Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the. Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0042), Washington, DC 20503.

## PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY.

NOTE: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the Awarding Agency. Further, certain Federal assistance awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.
As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance, and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project costs) to ensure proper planning, management and completion of the project described in this application.
2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States and, if appropriate, the State, the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the assistance; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.
3. Will not dispose of, modify the use of, or change the terms of the real property title, or other interest in the site and facilities without permission and instructions from the awarding agency. Will record the Federal awarding agency directives and will include a covenant in the title of real property acquired in whole or in part with Federal assistance funds to assure nondiscrimination during the useful life of the project.
4. Will comply with the requirements of the assistance awarding agency with regard to the drafting, review and approval of construction plans and specifications.
5. Will provide and maintain competent and adequate engineering supervision at the construction site to ensure that the complete work conforms with the approved plans and specifications and will furmish progress reports and such other information as may be required by the assistance awarding agency or State.
6. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.
7. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.
8. Will comply with the Intergovemmental Personnel Act of 1970 ( 42 U.S.C. $\S \$ 4728-4763$ ) relating to prescribed standards for merit systems for programs funded under one of the 19 statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM's Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).
9. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act ( 42 U.S.C. $\$ \$ 4801$ et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead-based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.
10. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended ( 20 U.S.C. $\$ \$ 1681$ 1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. §794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; ( g ) $\$ \$ 523$ and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 ( 42 U.S.C. $\$ \$ 290$ dd-3 and 290 ee 3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. $\$ \$ 3601$ et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) underwhich appllcation for Federal assistance is being made; and, $(0)$ the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.
11. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal and federally-assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.
12. Will comply with the provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.
13. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the DavisBacon Act (40 U.S.C. $\$ \S 276$ a to $276 \mathrm{a}-7$ ), the Copeland Act (40 U.S.C. $\S 276 \mathrm{c}$ and 18 U.S.C. §874), and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. $\$ \$ 327-$ 333) regarding labor standards for federally-assisted construction subagreements.
14. Will comply with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is $\$ 10,000$ or more.
15. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (PL. 91 190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §\$1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clean Air) implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended (P.L. 93-523); and, (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (P.L. 93-205).
16. Will comply with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. §§1271 et seq.) related to protecting components or potential components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.
17. Will assist the awarding agency in assuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. §470), EO 11593 (identification and protection of historic properties), and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. §§469a-1 et seq).
18. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 and OMB Circular No. A-1 33, "Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations."
19. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations, and policies governing this program.
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REVENUES
OPERATING COST ASSUMPTIONS
GM Fee to GSG
GSG misc exp
NG\&N Gen Counsel

Federal Loan (BIP only)
CAPITAL EXPENDITURES
5\% 10 year term
All amounts including timing of purchase provided by WINS
DEPRECIATION USEFUL LIVES:
Network \& Access Equip
Outside Plant
Buildings
Customer Premise Equip
Billing support \& Op Sys
Op Equip
Prof Services
Other Upfront Costs
Costs for System Manager

| Operating Costsifor WINS | Year Mill |  | 5 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Annual Cost | Monthly | Annual Cost | Monthly |
| Salaries |  |  |  |  |
| CEO - Darrin Mylet | \$ 180,000 | \$ 15,000 | \$ 180,000 | \$ 15,000 |
| CTO - Jim Selby | \$ 60,000 | \$ 5,000 | \$ 90,000 | \$ 7,500 |
| COO-Scott Stevens | \$ 36,000 | \$ 3,000 | \$ 60,000 | \$ 5,000 |
| Sales \& Business Development (14 County) |  |  | \$ 80,000 | \$ 6,667 |
| CFO | \$ | \$ | \$ 60,000 | \$ 5,000 |
| Admin | \$ 36,000 | \$ 3,000 | \$ 72,000 | \$ 6 |
| Performance Bonus |  |  | \$ | \$ |
| Total | \$ 312,000 | \$ 26,000 | \$542,000 | \$ 45,167 |
| General Corporate Expenses |  |  |  |  |
| Auto Allowance CEO | \$ 12,000 | \$ 1,000 | \$ 24,000 | \$ 2,000 |
| Health Benefits | \$ 20,000 | \$ 1,667 | \$ 60,000 | \$ 5,000 |
| 401k/SEP | \$ | \$ | \$ 50,000 | \$ 4,167 |
| Sales, marketing, public relations | \$ 15,000 | \$ 1,250 | \$ 60,000 | \$ 5,000 |
| Legal | \$ 30,000 | \$ 2,500 | \$ 60,000 | \$ 5 |
| Operations contingencies | \$ 10,000 | \$ 833 | \$ | \$ |
| Support staff contingencies | \$ 10,000 | \$ 833 | \$ | \$ |
| Misc. office, telecoms, travel | \$ 15,000 | \$ 1,250 | \$ 30,000 | \$ |
| Liability Insurance | \$ 15,000 | \$ 1,250 | \$ 30,000 | \$ 2,500 |
| Total | \$ 127,000 | \$ 10,583 | \$ 314,000 | \$ 26,167 |
| Operations haidware 8 'Sofware (Nec) |  |  |  |  |
| Year 4 \& 5 Subscriber Add on mach estimates |  |  |  |  |
| Year 4 \& 5 Software and Hardware Upgrades |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |

## NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

## Revenues

Revenues were determined based on two main customer groupings: public sector and private sector. Generally, the assumption was made that public sector subscribers will purchase lesser bandwidth, but in greater volume. Private sector subscribers will purchase more bandwidth in lower volume. Both of these customer groupings were categorized into the following revenue categories:
-Best Effort Transport Only (In-Net)
-Best Effort Transport \& Internet (In-Net)
-Transport with CIR (Committed Information Rates)
The Full CIR were based on 10 Mbps dedicated unlimited in-network offering. Public sector revenues were discounted by $25 \%$ to allow for government discounted offerings.

In addition, installation revenues were included based on the aggregate number of subscribers utilizing a non-discounted rate for all customers.

## Operating Expenses

Government Authority Board expenses relate to the costs associated with managing board functions, as it relates to board meetings, production of documents, recording and legal notice of documents, and publication requirements.
The authority does not have any employees. All functions are provided on a contractual basis predicated on the management and operational needs of the authority. This includes management of the network, operations of the network, and legal counsel. General Manager expenses relate to those costs associated with management and oversight of the authority assets and network operator. WINS System/Network manager expenses relate to those costs associated with day to day operation and technical management/oversight of the network. Legal Counsel expenses relate to those costs associated with the provision of legal counsel related to board functions and action, regular operations, and potential or problem issues for the authority.

## Pre-application Expenses

Eligible expenses for the development of the Grant Application are approximately $\$ 400,000$. Full invoices and documentation will be available in Step 2, and will be incorporated into the detailed costs and financial statements at that time.

## Interest Expenses

There are two categories of interest expense:
-those related to the non RUS Bank Loan
-those related to the capital leases

## Property Taxes \& Income Taxes

The broadband authority was formed as a legal entity and public body based on Florida Statute and Interlocal agreements between multiple Florida Counties and Cities. Since the broadband authority is a government entity, it does not pay property taxes or income taxes.

## Accounts Receivable

Due to time constraints, no determination was made as to accounts receivable. Since these proformas represent enterprise operations which do not yet exist, revenues were considered paid in full within 30 days. Therefore, no value was assigned to accounts receivable.

## Capital Leases Asset \& Liability

The following items were considered capital leases: 1) Transport \$400,000 (Transport to Outside Vendor Network) and 2) IRU Backbone $\$ 540,000$ (Indefeasible Right of Use capacity)*.
*Quotes from vendors are being negotiated. Due to the complex nature and length of these negotiations, the final cost is not yet available. Firm commitment for delivery has been provided by 2 vendors, but for differing amounts of capacity, and at different locations. Negotiations include capacity and connection points, so minor changes in the configuration of the network may be made to accommodate the best value proposition. In any event, the total network costs (and the requested grant amount) will most likely come down with continued negotiation, once indications of grant award are evident.

Both of these leases are non-cancelable, and the lease term is equal to $75 \%$ or more of the estimated economic life of the leased property. The estimated economic life of the leased property totals 6 years, and the lease term for both of these items total 5 years, or $83.3 \%$ of the estimated economic life.

The depreciation period for both of these capital leases occurs over the term of the lease since the lease does not transfer ownership to the lessee. The implicit interest rate totals $10 \%$.

FASB requires the following information to be disclosed in the lessee's financial statements or in the notes:
I. The gross amount of the assets at each balance sheet date categorized by nature or function. This information may be combined with comparable information for owned assets.
(Please refer to Balance sheet for presentation)
II. Future minimum lease payments as of the latest balance sheet date, in the aggregate and for each of the five succeeding fiscal years. Separate deductions for executory costs included in the minimum lease payments and for the amount of imputed interest necessary to reduce net minimum lease payments to present value.

III. Assets recorded under capital leases and the accumulated amortization thereon shall be separately identified in the lessee's balance sheet or notes. Likewise, related obligations shall be separately identified as obligations under capital leases. Depreciation on capitalized leased assets should be separately disclosed.
(please refer to Balance sheet for presentation)

## Liabilities

The following terms pertain to the Bank Loan described in the statements:
Principal \$500,000
Term 10 year
Interest rate 6\%

## Depreciation Methods

The straight line depreciation was used for all plant, property \& equipment (assets). The following describes the various useful life periods categorized by Attachment $G$ areas:

## DEPRECIATION USEFUL LIVES:

Network \& Access Equip ..... 5
Outside Plant ..... 7
Buildings ..... 5
Customer Premise Equip ..... 5
Billing support \& Op Sys ..... 5
Op Equip ..... 7
Prof Services ..... 0
Testing ..... 5
Other Upfront Costs ..... 20

Method of Accounting
These statements were prepared in accordance with GAAP.

## 44. General Overall Budget

|  | Capital Budget Funding Source Breakdown |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Equipment Category | Loan Request | Grant Request |  | Equity |  | Debt |  |  | Bonds |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Other Funding } \\ \text { /In Kind } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | Total |  |
| Network \& Access Equipment (switching, routing transport, access) |  |  | 12,242,500 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12,242,500 |
| Outside Plant (cables, conuits, ducts, poles, towers, repeaters, etc.) |  | \$ | 6,289,576 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 6,289,576 |
| Buildings and Land - (new construction, improvements, renovations, lease) |  | \$ | 559,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 559,000 |
| Customer Premise Equipment (modems, set-top boxes, inside, wiring, etc.) |  | \$ | 6,270,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 6,270,000 |
| Billing and Operational Support Systems (IT systems, software, etc.) |  | \$ | 100,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 100,000 |
| Operating Equipment (vehicles, office equipment, other) |  |  | 1,191,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 1,191,000 |
| Engineering/Professional Services (engineering design, project management, consulting, etc.) |  |  | 3,216,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 216,000.00 |
| Testing (network elements, IT system elements, user devices, test generators, servers/computers, etc.) |  |  | 274,600 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 274,600 |
| Site Preparation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 868,000 | \$ | 868,000 |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
| Total Broadband System |  |  | 30,142,676 | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | - | \$ | 868,000 | \$ | 31,010,676 |

## Q-47 Historical Financial Statements

The North Florida Broadband Authority is a newly created government agency and as a result, has no historical financial statements.


SUBSCRIBER PROJECTION TABLE AND RATE PLANS VOICE SERVICES

COMPLETE THE CHART BELOW FOR EACH PROPOSED FUNDED SERVICE AREA. FOR ALL OTHER SERVICE AREAS, PLEASE PREPARE A CHART THAT AGGREGATES THIS INFORMATION
service area name: North FLorida - Rural ARea of CRitical Coinceni



Note: Complete a separate table for each service area.
PROJECT NAME: NORTH FLORIDA BROAD BAND AUTHORITy, UBIQUITOUS MIDDLE MICE.

## 21. Existing Broadband Service Providers and Services Offered

All applicants should conduct a competitive analysis in their proposed service area(s) to determine the level of competition that exists and to ensure that they offer competitive prices. Describe the services currently being advertised by competitors in the proposed funded service area for last mile projects or for the service areas that will receive benefits from a middle mile project. The tables on the following page are examples of how to present the information.

The North Florida Broadband Authority will serve public and private sector anchor tenants, critical community facilities and public safety institutions within our 14 County area, deemed by the State of Florida as a "Rural Area of Critical Economic Concern" or RACEC.

Our RACEC is the highest priority for the State of Florida for deployment of critical services to create sustainable progress to battle of extreme need and vulnerability. By building a ubiquitous high-capacity middle mile network covering nearly $99 \%$ of the RACEC, this Program will dramatically alter the short and long term landscape.

Through extensive research in partnership with local, county and state officials, NFBA has not been able to identify advertised middle mile connectivity with the exception of a limited "State Owned" facilities and a few "Intra-City" fiber rings, in our 14 County Region. We have concluded that our RACEC lacks access to and will not receive the benefit of middle mile infrastructure without assistance of this Program.

The North Florida Broadband Authority defines "Middle Mile" as IP transport services above $\mathrm{T} 1(1.5 \mathrm{Mbps})$ speeds with capabilities approaching 1 Gbps (1000Mbps).

Further evidence to this is supported in the attached table provided by the State of Florida. This spreadsheet indicates that nearly all the connections are T-1 and below within our RACEC. Our letters of support indicate a great demand for more robust and redundant middle mile connections, but they have not been provided by the incumbents.

There are no published rates available on the websites of the incumbents. Additionally, we made calls to Embarq and AT\&T to inquire about connectivity to specific towns and government buildings. It was apparent that the only option was an expensive and timeconsuming fiber build.

NFBA's wireless fiber middle mile solution costs a fraction of fiber while still delivering hundreds of megabits and even gigs in a matter of days. The network being constructed by NFBA will cover over 500 miles of route within the first year compared to fiber, but provides that capability in a ubiquitous fashion in any direction across the ENTIRE service area.

Our Microwave Network will offer a wide spectrum availability and extremely high capacity average capacity between 100 and 400 Mbps , with capabilities up to and including 1GBps. Microwave will be leveraged in the last mile access network to bring
broadband connectivity to a number of public safety, education, utilities and other verticals.

Microwave is a proven technology capable of providing and exceeding 99.999\% availability in running the most critical emergency voice and data services. Microwave is not subject to backhoe fades, line cuts and other failure scenarios; wireless transport solutions often exhibit superior uptime when compared to fiber.

Meanwhile, a report issued earlier this year concluded that special access charges now represent a huge chunk of incumbent telco business. The National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners found that in 1996, interstate special access charges represented less than five percent of Qwest's, Verizon's, and AT\&T's total revenue. In 2007 they represented almost 30 percent of Qwest's, nearly 25 percent of Verizon's, and close to a fifth of AT\&T's.

Although the NARUC survey identified competition in some regions, it also found market concentration to be high in most areas, while big ILEC earnings on special access are well beyond the rates set by the FCC. "In the case of AT\&T and Qwest, earnings are about three times that rate," the report said.

McKee says he could have told you that. "The rates that are being charged here are not just a little high," he complains. "This is not a question of 'oh well, you know, they're just expensive.' The rates that are being charged here are just exorbitant in comparison to what actual costs are. They're earning rates of return that are in excess of 100 percent. In AT\&T's case it's 125 percent. And that money is not only being passed on as a charge to our consumers, so it's also distorting the competitive landscape.

Please also see Attachment C - Competitor Table (Middle Mile).

## 21. Competitive Service Providers Middle Mile (ATTACHMENT C - Competitor Table)

| Service Area | Middle Mile Service Provider(s) | Technology Platform | Service Tier | Point to Point | Minimum Peak Load Network Bandwidth | Direct Internet Access Mbps | Pt to Pt or Frame Relay | Pricing |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Baker County | ILEC \& Cableco | Copper or Docsis 2.0 | Pt to Pt or Transport+Loop | Requires Multiple Carriers | $<1.5 \mathrm{Mbps}$ | DS1-DSO | 1.5M to 56K | \$3k-\$5k/mo |
| Bradford County | " |  |  | , |  | " | " | " |
| Columbia County | " | " | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Dixie County | " | " | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Gilchrist County | " | " | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Jefferson County | " | " | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Hamilton County | " | " | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Lafayette County | " | " | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Levy County | " | " | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Madison County | " | " | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Putnam County | " | " | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Suwannee County | " | " | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Taylor County | " | " | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Union County | " | " | " | " | " | " | " | " |

* no "middle mile" high speed connections offered. No single provider covering entire 14-county region.


## 21. Competitive Service Providers (Strategic Institutions -

Service Area Name: North Florida RACEC

| TYPE | SPEED (Mbps) | Total | Mbps Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| DSL | 1.5 | 4 | 6 |
| Ethernet | 1.5 | 3 | 5 |
|  | 2 | 4 | 8 |
|  | 6 | 1 | 6 |
|  | 12 | 2 | 24 |
|  | 15 | 2 | 30 |
|  | 21 | 1 | 21 |
|  | 33 | 2 | 66 |
|  | 100 | 1 | 100 |
| Fractional TDM * | 0.064 | 1 | 0 |
|  | 0.256 | 3 | 1 |
|  | 0.512 | 13 | 7 |
|  | 0.768 | 26 | 20 |
|  | 1.5 | 120 | 180 |
|  | 3 | 15 | 45 |
|  | 6 | 3 | 18 |
|  | 45 | 1 | 45 |

* Fractional TDM speed is shared $w /$ voice channels.

| CITY | TYPE | SPEED (Mbps) | Total |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Bell | Fractional TDM | 0.512 | 1 |
| Branford | Fractional TDM | 0.768 | 1 |
|  |  | 0.256 | 1 |
| Bronson | DSL | 1.500 | 1 |
|  | Ethernet | 2.000 | 1 |
|  | Fractional TDM | 1.500 | 4 |
| Cedar Key | DSL | 1.500 | 1 |
|  | Fractional TDM | 1.500 | 1 |
|  |  | 0.768 | 1 |
| Chiefland | Fractional TDM | 1.500 | 4 |
| Crescent City | Fractional TDM | 1.500 | 2 |
| Cross City | Fractional TDM | 1.500 | 2 |
|  |  | 0.512 | 1 |
| E Palatka | Fractional TDM | 1.500 | 2 |
| East Palatka | Fractional TDM | 1.500 | 1 |
|  |  | 0.768 | 1 |
| Fort White | Fractional TDM | 0.768 | 1 |
| Greenville | Ethernet | 1.500 | 2 |
|  | Fractional TDM | 1.500 | 1 |
| Hampton | Fractional TDM | 1.500 | 1 |
| Inglis | Fractional TDM | 1.500 | 1 |
| Interlachen | Fractional TDM | 1.500 | 2 |
| Jasper | Fractional TDM | 3.000 | 1 |
|  |  | 1.500 | 4 |
| Kingsley Lake | Ethernet | 0.768 | 1 |
| Lake Butler | Fractional TDM | 0.256 | 1 |
|  |  | 100.000 | 1 |
|  |  | 12.000 | 1 |
|  |  | 3.000 | 1 |
|  |  | 1.500 | 3 |
|  |  | 0.512 | 1 |
|  |  | 21.000 | 1 |
|  |  | 15.000 | 1 |
|  |  | 2.000 | 1 |
|  |  | 3.000 | 2 |
|  |  |  | 1 |


| CITY | TYPE | SPEED (Mbps) | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1.500 | 8 |
|  |  | 0.768 | 3 |
| Lawtey | Fractional TDM | 1.500 | 2 |
| Lee | Fractional TDM | 1.500 | 1 |
|  |  | 0.768 | 1 |
| Live Oak | Fractional TDM | 6.000 | 1 |
|  |  | 3.000 | 1 |
|  |  | 1.500 | 12 |
|  |  | 0.768 | 3 |
|  |  | 0.512 | 2 |
| Macclenny | Fractional TDM | 6.000 | 1 |
|  |  | 3.000 | 3 |
|  |  | 1.500 | 6 |
|  |  | 0.768 | 2 |
| Madison | DSL | 1.500 | 1 |
|  | Ethernet | 15.000 | 1 |
|  | Fractional TDM | 3.000 | 2 |
|  |  | 1.500 | 10 |
|  |  | 0.768 | 1 |
|  |  | 0.512 | 1 |
| Mayo | Fractional TDM | 3.000 | 1 |
|  |  | 1.500 | 3 |
|  |  | 0.512 | 1 |
| Monticello | DSL | 1.500 | 1 |
|  | Ethernet | 1.500 | 1 |
|  | Fractional TDM | 3.000 | 1 |
|  |  | 1.500 | 9 |
|  |  | 0.768 | 1 |
|  |  | 0.512 | 1 |
| Olustee | Fractional TDM | 0.512 | 1 |
| Palatka | Ethernet | 33.000 | 1 |
|  |  | 12.000 | 1 |
|  |  | 6.000 | 1 |
|  |  | 2.000 | 1 |
|  | Fractional TDM | 1.500 | 12 |
|  |  | 0.768 | 2 |
|  |  | 0.512 | 1 |
| Perry | Fractional TDM | 6.000 | 1 |
|  |  | 3.000 | 1 |
|  |  | 1.500 | 7 |
|  |  | 0.768 | 3 |
|  |  | 0.512 | 2 |
|  |  | 0.064 | 1 |
| Raiford | Fractional TDM | 45.000 | 1 |
|  |  | 1.500 | 3 |
| Sanderson | Fractional TDM | 1.500 | 1 |
|  |  | 0.768 | 1 |
| Sebring | Fractional TDM | 0.256 | 1 |
| Starke | Ethernet | 2.000 | 1 |
|  | Fractional TDM | 3.000 | 1 |
|  |  | 1.500 | 8 |
|  |  | 0.768 | 1 |
| Stnhtche | Fractional TDM | 0.768 | 1 |
| Trenton | Fractional TDM | 3.000 | 1 |
|  |  | 1.500 | 3 |
|  |  | 0.768 | 1 |
| Welaka | Fractional TDM | 1.500 | 1 |
| White Springs | Fractional TDM | 1.500 | 4 |
|  |  | 0.768 | 1 |
|  |  | 0.512 | 1 |
| Williston | Fractional TDM | 1.500 | 2 |
| Grand Total |  |  | 202 |

## 50. Pro-Forma 5-Year Financial Forecast and Assumptions - Statement of Cash Flows (ATTACHMENT M)

Beginning Cash
Cash Flows from Operating Activities:
Net Income
Adjustments to Reconcile Net Income to Net Cash
Provided by Operating Activities
Add: Depreciation
Add: Amortization
Changes in Current Assets and Liabilities:
Marketable Securities
Accounts Receivable
Inventory
Prepayments
Other Current Assets
Other Current Liabilities
Non Current Liabilities
Net Cash Provided (Used) by Operation

Cash Flows from Financing Activities:
Notes Receivable
Capital Leases
Notes Payable-Bank Loan
Principal Payments
New Grant
Additional Paid-in Capital/In Kind Contributions Additions to Patronage Capital Credits

Payment of Dividends
Net Cash Provided by Financing Activities
Cash Flows from Investing Activities
Capital Expenditures
Amortizable Asset (Net of Amortization) Capital Leases
Long-Term Investment
Net Cash Used by Investing Activities

Net Increase (Decrease) in Cash


## 50. Pro-Forma 5-Year Financial Forecast and Assumptions - Balance Sheet (ATTACHMENT L)

Assets
Current Assets
Cash
Accounts Receivable
Other Current Assets

NonCurrent Assets
Plant, Property \& Equipment Less: Accumulated Depreciation Net PPE

Leased Plant, Property \& Equipment Less: Accumulated Depreciation Net Leased PPE

Other

| Total NonCurrent Assets <br> Total Assets | \$ | - |  | \$ 14,031,189 |  | 21,098,793 |  | 16,746,191 | \$ 11,132,928 | \$ 5,519,666 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$ | - |  | \$ 29,031,925 | \$ | 24,813,975 |  | 21,902,815 | \$ 20,489,808 | \$ 20,574,910 |
| Liabilities and Owners Equity Liabilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Current Liabilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Accounts Payable | \$ | - | \$ | \$ - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | \$ |
| Capital Leases | \$ | - | \$ | 128,407 | \$ | 141,247 | \$ | 155,372 | \$ 170,908 | \$ |
| Current Portion-Proposed RUS Debt | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Current Portion-non RUS Debt (Bank Loan) | \$ | - | \$ | 40,210 | \$ | 42,623 | \$ | 45,180 | \$ 47,891 | \$ 50,764 |
| Other Current Liabilities | \$ | - | \$ | \$ - | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |
| Total Current Liabilities | \$ | - |  | \$ 168,617 | \$ | 183,870 | \$ | 200,552 | \$ 218,798 | \$ 50,764 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Long-Term Liabilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capital Leases Existing RUS Debt | \$ | - | \$ | 467,527 | \$ | 326,280 | \$ | 170,908 | \$ 0 | \$ |
|  | \$ | - | \$ | \$ - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposed RUS Debt | \$ | - | \$ | \$ - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | \$ |
| Existing non-RUS Debt (Bank Loan) Total Long-Term Liabilities | \$ | - | \$ | 421,856 | \$ | 379,233 | \$ | 334,053 | \$ 286,163 | \$ 235,398 |
|  | \$ | - | \$ | \$ 889,383 | \$ | 705,513 | \$ | 504,961 | \$ 286,163 | \$ 235,398 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In Kind Contributions-Government | \$ | - | \$ | 868,000 | \$ | 868,000 | \$ | 868,000 | \$ 868,000 | \$ 868,000 |
|  | \$ | - |  | \$ $(3,036,751)$ |  | $(7,086,084)$ |  | (9,813,374) | \$ (11,025,829) | \$ (10,721,929) |
| Grant Funding ${ }^{\text {Total Equity }}$ | \$ | - |  | \$ 30,142,676 |  | 30,142,676 |  | 30,142,676 | \$ 30,142,676 | \$ 30,142,676 |
|  | \$ | - |  | \$ 27,973,925 |  | 23,924,592 |  | 21,197,302 | \$ 19,984,847 | \$ 20,288,747 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \$ | - | \$ | \$ 29,031,925 | \$ | 24,813,975 | \$ | 21,902,815 | \$ 20,489,808 | \$ 20,574,910 |

## 50. Pro-Forma 5-Year Financial Forecast and Assumptions - Income Statement (ATTACHMENT K)

## Revenues

Network Service Revenues
Transport-Public
Transport-Private
Internet-Public
Internet-Private
Transport with CIR
Installation Revenues
Other Revenues

Expenses

Government Authority Board Expenses
General Manager
WINS System/Network Manager
Legal Counsel
Other Operating Expense

| Total Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | 669,400 | \$ | 1,136,850 | \$ | 1,138,364 | \$ | 1,139,922 | \$ | 1,141,528 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EBITDA | \$ | - | \$ | 66,552 | \$ | 1,459,838 | \$ | 2,958,037 | \$ | 4,456,190 | \$ | 5,954,296 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation Expense-Plant, Property \& Equipment | \$ | - | \$ | 2,916,516 | \$ | 5,265,067 | \$ | 5,456,476 | \$ | 5,456,476 | \$ | 5,456,476 |
| Amortization/Depreciation Expense Capital Leases | \$ | - | \$ | 156,787 | \$ | 156,787 | \$ | 156,787 | \$ | 156,787 | \$ | 156,786 |
| EBIT | \$ | - |  | $(3,006,751)$ | \$ | (3,962,016) | \$ | (2,655,226) | \$ | (157 073) | \$ | 341034 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Expense - New RUS Debt | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Interest Expense - Existing RUS Debt | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ |  |
| Interest Expense - Non RUS Bank Loan | \$ | - | \$ | 30,000 | \$ | 27,724 | \$ | 25,311 | \$ | 22,754 | \$ | 20,043 |
| Interest Expense - Capital Leases | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | 59,593 | \$ | 46,753 | \$ | 32,628 | \$ | 17,091 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income Before Taxes | \$ | - |  | $(3,036,751)$ |  | $(4,049,333)$ |  | $(2,727,290)$ |  | (1,212,455) | \$ | 303,900 |
|  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ |  |
| Income Taxes | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Income | \$ | - | \$ | $(3,036,751)$ | \$ | $(4,049,333)$ | \$ | (2,727,290) |  | $(1,212,455)$ | \$ | 303,900 |

## 20. Proposed Middle Mile Service Offerings (ATTACHMENT B)



* network capacity/capability will continue to build over time, service plans above reflect immediately available services based on ARRA c


## 48. Broadband Subscriber Estimates (ATTACHMENT H)

| PUBILC SECTOR SUBS | Year 1 (2010) |  |  |  | Year 2 |  |  |  | Year 3 |  |  |  | Year 4 |  |  |  | Year 5 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (more entities, less bandwidth) | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |
| Transport Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Add-ons |  |  | 28 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Cumuluative subscribers |  |  | 28 | 34 | 40 | 46 | 52 | 58 | 64 | 70 | 76 | 82 | 88 | 94 | 100 | 106 | 112 | 118 | 124 | 130 |
| Transport w/ Internet |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Add-ons |  |  | 42 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Cumuluative Subscribers |  |  | 42 | 50 | 58 | 66 | 74 | 82 | 90 | 98 | 106 | 114 | 122 | 130 | 138 | 146 | 154 | 162 | 170 | 178 |
| TOTAL CUMULATIVE SUBS |  |  | 70 | 84 | 98 | 112 | 126 | 140 | 154 | 168 | 182 | 196 | 210 | 224 | 238 | 252 | 266 | 280 | 294 | 308 |


| PRIVATE SECTOR SUBS | Year 1 (2010) |  |  |  | Year 2 |  |  |  | Year 3 |  |  |  | Year 4 |  |  |  | Year 5 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (less entities, more bandwidth) | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |
| Transport Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Add-ons |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cumuluative subscribers |  |  | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 16 | 18 | 20 | 22 | 24 | 26 | 28 | 30 | 32 | 34 | 36 |
| Transport w/ Internet |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Add-ons |  |  | 8 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Cumuluative Subscribers |  |  | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 24 | 28 | 32 | 36 | 40 | 44 | 48 | 52 | 56 | 60 | 64 | 68 | 72 | 76 |
| TOTAL CUMULATIVE SUBS |  |  | 10 | 16 | 22 | 28 | 34 | 40 | 46 | 52 | 58 | 64 | 70 | 76 | 82 | 88 | 94 | 100 | 106 | 112 |


| PUBLIC/PRIVATE SECTOR | Year 1 (2010) |  |  |  | Year 2 |  |  |  | Year 3 |  |  |  | Year 4 |  |  |  | Year 5 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (committed information rates) | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |
| Transport Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Add-ons |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cumuluative Subscribers |  |  | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 16 | 18 | 20 | 22 | 24 | 26 | 28 | 30 | 32 | 34 | 36 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AGRREGATE CUMULATIVE |  |  | 82 | 104 | 126 | 148 | 170 | 192 | 214 | 236 | 258 | 280 | 302 | 324 | 346 | 368 | 390 | 412 | 434 | 456 |


| Public Sector Market Size |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total MYFLN Subs | 369 (State and Local Enties using Old PSTN State Network-See Main) |
| Total Non MYFLN Subs | 276 (State and Local Enties not served by MYFL State Networkand/or using other facilities) |
| Private Sector Market Size |  |
| Mainstreet Broadband | 1 (12 County RUS Business Plan) |
| Medium/Large Enterprises | 274 (14 County) |
| Incumbent Providers | 54 (14 County) |
| Other New Entrants (WISP) | 10 (14 County) |

45. Detail of Project Costs (ATTACHMENT G)

Please complete the table below for the different equipment categories that will be required to complete the project. Each category should be broken down to the appropriate level for identifying unit costs.

| Service Area or Common Network Facilities | Eligibility (Yes/No) | Unit Cost | No. of Units | Total Cost | Support of Reasonableness |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Network \& Access Equipment |  |  |  |  |  |
| Switching <br> Hot Spare Switching Kits <br> Routing <br> Hot Spare Routing Kits <br> Transport <br> Transport-Turnkey Microwave Links Hot Spare Microwave Kits Transport IRU Backbone <br> Other | Y | \$ 4,000 | 168 | \$ 672,000 | Switching equipment necessary to support Layer 2 Transport |
|  | Y | \$ 4,000 | 17 | \$ 68,000 | Switching equipment necessary to support Layer 2 Transport |
|  | Y | \$ 5,900 | 168 | \$ 991,200 | Routing equipment necessary to support Layer 3 Transport |
|  | Y | \$ 5,900 | 17 | \$ 100,300 | Routing equipment necessary to support Layer 3 Transport |
|  | Y | \$ 80,000 | 5 | \$ 400,000 | Transport to Outside Vendor Networks |
|  | Y | \$ 73,500 | 126 | \$ 9,261,000 | Rapid Systems quote-Turnkey Microwave links Quote Ref \#11644 |
|  | Y | \$ 15,000 | 14 | \$ 210,000 | Hot spare for local replacement in inclement weather or electronics failure to maintain SLAs |
|  | Y | \$ 9,000 | 60 | \$ 540,000 | Exclusive unrestricted use of backbone capacity |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outside Plant |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conduits |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ducts |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poles |  |  |  |  |  |
| Towers | Y | \$ 53,133 | 72 | \$ 3,825,576 | 120 FT Towers |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other | Y | \$ 88,000 | 28 | \$ 2,464,000 | 190 FT Towers |
| Buildings |  |  |  |  |  |
| New construction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pre-Fab Huts <br> Improvements \& Renovation Other | Y | \$ 4,000 | 110 | \$ 440,000 | Supports 100 towers and 10 POPs |
|  | Y | \$ 1,750 | 68 | \$ 119,000 | Site improvements for electrical, stabilization, air conditioning and other site requirements |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Customer Premise Equipment |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inside Wiring Other | Y | \$ 10,000 | 42 | \$ 420,000 | Wire drops, electrician visits and site prep for 3 critical infrastructure facilities per county |
|  | Y | \$ 25,000 | 192 | \$ 4,800,000 | Critical Facility Microwave Links |
| Billing Support \& Operations Systems |  |  |  |  |  |
| Billing Support Systems Customer Care Systems Other Support | Y | \$ 50,000 | 1 | 50,000 | Billing software \& operations support systems |
|  | Y | \$ 50,000 | 1 | \$ 50,000 | Customer service software \& operations support systems |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating Equipment |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicles Office Equip/Furniture Other | Y | \$ 78,000 | 2 | \$ 156,000 | Bucket Truck 4x4 construction and maintenance vehicle |
|  | Y | \$960,000 | 1 | \$ 960,000 | Primary NOC Control Center |
|  | Y | \$ 25,000 | 3 | \$ 75,000 | Virtual NOC Control Center |
| Professional Services |  |  |  |  |  |
| Engineering Design Project Management Consulting Other | Y | \$ 144,000 | 9 | \$ 1,296,000 | On site engineers for deployment and turnup approval, mapping, network design for CPE |
|  | Y | \$192,000 | 8 | \$ 1,536,000 | Construction Management/Inspection network provisioning/capacity management |
|  | Y | \$ 96,000 | 4 | \$ 384,000 | Site acquisition, permitting |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Testing |  |  |  |  |  |
| Network Elements | Y | \$ 4,800 | 2 | \$ 9,600 | Intermapper license |
| IT System ElementsUser Devices | Y | \$ 30,000 | 1 | \$ 30,000 | Workstations |
|  | Y | \$ 10,000 | 2 | \$ 20,000 | Digital meters/calibrating equipment |
| Test Generators Lab Furnishings | Y | \$ 28,000 | 1 | \$ 28,000 | Spectrum analyzer |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Servers/Computers Servers/Computers | Y | \$ 3,900 | 10 | \$ 39,000 | Test work stations |
|  | Y | \$ 1,480 | 100 | \$ 148,000 | Test work stations |
| Other Upfront Costs   <br> Col   |  |  |  |  |  |
| County Land County Office Space Rights of Way | Y | \$ 10,000 | 56 | \$ 560,000 | In Kind Contribution from government |
|  | Y | \$ 12,000 | 14 | \$ 168,000 | In Kind Contribution from government |
|  | Y | \$ 10,000 | 14 | \$ 140,000 | In Kind Contribution from government |

Total $\quad \$ \mathbf{3 1 , 0 1 0 , 6 7 6}$
Math Check \$31,010,676

Network Design and Implementation Plan Certification (to be complete for projects requesting more than $\$ 1$ million in federal assistance)

## U.S. Department of Agriculture and U.S. Department of Commerce BIP and BTOP Program

We the undersigned, certify that the proposed broadband system will work as described in the System Design and Network Diagram sections, and can deliver the proposed services outlined in the Service Offerings Section. Moreover, the system, as designed, can meet the proposed build-out timeframe based on the resources designated in Project Viability Section, and will be substantially complete in two years, and complete within three years.
$\qquad$

$\frac{\text { Jim Selby }}{\text { Name: }}$


# North Florida Broadband Authority 

August 18, 2009

The Honorable Lawrence E. Strickling
Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information
National Telecommunications Information Administration
U.S. Department of Commerce

1401 Constitution Avenue, Northwest
Washington, D.C. 20230
RE: BTOP Waiver Request--North Florida Broadband Authority Project
Dear Honorable Strickling:
The North Florida Broadband Authority (NFBA or Authority) is requesting a waiver of the $20 \%$ matching funds requirement for the Broadband Technology Opportunities Program (BTOP) pursuant to Section 6001(f) of the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act of 2009 (ARRA).

The NFBA is a public body of the State of Florida created pursuant to an Interlocal Agreement between Baker County, Bradford County, the City of Cedar Key, Columbia County, the Town of Cross City, Gilchrist County, Hamilton County, Jefferson County, the City of Lake City, Levy County, the City of Live Oak, Madison County, the City of Monticello, Putnam County, Suwannee County, Taylor County, Union County, the Town of White Springs and the City of Worthington Springs. The Interlocal Agreement allows these 19 separate governmental entities located throughout the North Florida region to come together under a single charter to construct, own, and operate broadband infrastructure facilities to serve the region. This governance structure provides each of the member governments with a vote in the expenditure of any BTOP or other funds awarded to the NFBA and allows the member governments control over the deployment of broadband facilities to provide reliable, cost effective internet services for the residents and businesses in the region.

Section 288.0656(7), Florida Statutes authorizes the Governor of the State of Florida to designate rural areas of critical economic concern (RACECs) within the State comprised of communities that are struggling to maintain, support or enhance job creating activity or to generate revenues for education and other critical government services such as infrastructure, transportation and safety.

The 14 counties comprising the NFBA region -- Baker, Bradford, Columbia, Dixie, Gilchrist, Hamilton, Jefferson, Lafayette, Levy, Madison, Putnam, Suwannee, Taylor and Union - were originally designated as the North Florida Rural Area of Critical Economic Concern (NFRACEC) in 2003 by former Governor Jeb Bush. Pursuant to Executive Order Number 08132 issued by Governor Charlie Crist on June 11, 2008, the NFRACEC designation was renewed and extended based on the ongoing economic difficulties of the region. The Executive Order also establishes that the NFRACEC gets priority assignment for Rural Economic Development Initiatives, provides additional tax credits for businesses locating within the NFRACEC and allows for waivers of certain statutory requirements to encourage economic development within the NFRACEC. The RACEC designation for the NFBA region demonstrates the extraordinary needs of the citizens and businesses in these communities for educational improvements, job creation and economic development that can be spurred by the expansion of broadband facilities within the region.

In addition to being classified as a RACEC, the counties within the NFBA region are also designated as "fiscally constrained counties" pursuant to Section 218.67, Florida Statutes. Each fiscally constrained county is entitled to additional shares of State revenue sharing funds and priority for other State appropriations to help fund government operations and essential services in these economically challenged areas. The fiscally constrained designation of these communities demonstrates the financial limitations of each of the member governments to fund or obtain financing for a project of this scope. These governments are struggling daily to provide essential public services such as law enforcement, fire protection, emergency medical services, solid waste collection and disposal and transportation improvements. As a result, these governments would have to restrict funding needed for the essential public services and facilities needed by their residents in order to contribute cash towards the $20 \%$ matching requirement which is not feasible given their limited financial resources.

In an effort that was seemingly insurmountable, the region's governments have banded together to build their own community owned and operated network, and to take advantage of the opportunity presented by the Broadband Technology Opportunities Program. By creating the Authority, the member governments have expressed their desire to work together for a regional solution to the problem of limited broadband access in their communities. However, as a newly formed entity without assets, documented revenues or a demonstrated financial history the NFBA's proposed project fails traditional underwriting guidelines and is incapable of obtaining conventional financing. The attached letter from Mercantile Bank (Attachment A) provides that despite the benefits the project would bring to the citizens and businesses in the NFRACEC area, the bank was unable to approve the project for traditional financing. However, Mercantile Bank has committed to provide a Standby Letter of Credit to the NFBA to fund operating costs that are ineligible for payment with BTOP funds in the event the NFBA is awarded a broadband stimulus grant. The attached projected income statements and balance sheets also demonstrate the Authority's lack of current assets and its difficulty covering debt service obligations during the first several years of operations (Attachment B). These financial hardships should be taken into consideration in evaluating the Authority's request for a waiver of the matching requirement.

Finally, consideration should be given to the fact that unlike many other applicants for BTOP funding, the NFBA is an unaligned organization. The NFBA is a governmental entity composed entirely of local government members. This project will be accomplished through the
cooperative efforts of the member governments and the contractors and administrators employed by its Board of Directors. The Authority's revenues will be derived from charges for access to its facilities and services rather than from private investors.

While meeting all 5 of the statutory goals identified in the Notice of Funds Availability for the BTOP Program, the NFBA project will for the first time provide ubiquitous middle mile broadband internet access to residents, private entities, community anchor institutions, critical community facilities, public institutions and the business community in unserved, underserved and remote areas of North Florida in the NFRACEC. Broadband infrastructure is critical to the region and its citizens in order to provide $21^{\text {st }}$ century education, health care, public safety and business development opportunities for the communities within the NFRACEC. Availability and access to reliable, high-speed internet and other network connectivity is a critical infrastructure component necessary to attract new business and industry into the NFRACEC and to ensure that existing residents and businesses are competitive in today's state, national and global business and industrial environments. A 2008 study conducted by the Florida House of Representatives determined that expanded access to broadband facilities was one of the critical infrastructure needs of Florida's rural communities. On June 24, 2009, Florida Governor Charlie Crist signed into law Chapter 2009-226, Laws of Florida, providing that broadband internet service is critical to the economic development of rural communities in the State, including the NFBA region.

These communities are among the poorest in the nation. Five out of fourteen counties are designated Empowerment Zones. The annual income of the people in these counties stands at $33 \%$ under the national average, and these communities get poorer every year. Part of the problem with expanding middle mile facilities within the region is that the existing carriers have little economic incentive to open up existing access and build middle mile infrastructure due to the poor economy within the region. The stagnancy of the local economy is exacerbated by the inability to attract new businesses to the region due to the lack of broadband internet access. Further, the geographic expanse/terrain, poor economic climate, the current and expected prolonged recession and seasonal weather conditions within the 14 counties is difficult enough, but when you factor in the limited population in the cities and towns; there is not a large enough customer base, over which to allocate the costs of such an investment for a private carrier to receive an adequate return on their investment. Due to a lack of "Middle Mile" broadband infrastructure in the NFBA region, economic development and progress will remain stagnant with limited hope of change. The NFBA project will allow the governments within these communities to leverage grant funding to expand broadband access throughout the member communities.

The North Florida Broadband Authority believes that by acting together, these 19 local governments can create a solution that gives them a better future. Because of the region's access to public transportation via I-10 and I-75, many carriers already run transport through the area. The NFBA proposes to tap into these networks and make the middle mile access available to the area using cost-effective wireless backhaul to get the middle mile transport network in place. This will be a very cost-effective network to deploy due to the availability of access in the region. The network proposed will simply open up this access to the service providers for use to deploy cost-effective Internet to institutions and homes alike.

The need for expanded access to broadband within these communities is demonstrated by the enthusiastic support and extraordinary efforts of the leaders of the nineteen member governments
of the NFBA in establishing the Authority. This Authority began its existence in an unprecedented manner by bringing together 12 counties and 7 cities within a two week period to create a new governmental entity to strategically and systematically address the region's tremendous need for broadband access.

In addition to the support of the Authority's member governments, the NFBA's proposed middle mile broadband infrastructure project has received widespread political and community support. The Authority's application includes 65 letters of support including letters from: United States Senator Bill Nelson (Attachment C), Congressman F. Allen Boyd, Jr. (Attachment D), the Florida School Board Association, the Florida Department of State Library and Archives, as well as numerous city and county leaders, economic development agencies, educational institutions and libraries. Further, pursuant to a letter from the Chief Engineer for the Florida Department of Transportation, the State's rights of way along highway corridors will be made available to the NFBA/NFRACEC for installation of broadband infrastructure without payment of permit fees. The letter urges inclusion of the value of the State's rights of way in determining the in kind match requirement (Attachment E ).

The Authority's member governments have also joined together to provide in-kind contributions towards reaching the goal of the $20 \%$ matching funds set forth in the Program requirements. A preliminary list of in-kind contributions includes tower sites, automobiles, personnel, buildings, land and other assets needed to build the broadband infrastructure facilities. Given the short time frame in which the Authority was created and these lists were compiled, the proposed value of these assets has not been verified. A final list of in-kind assets can be made available once it is determined which of these items will be needed to fulfill the project requirements and the assets are properly valued. The final list of in-kind assets once verified and valued is expected to partially satisfy the $20 \%$ match for the project.

The North Florida Broadband Authority respectfully requests that the project be given a waiver for the $20 \%$ match requirement. Clearly given the economic conditions within the NFBA region and the unique characteristics of the NFBA as a newly created governmental entity composed of fiscally constrained cities and counties, these communities simply do not have the "cash" match to meet the $20 \%$ match requirement. The NFBA's member governments and their citizens are relying on the balance of funding for this worthwhile project to come from the federal government in the form of a grant.

The citizens of these communities deserve broadband access. The network that they plan to build and operate will allow for the cost of backhaul to be delivered at or below the national rate in urban areas. This project simply must be funded if the region is to have the same opportunities as the rest of America to thrive, create clean jobs, provide high quality education and healthcare services, and provide public safety and governmental services at the nationally acceptable levels.

We thank you in advance for your consideration.
Sincerely,


Stephen G. Fulford, Chair NFBA Board of Directors

## ATTACHMENT A

REJECTION LETTER FROM MERCANTILE BANK

## MERCANTILE BANK

August 11, 2009

Mr. Robert E. Sheets
North Florida Broadband Authority
1500 Mahan Drive, Suite 250
Tallahassee, FL 23208
Dear Mr. Sheets:
Mercantile Bank has reviewed the proposal of the North Florida Broadband Authority for the construction of Middle Mile Broadband Infrastructure Facilities to serve the North Florida Rural Area of Critical Economic Concern. The NFBA is a newly formed governmental entity established by an interlocal agreement between 13 counties and 7 cities within the RACEC, As a result, the NFBA has no demonstrated financial history or documented revenues to support an application for conventional financing. Traditional underwriting procedures would require an evaluation of the NFBA's existing assets and revenues, however, as a newly formed entity these guidelines are inapplicable to the NFBA.

While the NFBA middle mile project will provide a great value to the citizens and businesses located within the RACEC, the size of the proposed service area and the substantial capital expenditures associated with constructing the infrastructure facilities to serve the potential customer base within this area cause the project to fail financial feasibility requirements without some governmental assistance in the project financing. The debt service associated with traditional bank financing would not be supportable in the long term by the potential revenue streams, therefore we recommend consideration of alternative funding through state or federal grants.

Upon completion of the capital expenditures for construction of the infrastructure facilities and commencement of receipt of system revenues, the NFBA would become eligible for conventional funding for operating costs and additional capital expenditures through the issuance of municipal bonds or a secured line of credit.

If you should have any questions, please give me a call at 386-752-6270.
Sincerely,



Suzanne M. Norris
Market President
North Central Region

## ATTACHMENT B

PROJECTED INCOME STATEMENTS AND BALANCE SHEETS

Attachment K-Income Statement

## Revenues

Network Service Revenues
Transport-Public
Transport-Private
Internet-Pliblic
Internet-Private
Transport with CIR
Installation Revenues
Other Revenues

## Expenses

Government Authority Board Expenses General Manager
WINS System/Network Manager
Legal Counsel
Other Operating Expense
Total Revenues
Total Expe
EBITDA
Depreciation Expense-Plant, Property \& Equipment
Amorization Depreciation Expense Capital Leases Amortization/Depreciation Expense Capital Leases
Interest Expen
Interest Expens
Interest Expen
Interest Expens
Property Taxes
Income Taxes

## EBIT

Interest Expense - New RUS Debt Interest Expense-Existing RUS Debt Interest Expense - Non RUS Bank Loan Interest Expense-Capital Leases

Property Taxes Income Taxes Net Income


## Attachment L-Balance Sheet

## Assets

Current Assets
Cash
Accounts Receivable
Other Current Assets

## Total Current Assets

NonCurrent Assets
Plant, Property \& Equipment Less: Accumulated Depreciation Net PPE

Leased Plant, Property \& Equipment
Less: Accumulated Depreciation
Net Leased PPE

Other

Total NonCurrent Assets

Total Assets

## Liabilities and Owners Equity

Liabilities
Current Liabilities
Accounts Payable
Capitai Leases
Current Portion-Proposed RUS Debt
Current Portion-non RUS Debt (Bank Loan)
Other Current Liabilities

Long-Term Liabilities
Capital Leases
Existing RUS Debt
Proposed RUS Debt
Existing non-RUS Debt (Bank Loan) Total Long-Term Liabilities

In Kind Contributions-Government
Retained Earnings
Grant Funding
Total Equity
Total Liabilities and Owners Equity


## Attachment M-Statement of Cash Flows

Beginning Cash

## Cash Flows from Operating Activities:

Net Income
Adjustments to Reconcile Net Income to Net Cash
Provided by Operating Activities
Add: Depreciation
Add: Amortization
Changes in Current Assets and Liabilities:
Marketable Securities
Accounts Receivable
Inventory
Prepayments
Other Current Assets
Other Current Liabilities
Non Current Liabilities
Net Cash Provided (Used) by Operations

Cash Flows from Financing Activities:
Notes Receivable
Capital Leases
Notes Payable-Bank Loan
Principal Payments
New Borrowing \& New Grant
Additional Paid-in Capital/In Kind Contributions Additions to Patronage Capital Credits Payment of Dividends

Net Cash Provided by Financing Activities
Cash Fiows from Investing Activities
Gapital Leases
Long-Term Investments
Net Cash Used by lnvesting Activities

| Net Increase (Decrease) in Cash | \$ |  | \$ | 13,048,929 | \$ | (1,3,237,361) | \$ | (510,365) | \$ | 2,248,448 | \$ | $3,746,557$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ending Cash | \$ |  | \$ | 13,048,929 | \$ | (188,432) | \$ | (698.797) | \$ | 1.549,651 | \$ | 5,296,20 |

## Attachment K - Income Statement

## Revenues

Network Service Revenues
Transport-Public
Transport-Private
Internet-Public
Internet-Private
Transport with CIR

Installation Revenues
Other Revenues

Total Revenues

## Expenses

Government Authority Board Expenses
General Manager
WINS System/Network Manager
Legal Counsel
Other Operating Expense

Total Expenses
EBITDA

Depreciation Expense-Plant, Property \& Equipment Amortization/Depreciation Expense Capital Leases

> EBIT

Interest Expense - New RUS Debt Interest Expense. Existing RUS Debt Interest Expense - Non RUS Bank Loan Interest Expense-Capital Leases

Property Taxes income Taxes

| Income Before Taxes | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$ | . | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
|  | \$ | - | \$ | 30,000 | \$ | 27,724 | \$ | 25,311 | \$ | 22,754 | \$ | 20,043 |
|  | \$ | - | \$ | . | \$ | 59,593 | \$ | 46.753 | \$ | 32,628 | \$ | 17,091 |
|  | \$ | - | \$ | $(3,036,751)$ | \$ | (4,049,333) | \$ | (2,727,290) | \$ | (1,212,455) | \$ | 303,900 |
|  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
|  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Net Income | \$ | - | \$ | $(3,036,751)$ | \$ | $(4,049,333)$ | \$ | (2,727,290) | \$ | (1,212,455) | \$ | 303,900 |

## Attachment L-Balance Sheet

## Assets

Current Assets
Cash
Accounts Receivable
Other Current Assets

## Total Current Assets

NonCurrent Assets
Pant, Property \& Equipment Less: Accumulated Depreciation Net PPE

Leased Plant, Property \& Equipment Less: Accumulated Depreciation Net Leased PPE

Other
Total NonCurrent Assets

\[\)|  Total Assets  |
| :--- |
|  Liabilities and Owners Equity  |
|  Liabilites  |
|  Current Liabilities  |
|  Accounts Payable  |
|  Capital Leases  |
|  Current Portion-Proposed RUS Debt  |
|  Current Portion-non RuS Debt (Bank Loan)  |
|  Other Curent Liabilities  |

\]

Long-ferm Liabilities
Capital Leases
Existing RUS Debt
Proposed RUS Debt
Existing non-RUS Debt (Bank Loan)

In Kind Contributions-Government
Retained Earnings
Grant Funding
Total Long-Term Liabilities

Total Equity

Total Liabilities and Owners Equity



## ATTACHMENT C

LETTER OF SUPPORT FROM U.S. SENATOR BILL NELSON

# Hillited States Senute <br> WASHINGTON. DC 20510m0905 

```
BILLNELSON
FLORIDA
```

August 11, 2009

The Honorable Larry Strickling<br>Assistant Secretary of Commerce<br>National Telecommunications and Information Administration<br>U.S. Department of Commerce<br>1401 Constitution Avenue, Northwest<br>Washington, District of Columbia 20230

## RE: Letter of Support - Federal Broadband Infrastructure Stimulus Grant

## Dear Honorable Strickling:

I am pleased to provide this letter in support of the efforts' of the North Florida Broadband Authority (NFBA) to obtain funding under the above-mentioned grant. The goal of their proposed project is to significantly impact the expansion of, accessibility to, and affordability of an advanced broadband network throughout a 14 -county region serving Baker, Bradford, Columbia, Dixie, Gilchrist, Hamilton, Jefferson, Lafayette, Levy, Madison, Putnam, Suwannee, Taylor and Union counties. I respectfully request your consideration of this organization's application for federal stimulus funding under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA).

If funded, the broadband advancement and economic development of North Central Florida will create a sustainable regional and statewide infrastructure that interconnects Community Anchor Institutions and extends advanced broadband infrastructure into communities through Community Area Networks. We believe that NFBA will transform this rural region over the next ten and twenty years and provide the necessary communications infrastructure for current and prospective businesses and industry.

Again, I encourage your consideration of this worthy cause. If I can be of further assistance in this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me at the address below.


BN/pg
CC: Ms. Lynn Bannister, Regional Director, U. S. Senator Bill Nelson

United States Senator Bill Nelson, Landmark Two, 225 East Robinson Street, Suite 410, Orlando, Florida 32801
Telephone: (407) 872-7161 - Toll-Free in Florida Only (888) 671-4091 - Fax: (407) 872-7165 http://billnelson.senate.gov

## ATTACHMENT D

LETTER OF SUPPORT FROM CONGRESSMAN F. ALLEN BOYD, JR.

ALLEN BOYD
scecha Disinter．Fconita
CON：

## APPROPRIATIONS


Arshicitithte and Relatcia Agencies
Defense
Financial Services committee： BUDGET

# Congress of the $\mathfrak{Z a n i t e o}$ States 

馧ouse of 玉iepresentatioes
Wensfington，践 20515

Lakestes Bulionge，surge tot
 TALLMMSGEE，FL dz an

 Panama City，FL $3 \mathbf{Z} 4$ II


August 10， 2009

Mr．Robert E．Sheets
North Florida Broadband Authority
1500 Mahan Dr ，Suite 250
Tallahassee，FL 32308
Dear Mr．Sheets：
It is with much enthusiasm that I am writing in support of North Florida Broadband Authority（NFBA）on behalf of its efforts to obtain broadband stimulus funding under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 （ARRA）．

As you are well aware，much of North Florida has been designated a Rural Area of Critical Economic Concern（RACEC）．The NFBA is a regional collaboration designed to meet the essential and advanced broadband network needs of this RACEC region．I understand that NFBA covers 14 counties in the North Central Florida RACEC region．Five of those counties （Dixie，Jefferson，Lafayette，Suwannee \＆Taylor）lie within Florida＇s Second Congressional District．I know and realize，firsthand，the tremendous potential broadband would bring to this region＇s economy．

Through the NFBA，I support broadband advancement and economic development by creating a sustainable regional and statewide infrastructure that interconnects Community Anchor Institutions and extends advanced broadband infrastructure into communities though Community Area Networks．I believe that the NFBA will provide the North Central RACEC region with access to an advanced broadband infrastructure，aiding in meeting the challenges of our new information economy．

1 truly believe this is a worthy project that exemplifies exactly the intentions of the ARRA legislation．A broadband network infrastructure in this area stands to bring countless opportunities to already－established small businesses as well as larger businesses looking for a new area in which to expand．I gladly lend my support to the North Florida Broadband Authority as they see this project to fruition．

## Sincerely，



AB：th

ATTACHMENT E
LETTER OF SUPPORT FROM FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

# Florida Department of Transportation 

CHARLIE CRIST GOVERNOR

605 Suwannee Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450

STEPHANIE C. KOPELOUSOS
SECRETARY

August 17, 2009

Mr. David J. Villano
Assistant Administrator, Telecommunications Program
Rural Utilities Service
United States Department of Agriculture
Rural Development
Washington, DC 20250-1500
Dear Mr. Villano:
Please accept this letter as an expression of support from the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) for the Opportunity Florida ${ }^{1}$ / North Florida Economic Development Partnership ${ }^{2}$ / Florida's Heartland Rural Economic Development Initiative ${ }^{3}$ application for the Rural Utilities Service Broadband Initiatives Program. These three Rural Areas of Critical Economic Concern, designated by the Governor of Florida, have come together to pursue funding to help deploy a regional broadband network in the three rural regions of Florida. By providing much needed communications infrastructure to the twenty eight rural counties, opportunities for economic development will increase and quality of life will improve in rural Florida.

Currently, Sections 337.401-337.404, Florida Statutes and Rule 14-46.001, Florida Administrative Code allow communication lines access along the State Highway System, other than limited access right-ofways. ${ }^{4}$ All utility owned facilities on Florida Department of Transportation rights-of-way must be authorized by permit and all utility design work, to the extent allowed by Florida law, must comply with FDOT requirements. As long as each rural county submits permits with designs in accordance with the current FDOT Utility Accommodation Manual, the Florida Department of Transportation will issue the necessary permits.

## Intrinsic Value and Stability of State Right-of Way

According to a report issued by the Federal Highway Administration to Congress in $2007^{5}$, using a state department of transportation as a right-of-way provider eliminates some risks that would otherwise accompany having a private entity as the right-of-way providers. The risk of bankruptcy of the right-of-way provider and potential rejection of the right-of-way agreement by the bankruptcy party is much lower when the provider is a governmental entity. To the extent the right-of-way grant can be made in the form of an

[^0]Mr. David J. Villano
August 17, 2009
Page two
easement, the telecommunications company partner enjoys even greater stability of the right-of-way grant under state property laws.

## Value of State Right-of-Way

Due to drastic differences in rural land values across the state and the lack of exact corridor alignments, right-of-way values reflective of the specific corridors are not avallable at this time. Recognizing Florida Statutes allow utilities (including telecommunications/broadband) to be placed on non-limited access right-of-way without a permit fee, utility applicants are not required to purchase easements from adjacent landowners. In comparison, some states require applicants to purchase such easements for locating utilities and/or pay a permit fee to the state.

Fortunately, this cost will not be incurred by the applicant if they comply with Rule 14-46, Florida Administrative Code and the FDOT Utility Accommodation Manual when designing their facilities. Therefore, for purposes of valuing the necessary right-of-way for this project, one may assume this cost alleviation/avoidance to the applicant as the Florida Department of Transportation's in-kind match for the Broadband Initiatives grant application.

Thank you for initiating this effort to help strengthen the information infrastructure across rural America. In addition to the direct benefits to the rural areas, such a project would increase the Department's future opportunities to co-locate Inteligent Transportation Systems (ITS) in state-owned right-of-way in these rural counties. For these reasons, the Florida Department of Transportation is committed to serving as a key partner in meeting the challenge of rapidly expanding the access and quality of broadband services in rural Florida.


BB/mwc
Copies: Stephanie Kopelousos
Kevin Thibault
Debbie Hunt


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Northwest Rural Area of Critical Economic Concern
    ${ }^{2}$ North Central Rural Area of Critical Economic Concern
    ${ }^{3}$ South Central Rural Area of Critical Economic Concern
    ${ }^{4}$ FDOT Utility Accommodation Manual
    http://www2.dot.state.fl.us/proceduraidocuments/procedures/bin/710020001/Chapter-1.pdf
    ${ }^{5}$ Rural Interstate Corridor Communications Study Report to Congress - August 2007, page 116
    http://ops,fhwa.dot.gov/int its deployment/rural/congrpt0807/report to congress.pdf

