

# **Final Proposal**

## **Commonwealth of Kentucky**

Broadband Equity, Access, and Deployment Program  
(BEAD)

February 2026



## Table of Contents

<b>Overview</b> .....	3
<b>Final Proposal Data Submission</b> .....	4
<b>Subgrantee Selection Process Outcomes (Requirement 1)</b> .....	5
<b>Timeline For Implementation (Requirement 3)</b> .....	9
<b>Oversight and Accountability Processes (Requirement 4)</b> .....	10
<b>Local Coordination (Requirement 5)</b> .....	12
<b>Challenge Process Results (Requirement 6)</b> .....	13
<b>Unserved and Underserved Locations (Requirement 7)</b> .....	14
<b>Implementation Status of Plans for Cost and Barrier Reduction, Compliance with Labor Laws, Low-Cost Plans, and Network Reliability and Resilience (Requirement 11)</b> .....	16
<b>Substantiation of Priority Broadband Projects (Requirement 12)</b> .....	18
<b>Subgrantee Selection Certification (Requirement 13)</b> .....	20
<b>Environmental and Historic Preservation (EHP) Documentation (Requirement 14)</b> .....	22
<b>Consent from Tribal Entities (Requirement 15)</b> .....	23
<b>Prohibition on Excluding Provider Types (Requirement 16)</b> .....	24
<b>Waiver</b> .....	25

## Overview

The Office of Broadband Development (the Office), of behalf of the Commonwealth of Kentucky has prepared this Final Proposal as part of the final steps the application process for Broadband Equity, Access, and Deployment (BEAD) funding from the National Telecommunications and Information Association (NTIA). The Final Proposal has been prepared in accordance with the BEAD Program Notice of Funding Opportunity and the BEAD Restructuring Policy Notice (Policy Notice) which was released on June 6, 2025.

# Final Proposal Data Submission

**0.1 Attachment (Required): Complete and submit the Subgrantees CSV file (named “fp\_subgrantees.csv”) using the NTIA template provided.**

See Attachment at [https://broadband.ky.gov/BEAD/Documents/EXHIBIT\\_A\\_SUBGRANTEES.csv](https://broadband.ky.gov/BEAD/Documents/EXHIBIT_A_SUBGRANTEES.csv)

**0.2 Attachment (Required): Complete and submit the Deployment Projects CSV file (named “fp\_deployment\_projects.csv”) using the NTIA template provided.**

See Attachment at [https://broadband.ky.gov/BEAD/Documents/EXHIBIT\\_B\\_deployment\\_projects.csv](https://broadband.ky.gov/BEAD/Documents/EXHIBIT_B_deployment_projects.csv)

**0.3 Attachment (Required): Complete and submit the Locations CSV file (named “fp\_locations.csv”) using the NTIA template provided. The Location IDs in this list must match the NTIA-approved final list of eligible locations.**

See Attachment at [https://broadband.ky.gov/BEAD/Documents/EXHIBIT\\_C\\_LOCATIONS.csv](https://broadband.ky.gov/BEAD/Documents/EXHIBIT_C_LOCATIONS.csv)

**0.4 Attachment (Required): Complete and submit the No BEAD Locations CSV file (named “fp\_no\_BEAD\_locations.csv”) using the NTIA template provided. The Location IDs in this list must match the NTIA-approved final list of eligible locations.**

See Attachment at [https://broadband.ky.gov/BEAD/Documents/EXHIBIT\\_D\\_no\\_BEAD\\_locations.csv](https://broadband.ky.gov/BEAD/Documents/EXHIBIT_D_no_BEAD_locations.csv)

**0.5 Question (Y/N): If the Eligible Entity intends to use BEAD funds to serve CAIs, does the Eligible Entity certify that it ensures coverage of broadband service to all unserved and underserved locations, as identified in the NTIA-approved final list of eligible locations and required under 47 U.S.C. § 1702(h)(2)?**

Yes.

**0.6 Attachment (Required – Conditional on a ‘Yes’ Response to Intake Question 0.5): Complete and submit the CAIs CSV file (named “fp\_cai.csv”) using the NTIA template provided. Although CAIs are not included under (f)(1) deployment projects, to confirm the Eligible Entity’s compliance with the BEAD prioritization framework and identify BEAD-funded CAIs, the NTIA template is required. The Eligible Entity must only include CAIs funded via BEAD in this list; the Eligible Entity may not propose funding CAIs that were not present on the approved final list from the Eligible Entity’s Challenge Process results.**

N/A

# Subgrantee Selection Process Outcomes (Requirement 1)

## 1.1 Describe how the Eligible Entity’s deployment Subgrantee Selection Process undertaken is consistent with that approved by NTIA in Volume II of the Initial Proposal as modified by the BEAD Restructuring Policy Notice.

The Commonwealth of Kentucky completed the Subgrantee Selection Process as outlined in Volume II of the Initial Proposal. This process was approved by NTIA and was subsequently modified with the BEAD Restructuring Policy Notice (RPN) that was released to all Eligible Entities on June 6, 2025. Kentucky, through its Office of Broadband Development (the Office) conducted a thorough initial Subgrantee Selection Process, with follow-ups permitted by the Policy’s updates to the application for BEAD funding.

On June 11, 2025, the Office sent a communication to all applicants, stakeholders, and interested parties informing them of the NTIA RPN update, its impacts on the current process, and the steps necessary to ensure inclusion in the funding process going forward. The communication outlined the plans to reopen the application to all interested parties, including potential new applicants and those who were unsuccessful in completing submissions in the previous phase. Adjustments were made to questions and information sections of the application to reflect the changes required by the RPN. A prequalification period for prospective subgrantees was re-opened from June 16 through June 27, 2025, as required by the RPN.

Following the closure of the prequalification process, the Office opened its “Benefit of the Bargain” (BoB) round on July 7, 2025, allowing applicants, regardless of past participation or technology type, to apply for BEAD funds. The application window closed on July 28, 2025. This provided applicants with a three-week application period, and maximized the time Kentucky had under the new RPN timeline to complete the Final Proposal process.

The Office published its existing list of “No BEAD” locations – locations which do not require BEAD funding – to inform prospective applicants of locations which the Office had determined no longer needed BEAD funding. Additionally, the Office conducted a process to consider inclusion of locations served by Unlicensed Fixed Wireless (ULFW) service on the “No BEAD” list. All BEAD-eligible locations received at least one application during the process. Following the process described in the RPN, the Office accepted letters of intent from ULFW providers wishing to submit evidence of service and provided guidance to those providers on required evidence to substantiate that the ULFW service meets BEAD requirements. No additional locations were added to the “No BEAD” list through this process.

The applications submitted during the Commonwealth’s first round of BEAD subgrantee selection, which occurred from January to March 2025 prior to the release of the RPN, were

reopened to the applicants, allowing them to make modifications to previously submitted proposals. All first round applicants had to resubmit round 1 applications in order to participate in the Benefit of the Bargain Round. Subgrantees that were new to the process or had not completed submissions in the previous round were able to submit new applications. Application curing was limited to resolution of issues that hindered accurate review of the proposed project, such as improperly formatted lists of proposed locations or corrupted shapefiles. Applications otherwise were evaluated using materials submitted by the applicant in the application portal prior to the deadline. Since the Office received applications for all eligible locations, negotiations were limited to situations where an area was orphaned by the “separability” designation. If an applicant submitted an application for which CBGs were marked “inseparable” for an application in which all CBGs were not awarded to that applicant, but the applicant was the highest scoring for that orphaned project area, the Office gave that applicant the first right of refusal for that area before moving on to another bidder or adjacent winner.

## **1.2 Describe the steps that the Eligible Entity took to ensure a fair, open, and competitive process, including processes in place to ensure training, qualifications, and objectiveness of reviewers.**

The Kentucky Office of Broadband Development established an application process that would maximize the impact of funds available for this significant infrastructure investment. To do this, the process solicited competitive proposals that would address the Commonwealth’s needs relevant to the provision of services and use of technology, while ensuring a fair and open process for applicants.

The Office established a process in its Initial Proposal that was inclusive of all possible applicants, ensuring entities of all sizes and technology types could submit applications for funding. This allowed for small and large internet service providers (ISPs), or companies that focused on fiber, hybrid fiber coaxial, fixed wireless, on low earth orbit (LEO) satellite technologies, and other relevant technologies to prequalify and if approved, participate in the full application process to compete for funding to build out high speed internet infrastructure in Kentucky.

The Office further ensured a fair, open, and competitive process by following guidelines defined by NTIA as part of the funding process and by following general grantmaking best practices. What follows are the primary steps the Office enacted to ensure the process was fair, open, and competitive.

### **To ensure a Fair process:**

- The Office maintained its official and publicly available website with all grant-related information, including application and FAQs, and any corresponding supporting

documentation.

The Office ensured participants had access to information related to scoring rubric and program procedures prior to submitting applications. Information was made available on the official website, with notification of availability included in communications to all potential subgrantees. This includes a special update relevant to the BEAD Restructuring Policy Notice of June 6, 2025.

The Office provided a series of scheduled training and technical assistance calls/meetings for potential subgrantees during each stage of the process. These trainings/meetings were conducted by Office staff and relevant consultants. External reviewers were used to conduct primary, initial review and scoring of applications. This process provided an initial, impartial vetting of the applications, providing critical information for the Office to review during the decision-making process. All funding decisions were made by the Office, not by contractors.

The Office offered external office hours via Microsoft Teams to prospective subgrantees and stakeholders to ensure easy access to staff for technical assistance and questions.

**Open:**

- The Office maintained the standards and parameters outlined in its Initial Proposal for participation in the funding process. These parameters, approved by NTIA, were maintained through the implementation of the RPN changes.
- The Office ensured that published timelines were adhered to and that updates were communicated in a timely manner. KY OBD staff followed a communications plan in relation to its development and release of timeline information. The Office worked with relevant consultants to set the start and end applicant and application process within its grants processes to ensure adherence to its published timelines.
- Using both the constituent relationship management (CRM) functions of the Grant Portal software and internal email communications lists, communications about the funding process were delivered to all relevant stakeholders and were distributed from the most relevant source (i.e. Executive Director, Federal Program Specialist, Grant Administrator, or Consultant on software issues). This was meant to ensure that current applicants could respond regarding their submitted application and new or uncommitted applicants could make decisions on participation in the process.

**Competitive:**

- The Office encouraged participation by all eligible participants. The process was open to any entity with any technology type to participate in the prequalification process, and if approved, participate in the full application process for funding.

To further ensure a fair, open, and competitive process, Office staff had extensive involvement in the design and deployment of the application portal and conducted multiple rounds of user

experience testing to ensure that the application portal functioned properly and aligned with BEAD program requirements. The contractor that supported the development of the portal provided training and support to the contractor that assisted the office with the technical review of applications. Office staff additionally met with the technical review contractor to ensure that the contractor understood the application materials, applicant submissions, and program requirements. Office staff met at least once a week with the technical review contractor team to discuss progress of the reviews and resolve any issues.

**1.3 Affirm that, when no application was initially received, the Eligible Entity followed a procedure consistent with the process approved in the Initial Proposal**

Yes

**1.4 If applicable, describe the Eligible Entity’s methodology for revising its eligible CAI list to conform with Section 4 of the BEAD Restructuring Policy Notice.**

The Office complied with the BEAD June 6th Restructuring Policy Notice to remove from consideration Community Support Organizations with the narrowing of the interpretation of the CAI definition resulting in their exclusion.

**1.5 Certify that the Eligible Entity will retain all subgrantee records in accordance with 2 C.F.R. § 200.334 at all times, including retaining subgrantee records for a period of at least 3 years from the date of submission of the subgrant’s final expenditure report. This should include all subgrantee network designs, diagrams, project costs, build-out timelines and milestones for project implementation, and capital investment schedules submitted as a part of the application process.**

Yes

## Timeline For Implementation (Requirement 3)

**3.1 Has the Eligible Entity taken measures to: (a) ensure that each subgrantee will begin providing services to each customer that desires broadband service within the project area not later than four years after the date on which the subgrantee receives the subgrant; (b) ensure that all BEAD subgrant activities are completed at least 120 days prior to the end of the Eligible Entity's period of performance, in accordance with 2 C.F.R. 200.344; and (c) ensure that all programmatic BEAD grant activities undertaken by the Eligible Entity are completed by the end of the period of performance for its award, in accordance with 2 C.F.R. 200.344.**

The Office ensured that applicants seeking to deploy network facilities were able to meet the minimum requirements for financial and management capacity, technical and operational guidelines, and other standards outlined in the BEAD NOFO, Kentucky's approved Initial Proposal Volume 2, the RPN, supplemental guidance issued by NTIA, and 47 U.S.C. § 1702(g)(2)(A).

The Office has included within its planning, proposal development and application process the requirement that implementation must begin with four years of the date the awardee executes the project grant agreement. This is to ensure that each subgrantee will be providing services to each customer that desires broadband services within the project area no later than four years after the date on which the subgrantee receives the subgrant.

Applicants also submitted a project schedule, network design, diagram, project costs, build-out timeline and milestones for project implementation, and a capital investment schedule evidencing complete build-out and the initiation of service within four years of the date on which the entity receives the subgrant. All this certified by a professional engineer, stating that the proposed network can deliver broadband service that meets the requisite performance requirements to all locations served by the Project. The applicant agreed to demonstrate the ability to complete build-out and initiation of service within 120 days prior to four years of the date on which the entity is under contract.

The Office will rely on staff and contractor support to monitor post-award compliance and project reporting, as well as project completion dates. The Office will provide technical assistance through the period of performance to support the deployment of projects in a timely manner. The complete monitoring activities are outlined in Kentucky's subgrantee agreement and project monitoring plans. Information about project monitoring will be available on the Kentucky OBD website at [broadband.ky.gov](http://broadband.ky.gov). The Office will engage in active project monitoring and subgrantee engagement to ensure that all BEAD subgrant activities are completed at least 120 days prior to the end of the Eligible Entity's period of performance, in accordance with 2 C.F.R. 200.344.

## Oversight and Accountability Processes (Requirement 4)

4.1 Does the Eligible Entity have a public waste, fraud, and abuse hotline, and a plan to publicize the contact information for this hotline?

Yes.

4.2 Upload the following two required documents: (1) BEAD program monitoring plan; (2) Agency policy documentation which includes the following practices: a. Distribution of funding to subgrantees for, at a minimum, all deployment projects on a reimbursable basis (which would allow the Eligible Entity to withhold funds if the subgrantee fails to take the actions the funds are meant to subsidize) or on a basis determined by the terms and conditions of a fixed amount subaward agreement; and b. Timely subgrantee (to Eligible Entity) reporting mandates.

Required Documents available at <https://broadband.ky.gov/BEAD/Pages/BEAD-Final-Proposal.aspx>

4.3 Certify that the subgrant agreements will include, at a minimum, the following conditions:

- a. Compliance with Section VII.E of the BEAD NOFO, as modified by the BEAD Restructuring Policy Notice, including timely subgrantee reporting mandates, including at least semiannual reporting, for the duration of the subgrant to track the effectiveness of the use of funds provided.
- b. Compliance with obligations set forth in 2 C.F.R. Part 200 and the Department of Commerce Financial Assistance Standard Terms and Conditions.
- c. Compliance with all relevant obligations in the Eligible Entity's approved Initial and Final Proposals, including the BEAD General Terms and Conditions and the Specific Award Conditions incorporated into the Eligible Entity's BEAD award.
- d. Subgrantee accountability practices that include distribution of funding to subgrantees for, at a minimum, all deployment projects on a reimbursable basis.
- e. Subgrantee accountability practices that include the use of claw back provisions between the Eligible Entity and any subgrantee (i.e., provisions allowing recoupment of funds previously disbursed).
- f. Mandate for subgrantees to publicize telephone numbers and email addresses for the Eligible Entity's Office of Inspector General (or comparable entity) and/or subgrantees' internal ethics office (or comparable entity) for the purpose of reporting waste, fraud or abuse in the Program. This includes an acknowledge of the responsibility to produce copies of materials used for such purposes upon request of the Federal Program Officer; and
- g. Mechanisms to provide effective oversight, such as subgrantee accountability

**procedures and practices in use during subgrantee performance, financial management, compliance, and program performance at regular intervals to ensure that subgrantee performance is consistently assessed and tracked over time.**

Yes.

## Local Coordination (Requirement 5)

### 5.1 Describe the public comment period and provide a high-level summary of the comments received by the Eligible Entity during the public comment period, including how the Eligible Entity addressed the comments.

The Office received 32 public comments from applicants/awardees, industry groups, local officials, and citizens during the seven (7) day public comment period. Political subdivisions were afforded an opportunity to submit comments during the comment period. Applicants/awardees primarily commented on the outcome of the subgrantee selection process, and additionally offered comments on draft grantee documents and materials. ISPs also commented on potential overbuilds, indicating a potential need to continue to review awarded locations to prevent unnecessary overbuilds, and the importance of utilizing the remaining funds for non-deployment uses. Industry groups commented on proposed awards, notably objecting to the high percentage of awards to LEO providers, and the importance of utilizing the remaining funds for non-deployment uses. Local officials and citizens expressed concerns over the high percentage of locations awarded to LEO providers, especially in Eastern Kentucky. The Office applied the information presented related to deduplication of enforceable commitments. No other changes were made to the final proposal.

## Challenge Process Results (Requirement 6)

### **6.1 Certify that the Eligible Entity has successfully completed the BEAD Challenge Process and received approval of the results from NTIA.**

Yes.

### **6.2 Provide a link to the website where the Eligible Entity has publicly posted the final location classifications (unserved/underserved/CAIs) and note the date that it was publicly posted.**

The post-challenge BEAD classification list was posted on January 7, 2025, at

<https://kybroadband.maps.arcgis.com/sharing/rest/content/items/8804ca20ec024f009d97891eb2c8fe39/data>

The post-challenge CAI list was posted on January 8, 2025, at

<https://kybroadband.maps.arcgis.com/sharing/rest/content/items/1c5b3485ce67409389c77c1afc8bfe7e/data>

## Unserved and Underserved Locations (Requirement 7)

**7.1 Certify whether the Eligible Entity will ensure coverage of broadband service to all unserved locations within its jurisdiction, as identified upon conclusion of the Challenge Process required under 47 U.S.C. §1702(h)(2).**

Yes.

**7.2 If the Eligible Entity does not serve an unserved location because it is either financially incapable or has determined that costs to serve the location would be unreasonably excessive, explain and include a strong showing of how the Eligible Entity made that determination.**

N/A

**7.3 (Optional): If applicable to support the Eligible Entity's response to Question 7.2, provide relevant files supporting the Eligible Entity's determination.**

N/A.

**7.4 Certify whether the Eligible Entity will ensure coverage of broadband service to all underserved locations within its jurisdiction, as identified upon conclusion of the Challenge Process required under 47 U.S.C. §1702(h)(2).**

Yes.

**7.5 If the Eligible Entity does not serve an underserved location because it is either financially incapable or has determined that costs to serve the location would be unreasonable excessive, explain and include a strong showing of how the Eligible Entity made that determination.**

N/A

**7.6 (Optional): If applicable to support the Eligible Entity's response to Question 7.5, provide relevant files supporting the Eligible Entity's determination.**

N/A

**7.7 Certify that the Eligible Entity has utilized the provided reason codes to investigate and account for locations that do not require BEAD funding, that the Eligible Entity will utilize reason codes 1, 2, and 3 for the entire period of performance, and that the Eligible Entity will maintain documentation, following the guidelines provided by NTIA, to justify its determination if there is a reason to not serve any unserved or underserved location on the NTIA-approved Challenge Process list through a BEAD project. The documentation for each location must be relevant for the specific reason indicated by the Eligible Entity in the fp\_no\_BEAD\_locations.csv file. The Eligible Entity shall provide the documentation for any such location for NTIA review, as requested during Final Proposal review or after the Final Proposal has been approved.**

Yes.

**7.8 Certify that the Eligible Entity has accounted for all enforceable commitments after the submission of its challenge results, including state enforceable commitments and federal enforceable commitments that the Eligible Entity was notified of and did not object to, and/or federally-funded awards for which the Eligible Entity has discretion over where they are spent (e.g., regional commission funding or NTIA | 54 Capital Projects Fund/State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds), in its list of proposed projects.**

Yes.

# Implementation Status of Plans for Cost and Barrier Reduction, Compliance with Labor Laws, Low-Cost Plans, and Network Reliability and Resilience (Requirement 11)

**11.1 Provide the implementation status (Complete, In Progress, or Not Started) of plans described in the approved Initial Proposal Requirement 14 related to reducing costs and barriers to deployment.**

In its Initial Proposal, Kentucky outlined plans for reducing costs and barriers to broadband deployment across the Commonwealth. In drafting these proposals OBD listed several priorities to focus on to ensure BEAD program funds sent to State, local, and private partners can be invested efficiently and without delay.

The following are the strategies that Kentucky proposed to focus on to support applicants and promote effective BEAD investments:

1. Promoting the use of existing infrastructure
2. Promoting and adopting dig-once policies
3. Streamlining permitting processes
4. Streamlining cost-effective access to poles, conduits, easements; and
5. Streamlining rights of way, including the imposition of reasonable access rights

These plans are In Progress.

**11.2 Affirm that the Eligible Entity required subgrantees to certify compliance with existing federal labor and employment laws.**

Yes.

**11.3 (Optional – Conditional on a ‘No’ Response to Intake Question 11.2): If the Eligible Entity does not affirm that subgrantees were required to certify compliance with federal labor and employment laws, explain why the Eligible Entity was unable to do so.**

N/A

**11.4 Certify that all subgrantees selected by the Eligible Entity will be required to offer a low-cost broadband service option for the duration of the 10-year Federal interest period.**

Yes.

**11.5 (Optional – Conditional on a ‘No’ Response to Intake Question 11.4): If the Eligible Entity does not certify that all subgrantees selected by the Eligible Entity will be required to offer a low-cost broadband service option for the duration of the 10- year Federal interest period, explain why the Eligible Entity was unable to do so.**

N/A

**11.6 Certify that all subgrantees have planned for the reliability and resilience of BEAD-funded networks.**

Yes.

**11.7 (Optional – Conditional on a ‘No’ Response to Intake Question 11.6): If the Eligible Entity does not certify that subgrantees have ensured/planned for the reliability and resilience of BEAD-funded networks in their network designs, explain why the Eligible Entity was unable to do so.**

N/A

# Substantiation of Priority Broadband Projects (Requirement 12)

## 12.1 Text Box: Describe how the Eligible Entity applied the definition of Priority Project as defined in the Infrastructure Act and the BEAD Restructuring Policy Notice.

The Office established a review methodology based on the statutory definition of Priority Broadband Project (PBP):

- provides broadband service at speeds of no less than 100 megabits per second for downloads and 20 megabits per second for uploads,
- has a latency less than or equal to 100 milliseconds,
- can easily scale speeds over time to meet the evolving connectivity needs of households and businesses and support the deployment of 5G, successor wireless technologies, and other advanced services.

The Office anticipated receiving applications requesting priority broadband status from the following technology types, explicitly listed in the RPN:

1. Fiber
2. Hybrid fiber-coaxial (cable)
3. Licensed fixed wireless
4. Unlicensed fixed wireless
5. Low-Earth orbit (LEO) satellite

For technology types not listed in the RPN, but requesting priority status, the Office evaluated the applications' documentation and evidence submitted by the applicant and whether the information provided sufficiently supported those claims of PBP status based on the criteria listed above, and evidence submitted by the applicant of project feasibility and permission to access required infrastructure.

All applicants were eligible to apply for PBP status so applications were first evaluated for the status based on documentation submitted by the applicant requesting project(s) be treated as PBP, and whether the information provided sufficiently supported those claims. This assessment included a review of network design and diagrams to ensure that projects met the requirement to broadband service at speeds of no less than 100/20 Mbps with latency less than or equal to 100 milliseconds. Additionally, application materials were evaluated to determine if the proposed technology can easily scale over time to meet the evolving connectivity needs of households and businesses and support the deployment of 5G, successor wireless technologies, and other advanced services. Scalability was evaluated

along many points that included active networks, equipment, deployment, locations, bandwidth, signal strength, and others to help determine viability of the technology.

Following the review of technical documentation submitted with applications, PBP status was evaluated on a project area basis based on the suggested factors in NTIA’s FAQ Version 12:

- The natural and physical features of a project area (including weather patterns;
- Tree coverage or threats to infrastructure, the concentration of BSLs;
- Statewide capacity of an applicant to meet the Priority Broadband Project definition to identify project areas where the proposed technologies may be limited by external factors from meeting the performance criteria.

This review included consideration of USDA Forest Service FSGeodata Clearinghouse and Kentucky Geological Survey information on tree cover, topography, and concentration of BSLs, evaluating the proximity of each BSL to woodland areas and obstruction created by tree canopy, analyzing the impact of obstruction from elevation changes on eligible BSLs, and evaluating the concentration/density of BSLs in a project area. Statewide capacity included review of available data on performance (e.g. speed tests), as well as consideration of the applicant’s existing infrastructure in Kentucky or neighboring states, if the detailed narrative described deployment plans for all applied for counties, experience with local government permitting across applied-for jurisdictions, if applicant provided sufficient information on plans for increases in on-site deployment staffing and maintenance personnel post-deployment, and sufficient plans for building of new infrastructure and/or access to existing infrastructure (for example, permits to locate infrastructure on existing towers or agreements with electric utilities for access to neutral lines).

The Commonwealth understands its obligation to ensure a technology neutral and fair evaluation of evidence submitted by applicants to support consideration of a project as a PBP, and the Office abided by the threshold set by the RPN: “Applicants must provide supporting documentation sufficient for the Eligible Entity to assess the network application and determine that the proposed network architecture for each specific project area meets this standard.” (pg. 9, NTIA BEAD Restructuring Policy Notice). When an applicant failed to provide evidence to support these NTIA-specified considerations related to (1) “[...] if a proposed technical capability showing is not sufficiently tailored to a given project area”, or (2) scalability over time and suitability based on “geography, topography, density, and statewide capacity” at a project-area-by- project area (pgs. 46-47, NTIA’s FAQ Version 4), an application was deemed a non-priority broadband in accordance with NTIA’s RPN.

# Subgrantee Selection Certification (Requirement 13)

**13.1 Provide a narrative summary of how the Eligible Entity applied the BEAD Restructuring Policy Notice’s scoring criteria to each competitive project application and describe the weight assigned to each Secondary Criteria by the Eligible Entity. Scoring criteria must be applied consistent with the prioritization framework laid out in Section 3.4 of the BEAD Restructuring Policy Notice.**

The Office invited all eligible prospective subgrantees to participate in the “Benefit of the Bargain” application process that ran July 7, 2025, through July 28, 2025. Applicants that had previously applied for funds had the benefit of “application rollover”, meaning that their original proposal was carried forward in the process and reopened to allow for revisions following the RPN. Prior applicants had to affirmatively resubmit these applications in order to participate in the Benefit of the Bargain Round. Subgrantees that joined the process as new applicants had the opportunity to complete new applications.

All returning and new applicants were required to complete and submit their applications by the July 28, 2025, deadline.

The application changes were prepared with the consideration that the Primary Scoring Criteria was “Minimal BEAD Program Outlay” To determine Minimal Program Outlay, the Office considered three factors:

- 1.The total BEAD funding required for the project (the total project cost minus the applicant's proposed match).
- 2.The cost per BSL of the project (the total BEAD funding that will be required to complete the project divided by the number of BSLs the project will serve); and
- 3.The combination of the proposals with the lowest overall cost to the Program.

In addition, secondary criteria were evaluated when a project proposed a project cost within 15% of the lowest-cost proposal received for that same general project area on a per BSL basis. If so, competing applications were evaluated to determine comparison on speed of deployment, speed of network, and preliminary/provisional subgrantee status. The secondary scoring criteria were set as follows:

Secondary scoring weights: Primary score = Cost = 35%

Secondary Criteria – total 65%

Speed to deployment – 10%

Speed and Latency – 10%

Network Resiliency – 10%

Scalability – 10%

Preliminary Winner – 25%

The Office hosted online office hours and distributed communications to inform applicants of application changes, specifically in regard to the way scoring and recommendations would occur. In addition, extensive work was conducted with the Office’s consultants to ensure application changes were made, access to technical assistance was readily available, and scoring mechanisms functioned as expected.

External review of subgrantee applications, with subsequent scoring and reporting, revealed the results of a process that adhered to requirements set forth in the Restructuring Policy Notice. The work the Office and applicants did in the preceding months to prepare for the Final Proposal submission focused on cost effectiveness.

The results of this process, referenced in the Data Submissions section of this application, include a list of Subgrantees identified by the Office of Broadband Development to increase access to high-speed internet.

# Environmental and Historic Preservation (EHP) Documentation (Requirement 14)

**14.1 Attachment (Required):** Submit a document which includes the following: Description of how the Eligible Entity will comply with applicable environmental and historic preservation (EHP) requirements, including a brief description of the methodology used to evaluate the Eligible Entity's subgrantee projects and project activities against NTIA's National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) guidance. The methodology must reference how the Eligible Entity will use NTIA's Environmental Screening and Permitting Tracking Tool (ESAPTT) to create NEPA project records, evaluate the applicability of categorical exclusions, consider and document the presence (or absence) of Extraordinary Circumstances, and transmit information and draft NEPA documents to NTIA for review and approval.

Description of the Eligible Entity's plan to fulfill its obligations as a joint lead agency for NEPA under 42 U.S.C. 4336a, including its obligation to prepare or to supervise the preparation of all required environmental analyses and review documents.

Evaluation of the sufficiency of the environmental analysis for your state or territory that is contained in the relevant chapter of the FirstNet Regional Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), available at <https://www.firstnet.gov/network/environmental-compliance/projects/regionalprogrammatic-environmental-impact-statements>.

Evaluation of whether all deployment related activities anticipated for projects within your state or territory are covered by the actions described in the relevant FirstNet Regional PEIS.

Description of the Eligible Entity's plan for applying specific award conditions

or other strategies to ensure proper procedures and approvals are in place for disbursement of funds while projects await EHP clearances.

See Attachment at

<https://broadband.ky.gov/BEAD/Documents/KENTUCKY%20FP%20EHP%20Section%2014%20Draft.pdf>

## Consent from Tribal Entities (Requirement 15)

**15.1 Attachment(s) (Required if any deployment project is on Tribal Lands): Upload a Resolution of Consent from each Tribal Government (in PDF format) from which consent was obtained to deploy broadband on its Tribal Land. The Resolution(s) of Consent submitted by the Eligible Entity should include appropriate signatories and relevant context on the planned (f)(1) broadband deployment including the timeframe of the agreement. The Eligible Entity must include the name of the Resolution of Consent PDF in the Deployment Projects CSV file.**

**Not applicable – No Tribal Lands in Commonwealth of Kentucky**

## Prohibition on Excluding Provider Types (Requirement 16)

**16.1 Question (Y/N): Does the Eligible Entity certify that it did not exclude cooperatives, nonprofit organizations, public-private partnerships, private companies, public or private utilities, public utility districts, or local governments from eligibility for a BEAD subgrant, consistent with the requirement at 47 U.S.C.**

**§ 1702(h)(1)(A)(iii)?**

Yes.

# Waiver

**17.1 If any waivers are in process and/or approved as part of the BEAD Initial Proposal or at any point prior to the submission of the Final Proposal, list the applicable requirement(s) addressed by the waiver(s) and date(s) of submission. Changes to conform to the BEAD Restructuring Policy Notice should be excluded. If not applicable to the Eligible Entity, note 'Not applicable.'**

The Office of Broadband Development is requesting a waiver of the BAFO process. The BAFO process is not a NOFO requirement. Date of submission: 12/3/2025

**17.2 (Optional): If not already submitted to NTIA, and the Eligible Entity needs to request a waiver for a BEAD program requirement, upload a completed Waiver Request Form here. If documentation is already in process or has been approved by NTIA, the Eligible Entity does NOT have to upload waiver documentation again**