable internet service past 15 business and 209 residential locations near Egg Harbor, in the Town of Gibraltar in Door County.</p>	<p>\$ 2,414,729</p>	<p>\$ 337,122</p>
89	<p><b>Spectrum Mid-America, LLC</b> Town of Holland cable internet project</p>	<p>This project will build a cable internet service past 4 business and 30 residential locations along Highway G northwest of Cedar Grove, and along Idlewood Lane south of Oostburg, in the Town of Holland in Sheboygan County.</p>	<p>\$ 97,000</p>	<p>\$ 99,091</p>
41	<p><b>Door County Broadband, LLC</b> 3 Towns fixed wireless project</p>	<p>This project will build 5 new wireless towers in the Towns of Jacksonport, Egg Harbor and Sevastopol in Door County. This projects builds on the infrastructure built DCB with its FY 2020 CARES project. The service will potentially reach 157 business, 1, 347 permanent residential, and 2,695 seasonal residential locations.</p>	<p>\$ 313,841</p>	<p>\$ 325,841</p>
72	<p><b>Oneida County Economic Development Corp.</b> Minocqua fixed wireless project</p>	<p>This project will build and equip 3 wireless towers to provide a fixed wireless service in the Town of Minocqua in northwest Oneida County. The service will potentially reach 16 business and 557 residential locations.</p>	<p>\$ 129,975</p>	<p>\$ 88,200</p>
66	<p><b>Brown County C-LEC, LLC d/b/a Nsight Services</b> Carlsville fixed wireless project</p>	<p>This project will build and equip one wireless tower near Carlsville in the Town of Egg Harbor in Door County. The service will use a CBRS product providing a maximum 100 Mbps down, and will potentially reach 72 business and 104 residential locations.</p>	<p>\$ 36,812</p>	<p>\$ 110,436</p>
114	<p><b>UpNetWI, LLC</b> Town of Pleasant Springs fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 5 business and 128 residential locations along County Road N between Skaleen Road and Koshkonong Road, in the Town of Pleasant Springs In Dane County.</p>	<p>\$ 97,073</p>	<p>\$ 97,074</p>

20	<p><b>Bug Tussel Wireless</b> Town of Morrison fixed wireless project</p>	<p>This project will build one new wireless tower in the Town of Morrison in the southern part of Brown County. The service will use a Cambrium product providing a maximum 100 Mbps down, and will potentially reach 53 business and 890 residential locations.</p>	\$ 121,984	\$ 182,976
65	<p><b>Northwoods Communications Technologies, LLC d/b/a Northwoods Connect</b> Marathon County fixed wireless project</p>	<p>This project will build and equip 5 wireless towers to provide a fixed wireless service in portions of the Towns of Bern, Berlin, Halsey, Hamburg, Johnson, Maine, Rib Falls, and Rietbock, in northwest Marathon County. The service will potentially reach 78 business and 3,607 residential locations.</p>	\$ 295,125	\$ 300,000
102	<p><b>Central State Telephone Company, LLC d/b/a TDS Telecom</b> Necedah telephone exchange DSL project</p>	<p>This project will build 31 miles of new fiber, install 33 new DSAs to provide improved DSL service for 61 business and 1,247 residential locations in the Necedah telephone exchange, in the Village of Necedah and in the Towns of Armenia, Clearfield, Finley, Germantown, and Necedah&gt; All locations are in Juneau County.</p>	\$ 1,376,331	\$ 1,376,332
29	<p><b>CCI Systems, Inc. d/b/a Astrea</b> Lake Eau Claire fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 3 business and 194 residential locations in the Town of Bridge Creek in eastern Eau Claire County. This project would serve the north, south, and west shore of Lake Eau Claire, overbuilding the FY 2014 fixed wireless project to some extent.</p>	\$ 239,560	\$ 237,808
6	<p><b>24-7 Telcom, Inc.</b> Town of Weston Highway D project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 4 business and 40 residences in the Town of Weston in Dunn County. This project area is southwest of the City of Menomonie. The project area is just south and west of the FY 2018-2 24-7 Telcom Town of Weston project.</p>	\$ 351,300	\$ 150,600

69	<b>Ntera, LLC</b> Highway S fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 4 business and 70 residential locations along 165th Avenue and County Road S in the Towns of Arthur and Colburn in Chippewa County. This route is an extension off of the FY 2020 Ntera Andersen & Estella project.	\$	248,571	\$	372,858
54	<b>Marquette-Adams Telephone Cooperative, Inc.</b> Towns of Montello and Packwaukee fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 12 business and 409 residential locations west of Montello in the Towns of Montello and Packwaukee in Marquette County.	\$	714,505	\$	743,668
7	<b>Amherst Telephone Company</b> Town of Dayton Phase II fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 3 business and 346 residences in the Towns of Dayton and Farmington in Waupaca County and the Town of Belmont in Portage County. This project area builds both north and south from the FY 2020 Amherst Town of Dayton Phase I fiber project.	\$	689,128	\$	819,541
31	<b>CCI Systems, Inc. d/b/a Astrea</b> Rock Dam Lake fiber project	This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 4 business and 140 residential locations adjacent to Rock Dam Lake in the Town of Foster in western Clark County.	\$	86,924	\$	130,386
107	<b>Thrive Economic Development</b> Jefferson County Phase II fixed wireless project	This project will build and equip 9 structures in Jefferson County. The broadband service providers would be Bertram Communications and Netwurx Internet. The project would potentially reach 134 business and 2,737 residential locations within range of the new antenna sites.	\$	760,175	\$	843,151
121	<b>Waupaca Online</b> East Gate fixed wireless project	This project will upgrade and increase the capacity of the wireless service in Waupaca's East Gate neighborhood. This upgrade could improve service to as many as 8,196 people.	\$	42,139	\$	45,491

92	<p><b>Spectrum Mid-America, LLC</b> Village of Rochester cable internet project</p>	<p>This project will build a cable internet service past 56 residential locations along Rowntree Road and English Settlement Avenue, Steele Road southwest of Burlington, in the Town of Rochester in Racine County.</p>	\$ 353,240	\$ 109,900
63	<p><b>Amery Telcom, Inc. d/b/a Northwest Communications</b> Amery telephone exchange fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 18 business and 668 residential locations in the Towns of Apple River, Beaver, Black Brook, Clayton, Garfield and Lincoln; all in Polk County. This project builds upon the prior Amery broadband projects, filling in the gaps within the Amery telephone exchange.</p>	\$ 980,000	\$ 1,155,000
90	<p><b>Spectrum Mid-America, LLC</b> Village of Luxemburg fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 75 business and 910 residential locations in the Village of Luxemburg in Kewaunee County.</p>	\$ 224,496	\$ 1,567,902
117	<p><b>US Cellular Corporation</b> Outagamie County fixed wireless project</p>	<p>This project will upgrade 4 wireless towers in Outagamie County to potentially reach 303 business and 6,703 residential locations in Outagamie and Waupaca Counties that are within range of the new antenna sites.</p>	\$ 425,333	\$ 850,667
34	<p><b>CenturyTel of the Midwest-Wisconsin LLC d/b/a CenturyLink</b> Casco telephone exchange DSL project</p>	<p>This project will build a DSL service to 9 business and 33 residential locations in the Casco Telephone Exchange, just west of the Village of Casco, in the Town of Casco in Kewaunee County.</p>	\$ 8,000	\$ 12,000
50	<p><b>LaValle Telephone Cooperative</b> Lime Ridge fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 5 business and 130 residential locations in the Village of Lime Ridge and rural areas north and west of Lime Ridge, in the Town of Ironton in Sauk County and the Town of Westford in Richland County.</p>	\$ 376,000	\$ 376,000

111	<p><b>Union Telephone Company</b> Pleasant and Wood Lakes fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 4 business and 265 residences near Pleasant Lake and Wood Lake, in the Town of Coloma in Waushara County and in the Town of Springfield in Marquette County.</p>	\$ 673,499	\$ 551,045
74	<p><b>Pierce Pepin Cooperative Services</b> Belle Vinez fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 3 business and 100 residential locations in the Town of Clifton in northwest Pierce County.</p>	\$ 376,400	\$ 564,400
101	<p><b>Badger Telecom, LLC d/b/a TDS Telecom</b> Granton telephone exchange DSL project</p>	<p>This project will build 23 miles of new fiber, install 23 new DSAs and upgrade 4 DSAs to provide improved DSL service for 17 business and 521 residential locations in the Granton telephone exchange, in the Village of Granton and in the Towns of Fremont, Lynn, Grant, York, Sherwood and Washburn, in Clark County.</p>	\$ 1,015,668	\$ 1,015,669
116	<p><b>US Cellular Corporation</b> La Crosse County fixed wireless project</p>	<p>This project will upgrade 4 wireless towers in La Crosse County. The upgraded service will potentially reach 195 business and 3,746 residential locations in La Crosse, Monroe and Vernon Counties that are within range of the new antenna sites.</p>	\$ 425,333	\$ 850,667
100	<p><b>Badger Telecom, LLC d/b/a TDS Telecom</b> Chili telephone exchange DSL project</p>	<p>This project will build 14 miles of new fiber, install 11 new DSAs and upgrade a 12th DSA to provide improved DSL service for 7 business and 261 residential locations in the Chili telephone exchange, in the Towns of Fremont, Lynn and Sherman, in Clark County.</p>	\$ 541,131	\$ 541,131
61	<p><b>Mount Horeb Telephone Company</b> Towns of Perry fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 8 business and 120 residential locations in the Town of Perry in Dane County.</p>	\$ 456,750	\$ 848,250



24	<p><b>Bug Tussel Wireless</b> Wauzeka-Steuben SD fixed wireless project</p>	<p>This project will build two new wireless towers in the Villages of Wauzeka and Stueben in southeast Crawford County. The service will use a Cambrium product providing a maximum 100 Mbps down, and will potentially reach 14 business and 334 residential locations.</p>	\$ 274,464	\$ 335,456
35	<p><b>CenturyTel of the Midwest Wisconsin LLC - Kendall d/b/a CenturyLink</b> Ladysmith fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 58 business and 2,333 residential locations in the City of Ladysmith in Rusk County.</p>	\$ 2,333,370	\$ 1,844,330
32	<p><b>CCI Systems, Inc. d/b/a Astrea</b> Wheeler and Waubee Lakes fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 2 business and 367 residential locations adjacent to Wheeler and Waubee Lakes in the Town of Lakewood in northern Oconto County.</p>	\$ 394,582	\$ 394,582
104	<p><b>Mid-Plains Telephone, LLC d/b/a TDS Telecom</b> Cross Plains telephone exchange DSL project</p>	<p>This project will build 8 miles of new fiber, install 10 new DSAs and upgrade 1 DSA to provide improved DSL service for 18 business and 260 residential locations in the Towns of Berry, Cross Plains and Springfield, in Dane County.</p>	\$ 373,999	\$ 374,000
115	<p><b>US Cellular Corporation</b> Iowa County fixed wireless project</p>	<p>This project will upgrade 3 wireless towers in Iowa County. The upgraded service will potentially reach 69 business and 1,521 residential locations in Iowa, Sauk and Richland Counties that are within range of the new antenna sites. <b>Note: This project overlaps (# 77) RUC Bear Valley and (# 122) WIconnect Bear Valley projects.</b></p>	\$ 283,556	\$ 567,111
99	<p><b>Taylor County</b> Taylor County fiber and fixed wireless project</p>	<p>This project will extend fiber to, build, and equip 3 wireless towers in Taylor County. The broadband service provider would be Country Wireless LLC.</p>	\$ 561,055	\$ 620,625

51	<p><b>Lemonweir Valley Telephone Company d/b/a Lynxx Networks</b> Highway 21 and Wyeville fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 8 business and 267 in the Village of Wyeville and in rural areas in the Towns of Byron and La Grange in Monroe County.</p>	\$ 359,976	\$ 439,971
38	<p><b>Clear Lake Telephone Company</b> Town of Cylon fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 10 business and 44 residential locations in the Town of Cylon in St. Croix County. This project builds up to but does not overlap the on the FY 2020 Amery Telcom Town of Cylon project.</p>	\$ 100,000	\$ 136,428
44	<p><b>e-vergent.com, LLC</b> Town of Yorkville Phase II fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 45 residential locations in the Village of Raymond in Racine County. This project builds on the FY 2020 e-vergent Town of Yorkville fiber project.</p>	\$ 65,614	\$ 65,615
60	<p><b>Mount Horeb Telephone Company</b> Town of Blue Mounds fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 5 business and 107 residential locations in the Town of Blue Mounds in Dane County.</p>	\$ 588,700	\$ 1,093,300
62	<p><b>Mount Horeb Telephone Company</b> Towns of Springdale fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 7 business and 164 residential locations in the Town of Springdale in Dane County. This project builds on the FY 2020 CARES Mt. Horeb Tel Springdale project.</p>	\$ 909,426	\$ 1,688,934

103	<p><b>The Farmers Telephone Company, LLC d/b/a TDS Telecom</b> Lancaster telephone exchange DSL project</p>	<p>This project will build 46 miles of new fiber, install 35 new DSAs and upgrade 4 DSAs to provide improved DSL service for 66 business and 651 residential locations in the Lancaster telephone exchange, in Grant County.</p>	\$ 1,829,324	\$ 1,829,325
105	<p><b>Scandinavia Telephone Company, LLC d/b/a TDS Telecom</b> Scandinavia telephone exchange DSL project</p>	<p>This project will build 6 miles of new fiber, and install 10 new DSAs to provide improved DSL service for 5 business and 193 residential locations in the Scandinavia telephone exchange, in the Towns of Farmington, St. Lawrence and Scandinavia, in Waupaca County.</p>	\$ 314,662	\$ 314,663
85	<p><b>SonicNet, Inc.</b> Vilas County fixed wireless project</p>	<p>This project will build and equip three wireless towers and one network operations center in the Towns of Phelps and Washington in Vilas County. This project will also build up to 5 mini Points of Presence to serve specific customers in the area. In total, the project will potentially reach 22 business and 425 residential locations.</p>	\$ 212,530	\$ 212,530
48	<p><b>Hillsboro Telephone Company</b> Union Center fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 15 business and 119 residential locations in the Village of Union Center in Juneau County.</p>	\$ 209,000	\$ 209,000
10	<p><b>Baldwin Telecom, Inc. d/b/a Baldwin Lightstream</b> Town of Warren fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 19 business and 243 residences in three discrete project areas; along Highway E in the Town of Warren in St Croix County, along Highway 65 between Ellsworth and River Falls in Pierce County, and along Highway N between Baldwin and Roberts in St Croix County.</p> <p><b><u>Note: A portion of this project overlaps (# 73) Pierce Pepin Beldenville project.</u></b></p>	\$ 872,746	\$ 469,940

43	<p><b>e-vergent.com, LLC</b> Town of Raymond Phase II fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 230 residential locations in the Village of Raymond in Racine County. This project builds on the FY 2019 e-vergent Town of Raymond fiber project.</p>	\$ 406,944	\$ 406,944
46	<p><b>Farmers Independent Telephone Company d/b/a Grantsburg Telcom</b> Spirit Lake Phase II fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 2 business and 203 residential locations east of Spirit Lake in the Towns of Daniels and Trade Lake in Burnett County and the Town of West Sweden in Polk County. This project builds on the FY 2020 CARES Grantsburg Telcom Spirit Lake fiber project. <b>Note: This project overlaps (# 97) Starwire West Sweden project.</b></p>	\$ 552,497	\$ 828,745
8	<p><b>Joshua Anderson</b> Town Hall Drive fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 5 locations (5 residences with 1 additional business account at one of the homes) in the Town of Sun Prairie in Dane County. This project area is just east of the municipal boundary of the City of Sun Prairie.</p>	\$ 40,000	\$ 20,000
30	<p><b>CCI Systems, Inc. d/b/a Astrea</b> Roberts Lake fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 1 business and 159 residential locations in the Town of Freedom in Forest County.</p>	\$ 334,267	\$ 180,360
87	<p><b>Spectrum Mid-America, LLC</b> Town of Dekorra cable internet project</p>	<p>This project will build a cable internet service past 78 residential locations in a subdivision near the Northeast side of Lake Wisconsin, in the Town of Dekorra in Columbia County.</p>	\$ 116,417	\$ 110,622
39	<p><b>Country Wireless, LLC</b> 4.5 G fixed wireless project</p>	<p>This project will install a fixed wireless service on 44 existing structures in Clark, Marathon, Taylor, and Wood Counties. The service will use a CBRS product providing a maximum 50 Mbps down, and will potentially reach 500 business and 3,600 residential locations.</p>	\$ 848,052	\$ 788,320

Attachment 1

49	<p><b>Ideal Technologies</b> Town of Wrightstown fiber project</p>	<p>This project will build a Fiber-To-The-Premises (FTTP) service past 14 business and 288 residential locations in the Town of Wrightstown in Brown County.</p>	<p>\$ 1,202,984</p>	<p>\$ 208,380</p>
45	<p><b>Forest County Economic Development Corporation</b> Forest County Dynamic Networking project</p>	<p>This project will establish a mobile command system for Forest County, capable of broadcasting 4G/5G and/or WiFi networks using a Telelift drone-based platform.</p>	<p>\$ 300,000</p>	<p>\$ 200,000</p>
123	<p><b>Wisconsin Telelift LLC</b> NPSD Dynamic Networking</p>	<p>This project will establish a Virtual Private Network for the Northland Pines School District.</p>	<p>\$ 300,000</p>	<p>\$ 200,000</p>
<p>Total amount of all 124 grant requests</p>			<p><b>\$ 62,519,874</b></p>	<p><b>\$ 85,139,049</b></p>