

 BEAD Final Proposal Feedback Tracker
(9/15/2025 to 9/22/2025)

Communication Type	Email Date	To	From	Org. / ISP Name	Subject	Response / Feedback
Email	9/15/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Christy Acord	Elmore County Rural Development	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	Thank you for choosing the areas in and around the Pine/Featherville in Elmore County. This area is of critical concern for broadband for: emergency communications, economic development projects, and the need for residents to communicate with medical personnel and other Internet necessities. In the world of everchanging technology, being without reliable Internet access is no longer an option. - Project Area: Elmore County
Email	9/15/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Sean Gerner	Education Super Highway	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	EducationSuperHighway, a national non-profit, works with states to close the 20–25% digital divide concentrated in affordable multi-dwelling units (MDUs). Idaho should reserve its remaining BEAD funds for eligible infrastructure once NTIA guidance is issued, ensuring they are not deemed “unused.” One such activity is upgrading in-building internet infrastructure in MDUs (\$1702(f)(4)). We recommend allocating ~\$7M to a targeted MDU program, modeled after Tennessee’s \$50M program, to address wiring bottlenecks and enable true connectivity. About 66% of Idaho’s affordable/public housing MDU residents lack high-speed internet. Fourteen states have already committed \$579M toward MDU connectivity, and we created a ready-to-launch model program Idaho can adopt (https://www.educationsuperhighway.org/mdu-community-connect/). To date, 4 Idaho property owners representing 689 units want to participate, demonstrating demand. A \$7M program could connect an estimated 7,000 residents.
Email	9/16/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	SpaceX	SpaceX	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	September 16, 2025 Link Up Idaho Re: Space Exploration Technologies Corp. (SpaceX) Comments on Idaho Final Proposal Link Up Idaho Team SpaceX highlights the following in Idaho’s proposal: % Households % Program Budget Total Spend Weighted-Average Per-Location Price Low-Earth Orbit Satellite Providers 25.31% 8.01% \$34,965,000 \$1,512 All Other Technologies Providers 74.69% 91.99% \$401,454,856 \$5,880 Awards > 10 Times the Cost of the Lowest Offer 14.84% 34.48% \$150,475,651 \$11,090 Awards > \$10,000 Per Location 14.61% 34.06% \$148,664,366 \$11,129 Based on the average per-location price for each provider. Idaho’s “analysis” of LEO capability is factually incorrect. NTIA should carefully review Idaho’s proposal, reject unnecessary spending, and require Idaho to recompete these locations to achieve the Benefit of the Bargain and bring internet to those who need it in months, not years.
Email	9/16/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Randy Mead	Mud Lake Telephone	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	This APA is already served by FTTP from Mud Lake Telephone. Services are turned up with active customers with speeds up to 1 Gig symmetrical. This project was completed August 1, 2025. - Project Area (if applicable) - 1052
Email	9/17/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Nicole Loundagin	International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW)	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	These comments are submitted on behalf of the 4,020 active IBEW members in Idaho. IBEW represents ~36,000 permanent telecom employees and thousands of construction workers for ISPs nationwide. As one of the largest labor unions in the industry, we also represent workers manufacturing and assembling telecom equipment. The IBEW believes selecting SpaceX/Starlink for BEAD projects would be the wrong choice. BEAD requires speeds of 100/20 Mbps, yet a recent Ookla study found only 17.4% of Starlink subscribers meet this standard. Another recent analysis by Sascha Meinrath (PSU Researcher) shows the system hits capacity above 6.6 subscribers/sq. mile. Further, Starlink adds no local infrastructure, creates no local jobs, and will likely cost Idahoans more long-term than other technologies like fiber. IBEW members look forward to helping Idaho create good-paying jobs through this once-in-a-generation investment to close the digital divide and deliver reliable, future-proof broadband.
Email	9/18/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Mark Martell	RTI	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	RE APA 1381, Overview, Requirements 1,3: Please explain why RTI was not awarded APA #1381. The IOB, as a means of prioritizing awards to Priority Broadband Projects with the lowest costs, should revise the Final Proposal and award APA #1381 to RTI. RTI submitted an Updated Funding Request to IOB on 9/10/2025 as part of the deconfliction phase. RTI’s Updated Funding Request was \$1,553.55/BSL in its deconfliction spreadsheet. FlyberCom’s preliminary award is \$1,906.19/BSL. FlyberCom’s cost is 23% higher than RTI. RTI’s proposed FTTP priority broadband project would deliver 1000/1000 Mbps with 5 ms minimum latency. RTI commits to completing the proposed project within 36 to 41 months. RTI’s fiber network has a 30-year useful asset life and can scale to 10 Gbps with an upgrade to software. RTI plans an upgrade to electronics as part of standard network maintenance within 7 years after deployment.
Email	9/18/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Mark Martell	RTI	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	RE APA 1349, OVERVIEW, REQUIREMENTS 1,3: Please explain why RTI, the ILEC with existing backbone facilities, was not awarded APA #1349. The IOB should award APA #1349 to RTI. IOB identified APA #1349 as eligible for a potential award under RTI’s current application with \$18,040/BSL. Because it was shaded GREEN on the RTI Deconfliction spreadsheet, and designated as eligible for potential award, RTI did not submit an Updated Funding Request. Because Column K was blacked out, RTI did not have an option to mark APA #1349 as not severable and submit an Updated Funding Request. ETS Management LLC’s preliminary award is \$19,502.20, 8% higher than RTI. RTI’s proposed FTTP priority broadband project would deliver 1000/1000 Mbps with 5 ms minimum latency. RTI commits to completing the proposed project within 36 to 41 months. RTI’s fiber network has a 30-year useful asset life and can scale to 10 Gbps with an upgrade to software.
Email	9/18/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Mark Martell	RTI	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	RE APA 1326, OVERVIEW REQ. 1,3: Please explain why RTI, the ILEC with existing backbone facilities, was not awarded APA #1326. The IOB should award APA #1326 to RTI. IOB identified APA #1326 as eligible for a potential award under RTI’s current application with \$5,648/BSL. Because it was shaded GREEN on the RTI Deconfliction spreadsheet, and designated as eligible for potential award, RTI did not submit an Updated Funding Request. Because Column K was blacked out, RTI did not have an option to mark APA #1349 as not severable and submit an Updated Funding Request. ETS Management LLC’s preliminary award is \$9,473.87/BSL, 68% higher than RTI. RTI’s proposed FTTP priority broadband project would deliver 1000/1000 Mbps with 5 ms minimum latency. RTI commits to completing the proposed project within 36 to 41 months. RTI’s fiber network has a 30-year useful asset life and can scale to 10 Gbps with an upgrade to software.
Email	9/19/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Greg Guice	Vernonberg Group	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	Vernonburg Group applauds the IOB for embracing the full range of technology to ensure that all unserved and underserved locations across the Gem State will have access to the internet. With \$146.8 million still unallocated, Idaho is fully authorized to use the remainder of its BEAD funds for non-deployment purposes. We encourage IOB to communicate to NTIA that Idaho intends to make use of the remaining funds, perhaps in a cover letter accompanying the Final Proposal or in a field on the form. These remaining funds are crucial because many households remain offline because of barriers related to cost, skills, trust, or perceived relevance—not because of a lack of infrastructure. Comprehensive programs with digital navigators reach twice as many households per dollar spent, compared to network deployment alone. Pairing the newly awarded deployment projects with targeted adoption investments ensures that the bipartisan promise of BEAD is fulfilled, empowering all Idahoans to thrive.
Email	9/19/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Ken Burgess	Cox Communications	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	RE - APP-007142 ETS: The following BSLs in BEAD Application APP-007142 (ETS) are already served by Cox broadband infrastructure: 1110594667, 1110595016, 1110596883, 1110598283, 1110599163, 1110599255, 1110599797, 1110601252, 1110601489, 1463383073, 1463383076, 1463383079, 1463383403, 1463383657, 1463384399, 1463384402, 1463389610, 1463389639. Cox already provides robust, reliable broadband connections at these locations that exceed 100/20 Mbps, meeting NTIA’s definition of “served.” Therefore, these BSLs should be excluded from BEAD-eligible funding areas in the Final Proposal. Since the BEAD program is intended to fund projects only in “unserved” or “underserved” areas, including these locations deviates from federal guidance and risks wasteful allocation and conflict with statutory requirements. As a result, Cox asks that these BSLs be deemed ineligible for BEAD funding and removed from APP-007142.
Email	9/19/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Ken Burgess	Cox Communications	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	RE - APP-007171- SpaceX: The following BSLs in BEAD Application APP-007171 (SpaceX) are already served by Cox broadband infrastructure: 1110592326, 1110597760, 1110600813, 1110601110, 1110601437, 1413318388, 1413318389. Cox already provides robust, reliable broadband connections at these locations that exceed 100/20 Mbps, meeting NTIA’s definition of “served.” Locations 1110592326, 1110600813, 1110601437, 1413318388, 1413318389 are Sun Valley Resort outbuildings served by Cox fiber, while 1110597760 and 1110601110 are active HFC customers receiving >100/20 Mbps service today. Therefore, these BSLs should be excluded from BEAD-eligible funding areas in the Final Proposal. Since the BEAD program is intended to fund projects only in “unserved” or “underserved” areas, including these locations deviates from federal guidance and risks wasteful allocation and conflict with statutory requirements. As a result, Cox asks that these BSLs be deemed ineligible for BEAD funding and removed from APP-007171.

 BEAD Final Proposal Feedback Tracker
(9/15/2025 to 9/22/2025)

Communication Type	Email Date	To	From	Org. / ISP Name	Subject	Response / Feedback
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Karianne Fallow	AARP Idaho	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	Overview, Requirements 1,3: AARP Idaho appreciates IOB's BEAD revision work and its commitment to connecting communities statewide. We applaud IOB for centering older adult-serving locations - especially libraries - as trusted gateways for free internet, device help, and digital learning, alongside other community anchors that deliver training and build confidence. With demand rising, both access and ability to use it need ongoing stewardship. As NTIA refines BEAD guidance, we urge using available non-deployment funds for digital skills, device access, and other adoption priorities. Idaho's Digital Access for All Plan shows strong need among older adults; investing through libraries, community colleges, and senior centers in hands-on skills - safe browsing, online banking, telehealth, and communication tools - will turn infrastructure into meaningful use. We commend IOB's progress and look forward to a connected Idaho.
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Steve Ewart	Private	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	• Applicants were given a short timeframe to create the designs. • The state kept changing rules and designs while the application was open. • This solution is not a long-term viable solution for Idaho citizens. • There was no opportunity for local carriers to participate, which contradicts the program's original intent. • It does not make sense why so much was awarded to a LEO company when there was an opportunity for fiber to be put in the ground. • A new LEO company was awarded the majority of the areas, even though they are not a priority service compared to other licensed spectrum services. • ISPs were not involved to see what BSLs could be removed to lower costs, even though the state had a strict requirement of application not being considered if no more than 5% of an area had to be removed. • There was no opportunity to challenge designs or sharpen pencils to get costs down. • The state map BSL designs appeared to be catered to a specific "LEO" design
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Aaron Westgate	Inland Cellular/ Emerge Technologies	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	• Applicants were given a short timeframe to create the designs. • The state kept changing rules and designs while the application was open. • The LEO solution is not a long-term viable solution for Idaho citizens. A massive disappointment considering the meetings we had all agreeing to this. • There was no opportunity for local carriers to participate, which contradicts the program's original intent. • It does not make sense why so much was awarded to a LEO company when there was an opportunity for fiber to be put in the ground. • The state did not provided an extension to allow local ISPs to "sharpen their pencils" • A new LEO company was awarded the majority of the areas, even though they are not a priority service compared to other licensed spectrum services. • There was no opportunity to challenge designs or sharpen pencils to get costs down. • The state map BSL designs appeared to be catered to a specific "LEO" design
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Lydia Weis	Inland Cellular	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	We are writing to challenge the provisional BEAD awards, which we believe contradict the program's original intent to provide viable, long-term broadband solutions for Idaho. The application process created an unfair environment due to a short timeframe and constant changes to rules and designs. These designs appeared to be tailored to a specific LEO solution, ignoring the opportunity for local carriers to deploy fiber, a more sustainable technology. Furthermore, the scattered Broadband Service Locations (BSLs) and lack of an opportunity to challenge designs or reduce costs made it difficult for local ISPs to compete. We are concerned that awarding a majority of the territories to a non-priority LEO service undermines the goal of building a future-proof network for the citizens of Idaho.
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Nathan R Weis	Inland Cellular	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	Overview, Requirements 1,3: Project Area (if applicable) - 1179,1175,1182,1035,1262,1482,1579,1105,1182,1091,1136,1573,1178,1183,1131: This solution is not a long-term viable solution for Idaho citizens. There was no opportunity for local carriers to participate, which contradicts the program's original intent. It does not make sense why so much was awarded to a LEO company when there was an opportunity for fiber to be put in the ground. The state did not provided an extension to allow local ISPs to "sharpen their pencils. A new LEO company was awarded the majority of the areas, even though they are not a priority service compared to other licensed spectrum services. There was no opportunity to challenge designs or sharpen pencils to get costs down. LEO can does not address or support 5G connectivity.
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Anthony Jovanovich	Internet User	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	Northern Idaho: I am concerned about the reliability of LEO service. From my recent experience, the service has not been consistent, and I would much rather use a local internet provider and fiber if at all possible. This brings me many concerns regarding the long-term viability of the state's choices.
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Nathan R Weis	Inland Cellular	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	Central Idaho & Northern Idaho: We were disappointed by the lack of opportunity to refine our designs after submitting a priority application. Our proposal featured a hybrid licensed spectrum and fiber solution, intended to provide a reliable, long-term backbone infrastructure capable of supporting services beyond just residential households. The decision to award the majority of these territories to a LEO company is not a viable long-term solution, nor does it align with the priority status of licensed services. The state's BSL designs appeared to be specifically catered to LEO, which precluded local ISPs from effectively creating and proposing designs that would utilize a fiber or wireless backbone that could be utilized by the state beyond the BSLs - emergency services, interconnects.
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Cody Traylor	Internet User	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	I have a frustration that local carriers were not prioritized in the BEAD awards for Idaho. It is disappointing that the state chose to fund LEO applications instead of building a robust, long-term fiber or hybrid infrastructure. I do not plan to subscribe to a non-local, third-party LEO company, as I believe the program's intent was to empower local providers and create a more reliable and sustainable network for Idaho citizens. This decision seems to contradict the very purpose of the program.
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	James Smith	Private	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	Overview, Requirements 1,3: A new LEO company was awarded the majority of the areas, even though they are not a priority service compared to other licensed spectrum services. This solution is not a long-term viable solution for Idaho citizens. The state map BSL designs appeared to be catered to a specific "LEO" design
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Lisa Weis	Internet User	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	Northern Idaho: It is truly disheartening to see the state choose a heavy LEO presence for the very areas where we live and recreate. These communities had a genuine opportunity for a strong, local backbone infrastructure that the state could have leveraged for future growth and economic development. Instead, the decision was made to go with a non-local LEO provider. There were proposals for a hybrid solution was not utilized, despite its potential. I am left wondering how the state of Idaho plans to emphasize the importance of robust backbone infrastructure to support local businesses and the overall growth of our state with this approach.
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Samir Rahi	Private	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	Applicants were given a short timeframe to create the designs. -This solution is not a long-term viable solution for Idaho citizens. -There was no opportunity for local carriers to participate, which contradicts the program's original intent. • The state did not provided an extension to allow local ISPs to "sharpen their pencils" • A new LEO company was awarded the majority of the areas, even though they are not a priority service compared to other licensed spectrum services. • ISPs were not involved to see what BSLs could be removed to lower costs, even though the state had a strict requirement of application not being considered if no more than 5% of an area had to be removed. • There was no opportunity to challenge designs or sharpen pencils to get costs down. • The designs were scattered, with BSLs (Broadband Service Locations) not placed near other BSLs, making it difficult to lower costs. • The state map BSL designs appeared to be catered to a specific "LEO" design
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Andrew Mikel	Private	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	Panhandle, Northern & Central Idaho: Inland Cellular, LLC is the better fit for the Panhandle, Northern and Central Idaho. 1. Applicants were given a short timeframe to create the designs. 2. The state kept changing rules and designs while the application was open. 3. This solution is not a long-term viable solution for Idaho citizens. 4. There was no opportunity for local carriers to participate, which contradicts the program's original intent. 5. It does not make sense why so much was awarded to a LEO company when there was an opportunity for fiber to be put in the ground. 6. A new LEO company was awarded the majority of the areas, even though they are not a priority service compared to other licensed spectrum services. 7. ISPs were not involved to see what BSLs could be removed to lower costs, even though the state had a strict requirement of application not being considered if no more than 5% of an area had to be removed. 8. The state map BSL designs appeared to be catered to a specific "LEO" design.
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Amy Lytton	Inland Cellular	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	Northern & Central Idaho: I feel like a couple things need to be considered which I have listed below. The state kept changing rules and designs while the application was open. This solution is not a long-term viable solution for Idaho citizens. There was no opportunity for local carriers to participate, which contradicts the program's original intent. It does not make sense why so much was awarded to a LEO company when there was an opportunity for fiber to be put in the ground. The state did not provide an extension to allow local ISPs to sharpen their pencils. Thank you for your time in reviewing my comments.

 BEAD Final Proposal Feedback Tracker
(9/15/2025 to 9/22/2025)

Communication Type	Email Date	To	From	Org. / ISP Name	Subject	Response / Feedback
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Samir Rahi	Capital Factory	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	Requirement 12, 13: The International Telecommunications Union has approved four technologies as meeting 5G IMT-2020 standards. Only two apply in the U.S.: 3GPP 5G-RIT (standalone) and 3GPP 5G-SRIT (non-standalone, combining 5G and 4G). Both were developed by the 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), whose partners include the U.S. Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions. These form the basis of U.S. 5G deployments led by the FCC, NTIA, and others, and are the foundation for networks supporting handsets in urban areas and bridging the digital divide. Any wireless solution not supporting 3GPP standards cannot deliver true 5G or advanced services like spectrum sharing, sensing, slicing, or enterprise connectivity. Our review of Idaho's benefit-of-the-bargain proposals finds approved Fixed Wireless technologies lack 3GPP compliance—except Inland Cellular's Skylark Faros 3000 RAN. Given this, Idaho BEAD projects must be rescored, as non-3GPP wireless cannot meet the definition of 5G.
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Lydia Weis	Private	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	Northern and Central Idaho: Speaking as a homeowner in this area, it's disappointing that my home, which is surrounded by many trees, was awarded satellite internet through the BEAD program. To even use this service, I would have to drastically change my property, and it's frustrating to be denied the opportunity for fiber or a less invasive option. My past experience with satellite internet here has been consistently patchy and unreliable, often going down entirely. My fear is many homeowners will not do so and create a large digital divide than before. In addition, the state of Idaho is only factoring in current BSLs. What's to happen with community development with no fiber infrastructure connecting these communities?
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Anne Watanabe	Inland Cellular	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	Panhandle, Northern & Central Idaho: Inland Cellular should be awarded BEAD funding for its hybrid solution with its licensed spectrum and fiber. The state wrongly chose to award the territory Inland applied for to LEO satellite companies. This does not allow Inland to expand its network for the public's benefit. Please reconsider Inland's application for the following reasons: 1. Applicants were given a short timeframe to create the designs. 2. State rules and designs changed while the application was open. 3. LEO is not a long-term viable solution for Idaho citizens. 4. No opportunity for local carriers to participate, which contradicts the program's original intent. 5. Fiber and licensed spectrum should be preferred 6. No extension to allow local ISPs to lower costs 7. No opportunity to challenge designs or get costs down. 8. BSLs not placed near other BSLs, making it difficult to lower costs. 9. The state map BSL designs appeared to be catered to a specific "LEO" design Thank you, Anne Watanabe
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Samir Rahi	Private	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	Requirement 12, 13: Inland Cellular should be awarded BEAD funding to expand its internet service territory in Idaho using a hybrid solution with its licensed spectrum and fiber. The state wrongly chose to award the territory Inland applied for to LEO satellite companies. This does not allow Inland to expand its network for the public's benefit. Please reconsider Inland's application for the following reasons: 1. Applicants were given a short timeframe to create the designs. 2. State rules and designs changed while the application was open. 3. LEO is not a long-term viable solution for Idaho citizens. 4. No opportunity for local carriers to participate, which contradicts the program's original intent. 5. Fiber and licensed spectrum should be preferred 6. No extension to allow local ISPs to lower costs 7. No opportunity to challenge designs or get costs down. 8. BSLs not placed near other BSLs, making it difficult to lower costs. 9. The state map BSL designs appeared to be catered to a specific "LEO" design
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Nathan R Weis	Weis Towers LLC	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	Requirement 6, 7, 11: The International Telecommunications Union has approved four technologies as meeting 5G IMT-2020 standards. Only two apply in the U.S.: 3GPP 5G-RIT (standalone) and 3GPP 5G-SRIT (non-standalone, combining 5G and 4G). Both were developed by the 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), whose partners include the U.S. Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions. These form the basis of U.S. 5G deployments led by the FCC, NTIA, and others, and are the foundation for networks supporting handsets in urban areas and bridging the digital divide. Any wireless solution not supporting 3GPP standards cannot deliver true 5G or advanced services like spectrum sharing, sensing, slicing, or enterprise connectivity. Our review of Idaho's benefit-of-the-bargain proposals finds approved Fixed Wireless technologies lack 3GPP compliance—except Inland Cellular's Skylark Faros 3000 RAN. Given this, Idaho BEAD projects must be rescored, as non-3GPP wireless cannot meet the definition of 5G.
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Tom Edwards	Inland Cellular	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	Northern Idaho: It does not make sense why so much was awarded to a LEO company when there was an opportunity for fiber to be put in the ground.
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Laura Armstrong	Inland Cellular	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	Panhandle, Northern & Central Idaho: I'm saddened to hear Inland Cellular lost the award to LEO (Low-Earth Orbit) satellite companies instead of a local company, like Inland Cellular, to have the opportunity to provide in ground fiber to those who don't have access to satellite coverage, which contradicts the program's original intent. The state kept changing the rules & designs during the application process. There was no opportunity for local carriers to participate or to challenge designs. The state map BSL(Broadband Service Locations) appeared to be catered to a specific "LEO" design. Please reconsider Inland Cellular for the opportunity to provide in ground Fiber to those communities in great need of service. Thank you, Laura Armstrong
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Clayton Shepard	Private	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	Requirement 12, 13: The International Telecommunications Union has approved four technologies as meeting 5G IMT-2020 standards. Only two apply in the U.S.: 3GPP 5G-RIT (standalone) and 3GPP 5G-SRIT (non-standalone, combining 5G and 4G). Both were developed by the 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), whose partners include the U.S. Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions. These form the basis of U.S. 5G deployments led by the FCC, NTIA, and others, and are the foundation for networks supporting handsets in urban areas and bridging the digital divide. Any wireless solution not supporting 3GPP standards cannot deliver true 5G or advanced services like spectrum sharing, sensing, slicing, or enterprise connectivity. Our review of Idaho's benefit-of-the-bargain proposals finds approved Fixed Wireless technologies lack 3GPP compliance—except Inland Cellular's with Skylark Faros 3000 RAN. Given this, Idaho BEAD projects must be rescored, as non-3GPP wireless cannot meet the definition of 5G.
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Eric Lederhos	EL Automation, Inc, DBA EL Internet Northwest	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	APA-1090: On APA-1090, the contractor requested we voluntarily exclude this APA. Their words, a different company was similar in price with a higher scoring application. Per your guidelines, scoring can only be applied "when competing proposals fell within 15% of the lowest cost proposed". We took the risk that no one could be within 15% of our offer and from the data supplied, they were not. On this APA, two suppliers are the apparent sub-grantees, for LEO SpaceX at \$1500 per BSL and Zipy at over \$8000 per BSL. Not only are neither within 15% of our \$800/per BSL price, Zipy is over 10 times our offered price, how does this meet your requirements? Also, the apparent sub-grantees had a split of 85% Zipy and 15% SpaceX. The required coverage for application was 95%, neither matched that requirement. How was Zipy apparently granted an award with an 85% coverage? We believe the contractor did not follow the rules set forth and the State of Idaho IOB needs to answer why they did not.
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Abe Maycumber	Inland Cellular & Emerge Technologies	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	Panhandle, Northern and Central Idaho: There was no opportunity for local carriers to participate.
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Daniel Parrish	Direct Communications	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	1164: Direct Communications, the Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier (ILEC) for Fish Haven, ID, and APA 1164, submits this public comment. As a local provider with significant fiber investments in the area, we believe our fiber-to-the-home (FTTH) proposal would have been a more effective and future-proof use of public funds than the mixed-technology project provisionally awarded to FlyerCom. We are concerned that a mixed-technology build may leave Broadband Serviceable Locations (BSLs) in this APA further behind in the long term. In contrast, our FTTH solution offers greater reliability, scalability, and long-term value. We respectfully urge reconsideration and support for the competitive FTTH application in APA 1164.
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Daniel Parrish	Direct Communications	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	1112: Direct Communications, a local ISP, submits this comment on the provisional BEAD award to FlyerCom for APAs 1013 and 1112 in Lava Hot Springs, ID. We already have a significant, operational fiber network in the area and proposed a fiber-to-the-home (FTTH) expansion that would have been a more efficient and cost-effective use of public funds. While FlyerCom's fiber plan is commendable, it creates a duplicative network. Leveraging our existing infrastructure would allow faster deployment, lower costs, and more prudent use of state resources. As a long-time provider in Lava Hot Springs, we have the local experience, workforce, and commitment to deliver high-quality service quickly. We respectfully request reconsideration of the award, as our proposal offers a fiscally responsible and future-proof solution for connecting unserved residents.

 BEAD Final Proposal Feedback Tracker
(9/15/2025 to 9/22/2025)

Communication Type	Email Date	To	From	Org. / ISP Name	Subject	Response / Feedback
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Eric Lederhos	EL Automation, Inc, DBA EL Internet Northwest	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	APA-1087,-1088,-1089,-1104,-1131: The contractor requested we voluntarily exclude these APA's, which we did. However, in Their words, "a different company was similar in price with a higher scoring application". Per your guidelines, scoring can only be applied "when competing proposals fell within 15% of the lowest cost proposed". We took the risk that no one could be within 15% of our offer and from the data supplied, they were not. On these APA's, the apparent sub-grantee was for LEO, supplied by SpaceX at \$1500 per BSL. Our offer was \$800 per BSL, how is this within 15% and why is LEO the apparent Sub-grantee on all of these APA's, when we were far cheaper, the primary qualifying factor?
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Daniel Parrish	Direct Communications	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	1013: Direct Communications, a local ISP, submits this comment on the provisional BEAD award to FyberCom for APAs 1013 and 1112 in Lava Hot Springs, ID. We already have a significant, operational fiber network in the area and proposed a fiber-to-the-home (FTTH) expansion that would have been a more efficient and cost-effective use of public funds. While FyberCom's fiber plan is commendable, it creates a duplicative network. Leveraging our existing infrastructure would allow faster deployment, lower costs, and more prudent use of state resources. As a long-time provider in Lava Hot Springs, we have the local experience, workforce, and commitment to deliver high-quality service quickly. We respectfully request reconsideration of the award, as our proposal offers a fiscally responsible and future-proof solution for connecting unserved residents.
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Daniel Parrish	Direct Communications	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	1107: Direct Communications, the ILEC for Paris, Idaho (APA 1107), submits this public comment regarding the provisional BEAD award to FyberCom. We are concerned that funding a mixed-technology project—rather than our proposed fiber-to-the-home (FTTH) network—compromises long-term value. Mixed networks, often reliant on fixed wireless, lack the scalability and reliability needed for modern applications and future demands. These technologies offer asymmetrical speeds and are prone to performance issues due to weather and terrain, making them less resilient. In contrast, a full FTTH build provides symmetrical, multi-gigabit capabilities and supports evolving bandwidth needs without future infrastructure overhauls. As the local ILEC with existing assets and deep community roots, we are uniquely positioned to deliver this robust, future-proof solution. We respectfully urge reconsideration in favor of a scalable network that meets both today's and tomorrow's digital requirements.
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Daniel Parrish	Direct Communications	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	1010: The provisional BEAD award to FyberCom for a mixed-technology project in the Buckskin area (APA 1010), between Pocatello and Inkom, ID, is concerning. We were awarded the adjacent APA 1031—completing the other half of the mountain loop road—and proposed a unified fiber-to-the-home (FTTH) build. Fragmenting this loop undermines long-term infrastructure goals and poses a public safety risk. This area has limited cell coverage and no wireline connections, making reliable internet essential for 911 and emergency services. Wireless-based solutions lack the reliability and scalability of fiber—they are vulnerable to weather, terrain, and congestion, and cannot deliver consistent, symmetrical speeds. Our proposal would have created a redundant fiber loop, ensuring continuity if one side is damaged. We respectfully urge reconsideration to provide the Buckskin community with a unified, resilient, and future-proof network.
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Andrew Mikel	Private	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	Panhandle, Northern and Central Idaho: Inland Cellular, LLC is the better fit for the Panhandle, Northern and Central Idaho. 1. Applicants were given a short timeframe to create the designs. 2. The state kept changing rules and designs while the application was open. 3. This solution is not a long-term viable solution for Idaho citizens. 4. There was no opportunity for local carriers to participate, which contradicts the program's original intent. 5. It does not make sense why so much was awarded to a LEO company when there was an opportunity for fiber to be put in the ground. 6. A new LEO company was awarded the majority of the areas, even though they are not a priority service compared to other licensed spectrum services. 7. ISPs were not involved to see what BSLs could be removed to lower costs, even though the state had a strict requirement of application not being considered if no more than 5% of an area had to be removed. 8. The state map BSL designs appeared to be catered to a specific "LEO" design.
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Dylan Weis	Internet User	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	Central ID Northern Idaho: How is having Leo going to help with the development of Idaho and new businesses and homes coming in of having a Leo solution for most these areas are only to serve their homes currently and have the future or the development.
Email	9/22/2025	Idaho BEAD Inbox	Kristy Castillo	Private	<i>BEAD Comment Received</i>	The International Telecommunications Union recognizes four 5G IMT-2020 technologies, but only two apply in the U.S.: 3GPP 5G-RIT (standalone) and 5G-SRIT (non-standalone, combining 5G and 4G). Developed by 3GPP, with U.S. input from ATIS, these standards underpin FCC- and NTIA-led 5G deployments supporting both urban handsets and digital divide efforts. Wireless solutions that lack 3GPP compliance cannot deliver true 5G or advanced features such as spectrum sharing, slicing, or enterprise connectivity. Idaho's approved Fixed Wireless proposals fail this test—except Inland Cellular with Skylark Faros 3000 RAN—so BEAD projects should be rescored.