



---

# 2017 Border to Border Broadband Grant

Application Evaluation Report

07/02/18

---

MN Department of Employment and Economic Development  
Office of Broadband Development  
332 Minnesota Street, E200  
St. Paul, MN 55101  
(Phone) 651-259-7610  
deed.broadband@state.mn.us  
[mn.gov/deed/broadband](http://mn.gov/deed/broadband)

As required by Minnesota Statute 3.197: This report cost approximately \$321.65 to prepare, including staff time, printing and mailing expenses.

*Upon request, this material will be made available in an alternative format such as large print, Braille or audio recording. Printed on recycled paper.*

## Application Evaluation Report

Minn. Stat. §116J.395, subd. 8 requires the Office of Broadband Development to publish an application evaluation report by June 30 of each year. The report is to contain a list of all Border to Border Broadband Development Grant applications received during the previous year and, for each application, the results of any quantitative weighting scheme or scoring system used to award the grants or to rank the applications, the grant amount requested, and the grant amount awarded, if any. The report is to be published on the Department of Employment and Economic Development’s website and provided to the chairs and ranking minority members of the senate and house committees with primary jurisdiction over broadband.

The information below is provided in compliance with Minn. Stat. §116J.395, subd. 8. In addition to the total score as a factor in determining which projects were funded, those projects which were found to be credibly challenged were not funded (Palmer Wireless Sherburne Co. Rd. 8, Mediacom Eden Valley, Mediacom Wykoff, SCI Greenway) or only partially funded (Paul Bunyan Communications North Central and SCI Shamrock Township). Other factors that may have resulted in a higher scoring project not being funded was the requirement that the grants be awarded to all areas of the state [Minn. Stat. 116J.395, subd. 6.(c)] or there was insufficient funding available to award to a project so the next smaller project(s) were funded.

2017 Applications Received	Score	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded
AcenTek Houston	98	\$3,427,184	\$0
AcenTek Rushford	98	\$2,011,628	\$2,011,628
Advantenon Rural Chippewa County	61	\$253,317	\$0
Advantenon Grant, Stevens, Wilkin Counties	63	\$316,554	\$316,554
Advantenon Rural Kandiyohi County	62	\$506,634	\$0
Advantenon Lincoln and Lyon Counties	61	\$491,169	\$0
Advantenon Rural Mille Lacs County	64	\$824,738	\$0
Advantenon Rural Redwood County	62	\$382,043	\$0

<b>2017 Applications Received</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Amount Requested</b>	<b>Amount Awarded</b>
Albany Big Watab Phase II	69	\$866,775	\$0
Albany Two Rivers	71	\$616,743	\$616,743
Arvig Pelican Rapids	93	\$633,642	\$633,642
Benton Rice/Ramey	84	\$765,015	\$765,015
BEVCOMM Delavan SE Rural Project	91	\$220,350	\$220,350
BEVCOMM Elmore	91	\$120,178	\$0
BEVCOMM Freeborn	91	\$122,460	\$122,460
BEVCOMM Granada	92	\$202,410	\$202,410
BEVCOMM Pine Island	91	\$183,222	\$0
BEVCOMM Rice County New Prague	90	\$147,225	\$0
Carlton County Cromwell/Kettle River	87	\$569,058	\$569,058
CenturyLink Fish Lake	98	\$1,833,724	\$1,833,724
CenturyLink Fredenberg Township	85	\$1,809,312	\$1,809,312
CenturyLink Gnesen Township	78	\$2,141,465	\$0
Farmers NE Yellow Medicine County	N/A*	\$3,915,957	N/A*
Farmers Watson and SE Lac qui Parle Co.	88	\$760,501	\$760,501
Fond du Lac Big Lake	88	\$323,486	\$0

<b>2017 Applications Received</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Amount Requested</b>	<b>Amount Awarded</b>
Fond du Lac Brookston	91	\$258,265	\$258,265
Fond du Lac Saginaw	88	\$250,643	\$0
Garden Valley Bejou	86	\$1,304,421	\$1,304,421
Gardonville Douglas County Country Estates	91	\$101,624	\$101,624
Gardonville Douglas County Pospisil Drive	89	\$54,155	\$54,155
Halstad Huntsville and Rhinehart	79	\$323,000	\$0
Hanson Minnewaska	87	\$4,996,791	\$4,996,791
Jaguar Sand Creek Township	79	\$192,405	\$192,405
KMTelecom Rural Kasson	86	\$606,108	\$606,108
Mediacom Carlton County	74	\$483,089	\$0
Mediacom Eden Valley	67	\$360,357	\$0
Mediacom Fountain	66	\$202,125	\$202,125
Mediacom Medina	64	\$62,219	\$62,219
Mediacom Wykoff	61	\$82,774	\$0
Midco Annandale East	79	\$537,050	\$537,050
Midco Annandale West	78	\$1,403,550	\$0
Midco Wanamingo	86	\$768,600	\$768,600

<b>2017 Applications Received</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Amount Requested</b>	<b>Amount Awarded</b>
Midstate Kandiyohi	71	\$2,950,000	\$0
MVTC Milroy	87	\$742,365	\$742,365
NU Telecom Hanska	88	\$324,894	\$324,894
NU Telecom Hutchinson	87	\$468,749	\$0
NU Telecom New Ulm	87	\$608,445	\$0
NU Telecom Springfield	87	\$727,122	\$0
NU Telecom White Rock	89	\$411,704	\$411,704
Otter Tail Red Oak Drive	83	\$173,194	\$173,194
Palmer Duelm Hwy 95	76	\$162,814	\$162,814
Palmer Fisher Road Cold Spring	70	\$102,392	\$0
Palmer Ridgeview St. Augusta	70	\$203,273	\$0
Palmer Sherburne Co. Rd. 3	77	\$110,661	\$110,661
Palmer Sherburne Co. Rd. 8	78	\$356,491	\$0
PBC North Central Fiber	101	\$999,495	\$802,620
Runestone Villard	85	\$216,829	\$0
SCI Dell Grove	75	\$118,248	\$118,248
SCI Feeley	63	\$126,937	\$0

<b>2017 Applications Received</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Amount Requested</b>	<b>Amount Awarded</b>
SCI Greenway	61	\$136,162	\$0
SCI Shamrock	80	\$216,825	\$148,503
Sjoberg NW MN	83	\$307,088	\$307,088
WCTA Northern Todd County	95	\$902,695	\$902,695
WCTA Wadena Phase III	95	\$874,581	\$874,581
Wikstrom NWMN	97	\$1,307,785	\$1,307,785
Windomnet Jeffers	69	\$803,382	\$0
Winthrop Cornish Township	90	\$365,895	\$365,895
Woodstock Balaton	94	\$413,009	\$413,009
Woodstock Lynd	89	\$420,715	\$0
Woodstock-Pipestone County-Wireless	90	\$363,851	\$363,851

N/A\* means the application did not meet the requirement in Minn. Stat. §116J.395, subd. 5(9), which requires the applicant to provide evidence that they had contacted, in writing and at least six weeks prior to submitting an application, all entities providing broadband service in the proposed project area for information about the existing providers' plan to upgrade broadband service in the project area as part of their grant application. This evidence was not submitted with the application as required, and the application was therefore not scored.