QUESTION: My question is what if you do a full PFA and there is an ILEC in between but no other PFA's is that considered contiguous? Also are you able to parts of a contiguous PFA that is only Contiguous to the part and not the wholly built PFA?
ANSWER: Yes, PFAs are contiguous if there is no other PFA between the two in question. Many PFAs are surrounded or separated by served locations. In your example, if the ILEC were another PFA, then the primary PFA would be non-contiguous with the additional parts of the other PFAs. Applicants must submit separate applications for any non-contiguous Project Funding Area. *See question from FAQ 10/22. Question: Do PFAs have to share physical geographical borders in order to be considered contiguous? Answer: PFAs are lists of eligible locations, thus there is no physical border. KOBDs definition of a contiguous PFA is that is possible to reasonably traverse from one location in a PFA to another location in another PFA without passing a location in a separate PFA not being considered in the application.*

QUESTION: Now that there has been more alternative technology guidance since the original Kansas proposals, can we identify alternative technology options for a small subset of passings to reduce the overall cost, similar to Coloardo?
ANSWER: Yes, a combination of technologies may be proposed. The application portal is the same for all technology. The applicant will need to describe the technology used as including "other." Source: Project-Application-GuideKOBD, Page 17.

QUESTION: In all prior Kansas grant submissions, Kansas had requested we include all capital costs whether we were asking for subsidy or not. In that, we've included CPE, drops and install costs in the past and then put $0 subsidy requested/100% match. For BEAD, the standard KOBD template wasn't included for costs. Thus, do you want all capital costs to be included in the application even if we aren't seeking subsidy or use our match for those costs?
ANSWER: Yes, it is important to enter all project costs. Application item #137 Total Project Cost is the dollar amount of all project costs. Separately, "#139 Net Requested Grant Amount is automatically calculated as Total Project Cost minus Match Amount, which already includes the Waiver Amount." In addition to the total cost, the applicant will enter: "#140 Match Amount is the dollar amount of matching funds, including any waiver amount. Remember to include the Waiver Amount as part of the Match Amount entered." More details about project cost are required in the uploads for #149 Technical Capability.

QUESTION: I would like to make sure that I understand how KOBD will score the "Minimal BEAD Outlay" for a PFA. Is the statement in the 10/17 FAQ that "KOBD defines "total cost to serve" as "the total cost to serve only using the federal dollars requested in the application" and the illustration (set forth immediately below) accurate, such that the numerator in the "cost per passing" is the "Net Requested Grant Amount" identified in item 139 of the application guide? When computing the cost per passing for the Minimal BEAD Outlay, what locations count as passings (i.e., what is included in the denominator)?
ANSWER: The Total Project Cost is different than the Net Requested Grant Amount. As described in the Project Application Guide, #137a. Minimal BEAD Program Outlay is

"based on the total cost to serve a proposed funding area. The most cost-efficient applications will receive the maximum 50 points, and the highest total cost of that same PFA will receive zero points. All applications that fall between the highest and lowest cost will receive points that are proportionately applied. Only the Total Project Cost is broken down by Project Funding Area. Separately, the portal calculates the Net Requested Grant Amount (#139) of the entire application, which KOBD can use to compare materially identical applications, in accordance with the NTIA NOFO."

In accordance with section 2.4.6 of Volume 2, "For overlapping proposals, the same Scoring Criteria for Priority Broadband Projects and Other Last-Mile Broadband Deployment Projects will be employed and only like-to-like comparisons will be made (i.e., Priority Broadband Projects will not be compared to Other Last-Mile Broadband Deployment Projects). If there are conflicting overlapping proposals that use the same technology, the first consideration will be the cost per location and the second consideration will be the match amount offered."

NTIA NOFO, p21: "If the Eligible Entity is considering competing proposals that are materially identical, and one includes a higher proposed total cost but a larger match, whereas the other includes a lower proposed total cost and smaller match, the key consideration for comparative purposes is the amount of the subsidy required, not the proportion of the stated cost that the prospective subgrantee is willing to match."

Total Project Cost would be broken down by locations only for the purposes of applying the Extremely High-Cost Threshold requirements outlined in sections 2.4.9 and 2.4.10 of Volume 2.