

Nebraska Public Service Commission  
Nebraska Internet Enhancement Fund  
Application Form

**Date:**

**Project Title:**

**Submitting Entity:**

**Grant Amount Requested:**

**Project Contact Information**

(Please include: Name, Title, Address, Telephone Number, Fax Number and E-mail Address.)

**Party Who Prepared Application**

(Please include: Name, Title, Address, Telephone Number, Fax Number and E-mail Address.)

**Executive Summary**

Provide a one to two paragraph summary of the proposed project. Within this summary identify the segment of the population and approximate number of people that will benefit from the project, as well as the geographic area that will be served by the project. Please identify any other information that may assist the Commission in reviewing the application. This summary will be used in other externally distributed documents and should therefore clearly and succinctly describe the project.

The Commission and the Advisory Board reserve the right to request additional information deemed necessary to properly evaluate the application.

### Goals, Objectives and Outcomes

1. Provide a detailed project plan, including:
  - Describe the overall goals and purpose of the project;
  - A problem statement and needs assessment including any high-cost factors (e.g. population scarcity location remoteness, financial need, etc.)
  - Describe the internet service currently available to the community. (e.g. Dial-up, Cable, Satellite, Wireless or DSL) and what if any efforts have been previously made to obtain said services;
  - Describe the expected outcome of this project; and
  - Describe the economic viability and sustainability of the Project. For example, provide any estimated demand for the proposed services, the rates to be charged to the user for the service, etc.

(30 points)

### Project Justification

2. Explain how the proposed project supports one or more of the goals of the fund by describing how the project:
  - Would alleviate additional costs associated with providing internet and advanced telecommunications services due to population scarcity, location remoteness and other considerations of geographic context.
  - Would provide communities that demonstrate a need with the resources required to carry out projects that will provide or improve access to Internet and advanced telecommunications services.
  - Support projects that will provide the most benefit to the community by furthering or enhancing one or more of the following purposes: rural development, economic development, education or telemedicine.

(10 points)

3. Describe the expected benefits (both tangible and intangible) of the proposed project. If applicable, include any economic benefits or long-term cost savings. (5 points)

### Technical Impact

4. Identify the service provider and Internet technology selected for this project and explain why these choices were made. (5 points)

5. Address any technical issues with the proposed technology including but not limited to, conformity with generally accepted industry standards; whether project will interface with other state systems; compatibility with existing institutional and/or statewide infrastructure; and reliability, security and scalability (future needs for growth or adaptation). (5 points)
6. Provide terms and conditions of any agreement between the applicant and the service provider or other vendor for the project. (A copy of the contract would be sufficient.) (5 points)

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

7. Describe the project sponsor(s) and stakeholder acceptance. If letters of support are included, list the entities or individuals submitting letters of support and briefly summarize the letter's content. Include information on any matching funds being provided by project sponsors. (5 points)
8. Describe the project team, including their roles, responsibilities, and experience. (5 points)
9. List the major milestones and a timeline for completing each milestone. (5 points)
10. Describe the project's evaluation plan, including measurement and assessment methods that will verify project outcomes. (10 points)

Financial Analysis and Budget (20 points)

The budget will be scored on reasonableness (up to 10 points), mathematical accuracy (up to 5 points), and the strength and appropriateness of the match (up to 5 points).

Provide the following financial information:

	NIEF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	Total
Personnel					
Contractual Services					
Start up Expenses and Capital Expenditures (Hardware, software, etc.)					
Supplies and Materials					
Telecommunications					
Training					
Travel					
Other costs					
<b>Total</b>		<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>		<b>C</b>

Match Percent = \_\_\_\_\_

Match Requirement: This grant requires a 25% match. Please calculate your match by using the formula below to ensure your application meets this requirement:

$$\frac{\text{Total Cash Match (A) + Total In-Kind Match (B)}}{\text{Total Project Cost (C)}} \geq .25$$

## Financial Narrative Notes and Instruction

Several categories (see below) require further itemization.

1. Please include estimated number of hours or full-time equivalent (FTE) by position. Include separate totals for salary and fringe benefits. If it is necessary to itemize on a separate sheet, include only the subtotal in this table.
2. Please itemize other contractual expenses on a separate sheet. Please provide a copy of any contracts or agreements with any service provider or vendor or in the alternative provide detailed description of terms and conditions of any contract or agreement.
3. Please itemize capital expenditures by categories (hardware, software, network, and other) on a separate sheet.
4. Please itemize other operating expenses on a separate sheet.
5. Please indicate the source of any cash match.
6. Please indicate the source of any in-kind match and how it will be documented.
7. Please provide a breakdown of any other external funding sources. Sources of external funds may include grants from federal agencies or private foundations.

Please keep supporting documentation to a minimum. For example, rather than including a printout of a quotation from a vendor for a specific piece of equipment, include all relevant information in the budget narrative.

Nebraska Public Service Commission  
Nebraska Internet Enhancement Fund

Scoring Sheet

Application #:

Project Title:

Submitting Entity:

Reviewer:

---

**Review Score**

	<b>Score</b>	<b>Maximum</b>
Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes		30
Project Justification		15
Technical Impact		15
Preliminary Plan for Implementation		25
Financial Analysis and Budget		20
<b>Total</b>		<b>105</b>

After completing the review, return this scoring sheet to Angela Melton as an e-mail attachment in Microsoft Word format to [amelton@mail.state.ne.us](mailto:amelton@mail.state.ne.us). Please contact Angela Melton via email or at 402-471-0274 if you have any questions.

## GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES (30 Points)

1. Applicants were asked to describe the project, including problem statement and needs assessment, high-cost factors, goals, start-up expenses and the current state of the community's access to internet services.
  - A. How well do the project's problem statement, needs assessment and high-cost factors describe the need for this project?
    - 5... Excellent! There is a well-defined need.
    - 4... Very Good.
    - 3... Average.
    - 2... Minimally defined.
    - 1... Poorly defined.
    - 0... No information provided.
  - B. How appropriate and well-defined are the project goals and purpose?
    - 5... Excellent! Project goals are well-defined and very appropriate.
    - 4... Very Good.
    - 3... Average.
    - 2... Minimally defined and/or appropriate.
    - 1... Poorly defined and/or inappropriate.
    - 0... No information provided.
  - C. How does the current state of the community's access to Internet services indicate a need for this project?
    - 5... Excellent! There is a well-defined need.
    - 4... Very Good.
    - 3... Average.
    - 2... Minimally defined.
    - 1... Poorly defined.
    - 0... No information provided.
  - D. How appropriate and well-defined are the expected outcomes for this project?
    - 5... Excellent! Expected outcomes are well-defined and very appropriate.
    - 4... Very Good.
    - 3... Average.
    - 2... Minimally defined and/or appropriate.
    - 1... Poorly defined and/or inappropriate.
    - 0... No information provided.
  - E. How well is sustainability after this grant addressed?
    - 10... Excellent plan for sustaining the project.
    - 9....

- 8... Very Good plan for sustaining the project.
- 7...
- 6... Average plan for sustaining the project.
- 5...
- 4... Weak plan for sustaining the project.
- 3...
- 2... Inadequate plan for sustaining the project.
- 1....
- 0... No information provided.

Section Score:

Reviewer Comments:

### PROJECT JUSTIFICATION (15 Points)

2. How well does the proposed project support one or more of the following funding priorities?
  - Would alleviate additional costs associated with providing internet and advanced telecommunications services due to population scarcity, location remoteness and other considerations of geographic context.
  - Would provide communities that demonstrate a need with the resources required to carry out projects that will provide or improve access to Internet and advanced telecommunications services.
  - Support projects that will provide the most benefit to the community by furthering or enhancing one or more of the following purposes: rural development, economic development, education or telemedicine.
  - 10... Right on! The project STRONGLY support all funding priorities.
  - 9... Excellent! The project strongly supports most funding priorities.
  - 8... Very good!. Project strongly supports at least one of the funding priorities.
  - 7... Good.
  - 6... Fairly good.
  - 5... Average.
  - 4... Not quite average.
  - 3... Project minimally supports all priorities.
  - 2... Project minimally supports some priority.
  - 1... Poor.
  - 0... Why is this project even being considered?
  
3. Evaluate the expected benefits (both tangible and intangible) of the proposed project.
  - 5... Excellent! Project provides clear benefits.
  - 4... Very Good.

- 3... Average.
- 2... Minimally defined or unrealistic benefits.
- 1... Poorly defined or unrealistic benefits.
- 0... No information provided.

Section Score:

Reviewer Comments:

## TECHNICAL IMPACT (15 Points)

4. Are the hardware, software, and communications requested appropriate for the project and its stated objectives?
- 5... Perfectly appropriate! (or “not applicable” and justification is acceptable).
  - 4... Very Appropriate.
  - 3... Appropriate.
  - 2... Minimally appropriate.
  - 1... Not appropriate.
  - 0... No information provided (or “not applicable” and justification is NOT acceptable).
5. If necessary, are technical issues regarding conformity with generally accepted industry standards, compatibility with existing institutional and/or statewide infrastructure; and reliability, security, and scalability adequately addressed?
- 5... I have NO concerns regarding conformity; compatibility; and reliability, security, and scalability.
  - 4... I have minimal concerns regarding conformity; compatibility; and reliability, security, and scalability.
  - 3... I have possible concerns regarding conformity; compatibility; and reliability, security, and scalability.
  - 2... I have concerns regarding conformity; compatibility; and reliability, security, and scalability..
  - 1... I see a definite problem regarding conformity; compatibility; and/or reliability, security, and scalability..
  - 0... No information provided (or “not applicable” and justification is NOT acceptable).
6. How appropriate and well-planned are the terms and conditions of any agreement between the applicant and the service provider or other vendor for the project?
- 5... Perfectly appropriate and well-defined! (or “not applicable” and justification is acceptable).
  - 4... Very Appropriate and well-defined.
  - 3... Appropriate.
  - 2... Minimally appropriate.
  - 1... Not appropriate or poorly defined.
  - 0... No information provided (or “not applicable” and justification is NOT acceptable).

Section Score:

Reviewer Comments:

PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION (25 Points)

7. Does the project have the necessary support from sponsor(s) and stakeholder(s)?
- 5... Very strong support from sponsors and stakeholders..
  - 4... Strong support from sponsors and stakeholders.
  - 3... Adequate support from sponsors and stakeholders.
  - 2... Weak support from sponsors and/or stakeholders.
  - 1... Inadequate support from sponsors and/or stakeholders.
  - 0... No information provided.
8. Is the project team appropriate?
- 5... Extremely strong project team.
  - 4... Strong project team.
  - 3... Average project team.
  - 2... Weak project team.
  - 1... Inadequate project team.
  - 0... No information provided.
9. Are the timeline and listing of milestones realistic and appropriate?
- 5... Very detailed and realistic timeline and milestones.
  - 4... Detailed and realistic timeline and milestones.
  - 3... Adequate timeline and milestones.
  - 2... Weak timeline and milestones.
  - 1... Inadequate timeline and milestones.
  - 0... No information provided.

10. How appropriate and well-planned is the evaluation plan (including measurement and assessment methods that will verify project outcomes)?

- 10... Excellent plan for evaluating the project.
- 9....
- 8... Very good plan for evaluating the project
- 7...
- 6... Adequate plan for evaluating the project.
- 5...
- 4... Weak plan for evaluating the project.
- 3...
- 2... Inadequate plan for evaluating the project.
- 1...
- 0... No information provided.

Section Score:

Reviewer Comments: FINANCIAL ANALYSIS AND BUDGET (20Points)

Based upon the financial and budget information provided in Section IX, score this section as provided below.

What is your level of confidence that the budget is reasonable?

- 10...High.
- 9...
- 8...
- 7...
- 6...
- 5... Moderate.
- 4...
- 3...
- 2...
- 1...
- 0... Low.

How strong and appropriate do you feel the match is?

- 5... Match is very strong and appropriate.
- 4... Match is strong and appropriate.
- 3... Match is adequate.
- 2... Match is weak.
- 1... Match is very weak.
- 0... Match is not appropriate and very weak.

The Advisory Board and/or Commission staff will score the mathematical accuracy of the budget (additional 5 points)

Section Score:

Reviewer Comments on Budget:

Overall Reviewer Comments: