Public Service Commission of Wisconsin

Rebecca Cameron Valcq, Chairperson
Tyler Huebner, Commissioner
Summer Strand, Commissioner

4822 Madison Yards Way
P.O. Box 7854
Madison, WI 53707-7854

July 17, 2023

To Whom it May Concern:

Re: Broadband and Digital Equity Planning   5-BP-2023

Comments Due:	Address Comments To:
Monday, August 7, 2023 - 1:30 P.M.	**Joe Fontaine, Administrator**
	Public Service Commission
This docket uses the Electronic Records Filing system (ERF).	P.O. Box 7854
	Madison, WI 53707-7854

The **Internet for All Wisconsin Listening Tour Summary Report** is being provided to the public for comment. Comments must be received by 1:30 P.M. on Monday, August 7, 2023. Comments must be filed using the Commission's ERF system. The ERF system can be accessed through the Public Service Commission's web site at http://psc.wi.gov. Members of the public may file comments using the ERF system or by mail at the Public Service Commission, 4822 Madison Yards Way, P.O. Box 7854, Madison, WI 53707-7854.

Please direct questions about this docket or requests for additional accommodations for persons with a disability to the Commission's docket coordinator, Matthew Marcus at (608) 575-1509 or matthew.marcus@wisconsin.gov.

Sincerely,

Joe Fontaine
Administrator
Division of Digital Access, Consumer and Environmental Affairs

JF:TK:AK:MM:JL:kle DL:01955225

Attachment: Internet for All Wisconsin Listening Tour Summary

Internet for All Wisconsin Listening Tour Summary

In the spring of 2023, the State of Wisconsin Public Service Commission (PSC) held the Internet for All Wisconsin Listening Tour, a series of nine in-person and two virtual interactive meetings designed to help develop the state 5- year BEAD Action Plan and Digital Equity Plan.

The Listening Tour events were held in the following locations:

In person		
Date	*Location*	*Attendance*
Monday, May 8 1:00-3:00p.m.	UW Stout Memorial Student Center Menomonie	25
Tuesday, May 9 8:30-10:30a.m.	Seven Winds Casino Lodge and Conference Center Hayward	24
Tuesday, May 9 2:30-4:30p.m.	The Pines Event Center Rhinelander	36
Tuesday, May 9 1:00-3:00p.m.	Milwaukee 7 Partnership for Economic Development Milwaukee	9
Monday, May 15 1:00-3:00p.m.	La Crosse Public Library La Crosse	25
Friday, May 19 10:00a.m.-12:00p.m.	Fox Valley Technical College - Appleton Appleton	22
Tuesday, May 23 9:00-11:00a.m.	Madison College Truax Campus Madison	26
Tuesday, May 23 1:00-3:00p.m.	Platteville Public Library Platteville	24
Thursday, June 1 3:00-5:00p.m.	Mid-State Technical College Wisconsin Rapids	28
Virtual		
Date	*Location*	*Attendance*
Monday, May 22 6:00-7:30p.m.		33
June 6 8:30-10:00a.m.		72
Online Survey		Responses
Available May 1 – July 1		41

The PSC held these events after consulting with Wisconsin's nine regional economic development partners about the best way to engage local citizens. The events featured remarks from a representative from the regional economic development partner, a video from Governor Evers, and a welcome from a PSC Commissioner. Governor Evers attended the La Crosse event in person.

Combined attendance across all sessions totaled more than 300. Attendees included elected officials, local government, non-profit organizations, representatives from internet service providers, and citizens. PSC staff gave a brief presentation at each event, and then participants moved to small group discussions. The participants discussed the following questions in their small groups:

- Why did you decide to attend the listening tour event?
- What barriers exist to providing access to high speed broadband for all homes and businesses within the state of Wisconsin?
- What would success look like for the people, businesses and organizations if Wisconsin had Internet for All?
- In locations where broadband infrastructure is not an issue, what other challenges exist to the everyday use of the internet?
- What can the Wisconsin Broadband Office do to facilitate making high-speed broadband available for all homes and businesses in the state?

At the in-person events, after discussing the questions, the attendees used stickers to assign priority to various themes that emerged throughout the discussion; that exercise informs this report. In addition to the in-person events throughout the state, the PSC hosted two virtual events and made a short online survey available for member of the public unable to attend the scheduled event times.

Wisconsin's Connected Future

Listening Tour participants were excited to share their vision for a connected future with PSC staff. Participants shared the various ways full internet access and adoption would improve their lives, or the lives of those they serve. Among the most common positive outcomes were:

access to telehealth and improved health outcomes, the ability to age in place, remote work opportunities and participation in a global marketplace, increased tourism and rural economic development, and educational opportunities.

[Telehealth and improved health outcomes] Improved health outcomes were repeatedly mentioned as a positive outcome of a connected Wisconsin. Participants spoke out about the desire to access telehealth services. Particularly in rural areas, staff heard that telehealth provides a much more convenient, accessible option as opposed to driving to an appointment in another town or city. Participants were excited about improved health outcomes throughout the state as a result of more citizens utilizing telehealth services.

[Aging in place] Participants also spoke of the ability to age in place as a benefit of full internet access and adoption. Many participants emphasized their love for where they chose to live, and a desire to stay in that location as they age. They shared that many services available through the internet will enable them to stay in their homes, including telehealth, delivery services and more.

[Remote work opportunities and participation in a global marketplace] Many participants spoke of remote work opportunities as a benefit of a connected Wisconsin. The ability to get online allows residents to have access to more job opportunities, regardless of their geographic location. Residents who want to work from home will be able to take advantage of the growing number of work from home opportunities. Additionally, staff heard that citizens could start small businesses and market their goods and services online regardless of where they were located in the state. Some participants found this ability to participate in a global marketplace to be one of the most exciting aspects of a connected Wisconsin.

[Increased tourism and rural economic development] Participants were clear that tourism would increase as a result of a more connected state. Rural communities without internet would see more tourism if visitors were able to use the internet. Visitors may even stay longer if they were able to work remotely from a location with internet access. Rural economic development is an added benefit of an online population. More rural citizens would be likely to open businesses

if they could advertise and sell online. Rural economic development and increased tourism go hand in hand.

[Educational opportunities] Access to online educational opportunities was frequently cited as a benefit of a more connected state. The COVID-19 crisis taught us that citizens should be able to access education from their homes if needed. Remote educational opportunities would also help those that might not otherwise be able to get advanced educations have opportunities to seek higher education. The ability to get a higher education from home on one's own time would be a benefit of a fully connected state.

Barriers and Considerations

[Cost of broadband subscriptions] Listening Tour participants overwhelmingly cited the cost of broadband subscriptions as the foremost barrier to equitable access and adoption of high-speed broadband. Many shared that this high cost was often due to having only a single internet service provider option and that lack of competition leads to inflated subscription prices in their area, often for a service with inadequate speed offerings. Consumer participants noted a lack of interest by providers to build needed broadband infrastructure in areas of the state where it is more challenging and expensive to install and provide services. Some participants speculated that this may be due to limited profit margins for providing service in these areas. Providers shared that for some small to mid-sized providers, having sufficient upfront capital expenditure to undertake these expensive infrastructure builds is a substantial barrier, as well as ongoing maintenance costs which cannot be funded by certain government grants.

More broadly, participants shared that cost is a challenge across the state even where there is more than one option with some existing market competition. Many households and individuals shared that broadband subscriptions are often relegated to a lower priority for lower income households, where housing, food, childcare, and healthcare costs often take precedence. Many acknowledged that existing broadband subscription subsidies are impactful but felt not enough people were enrolled due to simply not knowing about the benefit or experiencing challenges when attempting to enroll. Participants also brought up trust issues, noting apprehension with provider pricing and felt there was limited transparency regarding subscription price tiers and

associated fees, as well as uncertainty about the sustainability or permanence of the Affordable Connectivity Program (ACP) subscription discount.

[Business case and financial challenges, Location and Geography] At all the Listening Sessions, barriers associated with geography were repeatedly mentioned. Challenging topography increases the cost of building broadband infrastructure and often deters providers from pursuing high-cost locations in these areas. These communities are often left unserved or underserved with inadequate broadband service due to outdated technology and/or deteriorating network components, or no service at all. The other geographical theme that arose repeatedly was the lack of high-speed broadband access due to living in a rural area with low population density. Low population density areas may also have higher upfront capital costs and providers often see less return on their investment in these areas. These challenges can be characterized as geography barriers, but topography and population density are barriers due to the costs required to connect. Many participants acknowledged that the core issue related to geography and population density is the minimal return on investment for providers, at least over a near term time horizon.

[Workforce and Labor] Organizations that work towards increased broadband connectivity and digital equity noted that financial barriers impeded much of their work, specifically lacking workforce capacity to apply for grants and administer the respective programs. Providers and private-sector participants across all of the Listening Tour sessions noted their challenges with finding and retaining an adequate labor force across all positions, but particularly roles related to construction of infrastructure.

[Infrastructure, technology, and Supplies (access + adoption)] Infrastructure or lack thereof is often directly connected to the reality of return-on-investment projections for specific regions. Providers noted that the lack of infrastructure was also due to the rising costs of materials and supply chain delays. End-user technology and supplies were highlighted as a challenge from both subscribers and users, the latter not having access to the needed devices and equipment. Providers shared that subscribers' outdated end-user equipment – routers and devices – often hampered the broadband service delivered to households.

[Data accuracy and availability of information (outreach and delivery of info for adoption)] A recurring theme related to barriers to access and adoption was lack of information and inaccurate or missing data. Many participants explicitly called out the inaccuracy of broadband availability maps, both in the data that describes broadband performance levels and that identifies which locations have access to broadband service. Participants also expressed frustration with the challenge process established by the Federal Communications Commission to build the most recent version of the Broadband Serviceable Location Fabric, which informs the allocation of Broadband Equity, Access, and Deployment Program (BEAD) funds to states. Beyond accuracy of data and maps, participants felt there was a lack of clear information from both governments and providers, primarily a lack of transparency as well as limited outreach and messaging. Participants stated that many providers were hard to engage, that data and information sharing was limited, and that pricing and subscription packages were often unclear to consumers. Some expressed that local, state and federal government outreach and messaging around grant programs, opportunities for feedback, and education about ongoing developments related to broadband were lacking.

[Education, outreach, digital skills, and personal barriers] Participants were clear that there are several barriers beyond physical access, technology, and cost. Broadly it was noted that a lack of digital skills was an impediment for many when trying to access the internet successfully. Staff heard that particularly for older populations, there is often a limited knowledge of key digital skills and limited digital education opportunities. For all specific communities and groups across the state, participants highlighted a need for tailored digital education and technical support to meet each community's needs, including multilingual support and accessibility measures.

Another challenge faced by both providers and those working to connect specific communities is understanding the specific internet use cases across the state – more specifically understanding why certain groups are uninterested in adopting available broadband services. In these scenarios, often the core issue is education about the benefits of broadband access based on the specific needs of each individual, though participants noted limited capacity to overcome the barriers of some populations through outreach and education.

[Status quo/resistance to change: existing policy, leaders, partnerships, and providers]
Participants noted some resistance to change from leaders in government and providers.
Participants expressed that many elected officials face a knowledge gap when it comes to
broadband access and digital equity issues. Staff heard perspectives that local governments
shouldn't be expected to provide services provided by private companies in a private market,
while others expressed that broadband should be regulated as a utility because it is essential to
fully participate in society. Additional points were made regarding current policies and
requirements from federal and state grant programs such as challenging timelines and limitations
on the allowable use of grant funds.

[Trust and Security] Relatedly, many participants expressed that some populations do not trust
providers for technical assistance and generally do not feel secure accessing the internet. This
lack of trust can stem from many places – fear of security or surveillance, concern about personal
security, and fear of hackers or online scams. Cyber security concerns were highlighted
numerous times and the need for increased education and resources for all populations in the
state to have the correct skills and knowledge to feel safe online.

Role of the Wisconsin Broadband Office
[***Communication, learning, messaging, guidance, tech assistance***] A thread that ran through
all the Listening Sessions was the expressed need for increased and more effective
communication to all stakeholders, particularly with the public. Participants noted a need for
more robust messaging around grant program opportunities, guidance, and technical assistance
that is available. Staff heard that the Wisconsin Broadband Office (WBO) maintains a high
level of transparency, but that clearer messaging and consistent guidance regarding grant
programs would be a positive step forward. Participants highlighted the existing technical
assistance as valuable but underlined the need for more accessibility of resources and messaging
about said resources.

[***Equity***] Participants stated that the WBO should center its outreach, messaging, and guidance
around equity – meeting people where they are by enabling trusted messengers and
prioritizing accessibility. This requires ongoing engagement with diverse groups and

stakeholders to continue to learn about how needs change and to maintain awareness of how efforts are being received.

[Simplify] Participants expressed desire for tailored messaging simplification and streamlining of WBO processes where possible. Many attendees recognized the inflexibility of federal requirements for certain grant funded programs, but nonetheless asked the WBO to work towards streamlining and simplifying processes related to applying for grants, reporting, and submitting grant reimbursement requests. For pieces of the process that are not easily streamlined, participants provided recommendations for increased technical support related to generally reoccurring barriers for broadband deployment, interpreting contracts, and understanding federal regulations. Related to messaging and availability of information, participants noted having a central hub for broadband related resources would make navigation easier for communities. Attendees also expressed challenges navigating the Commission's Electronic Records Filing (ERF) system and the Wisconsin Broadband Map. Requests were made for improved clarity in required processes, increased useability of online resources, and more robust technical assistance and guidance resources.

[Facilitation, collaboration, building connections] Participants emphasized the importance of facilitating conversations, connections, and potential collaboration among key stakeholder groups to improve broadband access, affordability and adoption across the state. Participants noted the need to convene the right stakeholders, facilitate trust building, break down silos among the important stakeholders, share resources and knowledge, and ultimately improve planning efforts. In particular, staff heard that bridging communication divides between providers, communities, and local governments is key to improve planning efforts. It was noted that this sort of intentional engagement across sectors and stakeholder groups will help design more inclusive and expansive initiatives, stretching efforts to more people and communities as collaboration grows.

[Planning, deployment, grant programs] Finally, participants focused on how the WBO can improve processes to benefit provider and community planning, improve broadband infrastructure buildouts, and improve the WBO's broadband grant programs. Regarding grant

programs, participants highlighted a need for clear requirements and expectations that match realistic timelines, robust monitoring, accountability measures for grant recipients, and more funding for broadband deployment. Many agreed that rural areas should be prioritized in grant funding decisions, which often have the most expensive locations to connect. Accurate data and maps should be a continued effort to inform this important work, particularly to get better granularity in rural areas of the state. Participants from local governments recommended the use of incentives or policy tools to better help local governments navigate funding opportunities and plan broadband projects, particularly when there have been challenges in engaging a provider partner. Last, with the influx of BEAD funding in mind, participants noted the need to focus funds on connecting unserved locations first and foremost.

Appendix I: Internet for All Wisconsin Listening Tour and survey top answers, themes, and discussion items by question

In order to determine the top 50 answers or themes for each question staff compiled the notes from all eleven Listening Tour sessions and the comments and notes submitted in the online survey. Items that had a sticker placed by them or that had a higher frequency of occurrence are listed in the appendix.

Top 50 answers or themes to the question: What barriers exist to providing access to high-speed broadband for all homes and businesses within the State of Wisconsin?

1. Density of population
2. Affordability of service
3. Quality / accuracy of maps
4. Cost to construct
5. Topography, geography, terrain
6. Supply chain
7. Materials shortages for broadband infrastructure construction
8. Challenges getting accurate information /speed data from end users
9. Satellite service, weather cost issues
10. In this area, there is no new infrastructure and no fiber,
11. No middle mile,
12. burden falls on the counties who don't have matching funds
13. Cost of materials
14. Workforce (labor construction, technical jobs)
15. Providers are profit motivated, not impact motivated
16. Lack of funds
17. Need waivers
18. Cost prohibitive for ISPs to build and to operate.
19. Competition little providers needed too
20. Not regulated like public utility
21. Can't keep up and catch up with developing programs
22. Security/willingness barrier
23. Access to devices
24. Lack of tools, trying to use phone and assumes everyone has internet
25. Too expensive, low-income neighborhoods have less choice.
26. Lack of competition. Impasse with ISP and they have no other choice.
27. Resident reporting of gaps in service.
28. Infrastructure logistics (geography, construction season)
29. Trust
30. Tech skills (programs, knowledge)
31. knowledge gap not just a wire

32. Local government understanding buy in
33. Cost per mile, home passing
34. Don't have local telco: ISPs are they only ones willing to work in this area
35. Don't even have access to 25/3
36. Reliability for video visits! Crucial for reaching folks in rural areas for telehealth.
37. "Once in a generation opportunity" – focus on those with nothing, first.
38. Build 21st century technology that will last until next century.
39. Availability of middle mile. Can't provide last mile without middle mile.
40. Lack of educational opportunities. Awareness!
41. Folks need to understand the possibilities of internet. Services and digital literacy.
42. Spectrum licensing – wireless is not as reliable but improving.
43. Limited number of providers, competition is better for consumers.
44. Not economically feasible for providers to place fiber in low-density areas
45. Match funding- rural, high poverty, large geography + local gov can't provide
46. Scoring criteria from PSC – rural areas don't score as well
47. Wealthier counties are getting the funding not fair
48. Permitting and pole attachments
49. Small companies don't have enough to do what big companies should be doing
50. Service providers not applying for grants

Top 50 answers or themes to the question: What would success look like for the people, businesses, and organizations if Wisconsin had Internet for All?

1. Internet is as reliable and available as electricity and water and other public utility/essential service
2. Broadband seen as an infrastructure
3. Connecting community and improved social wellbeing.
4. Need future proof service speeds.
5. Equal digital access regardless of geography
6. "When speeds don't matter, we've accomplished the goal"
7. Barriers removed (food, affordability, healthcare, housing, education, utilities, transportation)
8. Anyone who wants it, has internet available to them
9. People not feeling trapped by service providers
10. Retaining and growing population
11. Service available everywhere, ISPs have success for business + end users
12. One stop shopping for internet, it is simple to arrange for service and easy to make changes to service
13. Any build out ensures that future operations can be sustainable maintained.
14. Telehealth
15. Create economic development, business "meta universities"
16. Get more folks to move to rural Wisconsin

17. Agriculture is increasingly driven by tech. More knowledge, more responsible, more efficient use of chemicals, better timing of products to market.
18. Education opportunities improve - remote options for place-bound people
19. Business growth due to more reliable service – all Wisconsin business access the global marketplace
20. Wisconsin has centralized locations for comprehensive internet connection and digital skills training and in-home assistance
21. Rural areas as leaders and not followers in technology and innovation
22. New business and startups in rural areas
23. Healthy competition in the internet marketplace for consumers
24. Economic development and economic opportunity
25. Wisconsin is a mecca for remote workers
26. Seniors and older adults stay in their homes longer and can age in place
27. The internet is affordable
28. Fewer barriers to knowledge
29. Easier to build and maintain personal and professional connections
30. Rural Health care – everyone has access to the wi-fi and medical care they need
31. Meaningful and real competition for ISPs, better pricing, and customer service
32. Reliability – redundancy for the internet, minimal outages that are promptly fixed
33. Everyone in the state of Wisconsin can watch every Packer game.
34. Smaller carbon footprint and less ecological impact, technology can reduce driving and improve efficient water use
35. Improved value of homes in rural areas, people can sell their home with ease
36. People can live in rural area and easily find work
37. Improved health outcomes
38. More stable tax base, more people live in Wisconsin
39. Internet Service Providers need less or zero government subsidies to operate
40. Funds are distributed based on need not based on who submits the best application
41. People are less lonely and more connected to others, increased sense of belonging
42. No data caps
43. Vibrant economy, longer vacations, less time driving and waiting and more time with family and creating wealth
44. Increase educational opportunity, any student can access any class, for homeschool, for virtual snow days, for advanced learning, to learn languages and specialized skills.
45. Not just smart cities, but smart communities – where transportation and government services are more efficiently managed.
46. People can live and work where they choose.
47. People with disabilities have better access to community, government services, education and economic opportunity.
48. Classes to learn to use the internet and computers would be free, available and in person.
49. 911 and mapping works in every location in the state.
50. People are safer, property can be monitored, emergency services are better.

Top 50 answers or themes to the question: In locations where broadband infrastructure is not an issue, what other challenges exist to the everyday use of the internet?

1. Frustration with ISPs
2. Cybersecurity/risks. Security risks only get tougher
3. Advertised rate are incorrect
4. Individual training (how to use internet)
5. More technical support
6. Artificial Intelligence (AI) is coming
7. Adaptability
8. Equipment limitation
9. Training on how to use technology
10. Education & training is necessary to create interest and adoption
11. Digital literacy skills
12. Need better service and support from ISPs
13. Education to adopt broadband - need to expand networks but with people
14. Affordability
15. Non digital natives need more and different support
16. $20-40 price range for low income houses needed
17. Speeds- underserved are not served
18. Lack of equipment
19. Isolated locations make even getting to certain locations difficult
20. Lack of competition between providers: leaves communities vulnerable
21. Lack of equipment at home to use internet
22. Workforce challenges for enough instructors
23. Need for regional spaces for instruction of digital skills
24. Keeping up of technology is a lot, ready to throw up your hands
25. Security versus willingness - opens up to risk or theft
26. Education
27. Safety
28. Lack of stability of government programs
29. Switch to virtual reduces services in an area
30. Modes of information
31. No reason to take subscription
32. The United State has most expensive broadband
33. Lack of devices
34. Cost of devices
35. What's safe to access on internet?
36. Lack of Americans Disability Act (ADA) compliance online
37. Lack of trouble shooting knowledge
38. Fair and reasonable looks different for everyone
39. Potential for polarization via online communities

40. Pushed to buy higher speeds to get discounts
41. No matching funds, can't afford even with discount
42. Digital capability - need to learn how to use it
43. Misinformation!
44. Affordable Connectivity Program ACP only goes so far - is set to expire, need state-wide cost issue program. Need to figure out!
45. Towns that have great internet complain about the pricing, but do not realize that they at least have an option. Too many government officials do not realize that people in rural areas (less than 10 miles from a city) cannot get quality internet
46. Seasonal residents
47. Safely navigating the Internet, preventing scams, assessing site truthfulness. How to navigate different applications such as job application, telehealth, zoom, finance
48. Seasonal internet options - why pay annual contract if only at location for part of year?
49. Pride keeps folks from using ACP/local government programs - "no handouts for us"
50. Bundling services - need transparency/labeling of services - introductory prices / long-term pricing

Top 50 answers and themes to question: What can the Wisconsin Broadband Office i.e., State government do to facilitate making high-speed broadband available for all homes and businesses in the state?

1. Internet is a basic right
2. Broadband intervention zones - bonus points if a provider includes high need areas
3. Help bring funds to communities
4. Provide admirative support (writing grant proposals, applying)
5. Be thoughtful about how we define served/unserved
6. Better maps with more content: Where are gaps, where is fiber in the ground, speed tests, pockets of grant eligible, what providers are local, who to work with?
7. Convene stakeholders regularly
8. Road permitting - does fiber require extensive permitting – can we reduce this?
9. Strategy for closing the broadband gap
10. Some areas can't get providers to help
11. ISPs should be required to report "Actual" not "up to" speeds
12. Encourage and prefer high-performing providers
13. Money, Money, Money
14. Create connectivity between communities for planning/coordination
15. Bulk purchase of internet service, then provide that out to those with highest need at low cost
16. Put out an RFP for a statewide rollout of high speed broadband. Strength in numbers.
17. Having consistent data at the state level- shared
18. Enable regional and local partners to layer on other local data and make decisions on where to spend money

19. Don't forget individuals- find a way to reach every house- not just population clusters
20. Provide advice for local officials on technical issues
21. Expand CDBG – make all CDBG areas eligible for broadband
22. Dedicated or clear preference for rural areas in grant making
23. Put a dollar amount for every house to serve them
24. More grant options to suit more situation, fill in gaps, some communities struggle to get a provider on board
25. Accountability over match and places served
26. Be cognizant of administrative burdens and hoops to jump through.
27. Having to navigate rules bogs down/complicates internet for all.
28. Accurate/ actual map able to accept crowdsourced data
29. Finish the job
30. Plan for 50 years out
31. "Get in the fray" with underperformers
32. If 25/3 is ok- shame on all of us
33. Financial penalties for not reaching all locations - ISP grant recipients
34. Fix right of way ROW/ easement issues
35. Need public engagement and education on digital skills
36. Simplify and speed up processes for grants
37. Focus affordability of service
38. Private sector should not receive public funds when they are not providing for underserved
39. Regulate ISPs
40. Reduce red tape
41. More accountability for providers after award is made
42. Provide more training on federal regulations
43. Money is equally distributed based on need and cost to build across the state
44. Keep engaging with the people and coordinating efforts
45. Encourage the fill in
46. Link middle mile and local last mile needs
47. Speed up reimbursement
48. Get rid of fiber requirements so there is room for innovation/flexibility. On flipside, fiber is the best investment today
49. Public/Private partnerships - whatever state agency can get business partners in room to make plans to get service available locally.
50. Don't overbuild competition is great, but prioritize for those who have nothing