

# State of Michigan Digital Equity Plan



MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF  
LABOR & ECONOMIC  
OPPORTUNITY

MICHIGAN  
HIGH-SPEED  
INTERNET  
OFFICE

July 2024

# Table of Contents

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <b>1. Executive Summary</b> .....                                    | 4   |
| <b>2. Introduction and Vision for Digital Equity</b> .....           | 8   |
| 2.1. Vision.....   | 8   |
| 2.2. Alignment with Existing Efforts to Improve Outcomes .....       | 9   |
| 2.3. Strategy and Objectives .....                                   | 15  |
| 2.3.1. Strategies .....  | 16  |
| 2.3.2. Indicator Scores and Measurable Objectives.....               | 24  |
| <b>3. Current State of Digital Equity: Barriers and Assets</b> ..... | 37  |
| 3.1. Asset Inventory .....   | 37  |
| 3.1.1 Digital Inclusion Assets by Covered Population .....           | 37  |
| 3.1.2 Existing Digital Equity Plans.....                             | 52  |
| 3.1.3. Existing Digital Equity Programs .....                        | 64  |
| 3.1.4. Broadband Adoption .....                                      | 67  |
| 3.1.5. Broadband Affordability .....                                 | 69  |
| 3.1.6 Asset Gaps .....   | 70  |
| 3.2. Needs Assessment .....  | 73  |
| 3.2.1. Covered Population Needs Assessment .....                     | 73  |
| 3.2.2. Broadband Adoption.....                                       | 94  |
| 3.2.3. Broadband Affordability .....                                 | 95  |
| <b>4. Collaboration and Stakeholder Engagement</b> .....             | 96  |
| 4.1. Coordination and Outreach Strategy .....                        | 96  |
| 4.2. Continued Coordination and Outreach .....                       | 101 |
| <b>5. Implementation</b> .....                                       | 102 |
| 5.1. Implementation Strategy & Key Activities.....                   | 102 |
| 5.2. Timeline.....   | 115 |
| <b>6. Public Comment</b> .....                                       | 117 |
| <b>7. Conclusion</b> .....   | 119 |

**Appendix A-6**

- A-1 Appendix 1** ..... 120
  - A-1.1 Digital Participation Score Definitions..... 120
- A-2 Appendix 2** ..... 121
  - A-2.1 Digital Inclusion Assets by Covered Populations ..... 121
  - A-2.2 Organizations by Covered Population ..... 126
  - A-2.3 Digital Inclusion Plans ..... 132
- A-3 Appendix 3** ..... 136
  - A-3.1 Public Comments and Responses ..... 136
- A-4 Appendix 4** ..... 164
  - A-4.1 MIHI Tribal Consultation Invitation, Agenda, and Participation List ..... 164
- A-5 Appendix 5** ..... 167
  - A-5.1 Tribal Consultation Notes ..... 167
- A-6 Appendix 6** ..... 178
  - A-6.1 Organizational Matrix ..... 178

# Executive Summary

## Introduction to Digital Equity in Michigan

Nearly every aspect of modern life requires access to high-speed internet. Digital equity means that all individuals and communities have the tools and resources necessary to access and meaningfully connect to the internet. Currently, Michigan faces multifaceted challenges in achieving digital equity leading to a digital divide, or a portion of the population who do not have reliable, affordable access to the internet.

As of 2023, more than 492,000 households are unserved (locations without 25/3 Mbps service available) or underserved (locations without 100/20 Mbps service available)<sup>1</sup> by high-speed internet infrastructure. Another 730,000 households face barriers related to affordability, adoption, device access, digital literacy, or a combination thereof. Taken together, this means that approximately 30% of Michigan households struggle with some form of the digital divide.<sup>2</sup> This is particularly prevalent for covered populations including low-income households, where nearly 35% of households earning less than \$20,000 annually do not have a broadband connection<sup>3</sup>; aging individuals, where more than 22% of residents aged 65 and older do not have broadband at home<sup>4</sup>; and racial or ethnic minorities, who are nearly half as likely to have a home broadband connection than nonminorities.<sup>5</sup> Many Michigan residents fall within these covered populations, with individuals likely falling into more than one covered population category, highlighting a need to ensure all vulnerable populations are included within the state's digital equity efforts. Moreover, many individuals lack access to internet-connected devices such as computers, creating another significant obstacle. Michigan is also a fairly rural state, with 61 of the 83 counties in the state being labeled as rural by the U.S. Census Bureau, posing challenges related to access and affordability of broadband. These complex and overlapping issues create many barriers and challenges for achieving digital equity in Michigan.

High-speed internet is essential to communities, as it provides access to information, enhances communication, and expands opportunities for its users. Additionally, education, economic development and mobility, environment, healthcare, transportation, infrastructure, and workforce development are inextricably linked to the universal availability and adoption of broadband service—its benefits reach beyond the immediate users of broadband service. The Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Opportunity estimates expanding broadband statewide could produce significant economic opportunities for households valued between \$1.8 billion and \$2.7 billion annually.<sup>6</sup>

---

1. Data for number of unserved and underserved locations comes from the June 15, 2023, data published by the Federal Communications Commission that represents availability reported by internet service providers as of December 31, 2022.

2. 2021 Update to the Michigan Broadband Roadmap (2021), Michigan High-Speed Internet Office

3. U.S. Census Bureau. 2019. 2019 American Community Survey 1-year Estimates Detailed Tables

4. U.S. Census Bureau. 2019. 2019 American Community Survey 1-year Estimates Detailed Tables

5. U.S. Census Bureau. 2019. 2019 American Community Survey 1-year Estimates Detailed Tables

6. 2021 Update to the Michigan Broadband Roadmap (2021), Michigan High-Speed Internet Office

**Michigan’s goal to bridge the digital divide and increase digital connectivity also includes the aim to ensure all individuals, especially covered populations, are adequately educated, trained, and have the needed resources to utilize the internet in a productive and impactful manner.**

## **Vision**

Michigan envisions closing the digital divide by 2030 and achieving a digitally connected and inclusive future where every resident and community has an affordable high-speed internet connection available to them regardless of location, economic status, or race/ethnicity. These connections, devices, and applications will empower and enable Michiganders to improve their quality of life however they see fit. Community engagement, collaboration with federal and state agencies, and creating solutions that meet communities’ distinct needs are fundamental to realize Michigan’s vision for digital equity.



Michigan’s digital equity goal is to ensure that high-speed internet is available to every home, business, institution, and community and that every Michigander can access that connection to improve their quality of life. A key component of digital equity includes expanding the availability of internet-connected devices, technical assistance, and training programs to ensure individuals are able to utilize the internet effectively. These components are critical to move from availability of an internet connection to full access, adoption, and utilization.

## **Alignment with Existing Efforts to Improve Outcomes**

The goals of the Digital Equity Plan are aligned to the State of Michigan’s priorities and other existing or planned efforts such as the BEAD program. There is considerable overlap in prioritization of increasing the workforce, improving educational attainment, enhancing overall health outcomes, improving civic and social engagement, and increasing awareness to other essential services and programs. To best serve Michigan residents and bridge the digital divide, MIHI will collaborate with public, private, and governmental agencies on new and existing programs that coincide.

## Strategy and Objectives

Michigan's goals have informed the development of key strategies aimed at bridging the digital divide and enhancing digital equity throughout Michigan. These strategic initiatives will form the foundation for measurable tactics and objectives that will guide MIHI's efforts to ensure universal access and adoption of broadband service. By aligning Michigan's goals with actionable strategies and measurable objectives, Michigan can develop a comprehensive and equitable approach to achieving digital equity by 2030:

### MIHI's Digital Equity Goals

- 1** Ensure all Michiganders have access to an affordable, reliable high-speed internet connection at their homes
- 2** Attract workers and employers to Michigan
- 3** Improve educational attainment including removing barriers for credentialed workers and in postsecondary achievement
- 4** Improve overall health outcomes, particularly with improvement in rural areas and in underrepresented populations
- 5** Educate Michiganders about the online services available to them as a resident of the state

## Asset Inventory

MIHI has taken significant steps toward improving digital equity in Michigan through its comprehensive inventory of digital equity assets, plans, and programs. This inventory utilized the Michigan Digital Inclusion Resource Map to inform its collection of available resources and is focused on assets that serve covered populations to improve the state's digital equity ecosystem. The map is based on the Michigan Statewide Digital Inclusion survey, which received responses from over 200 organizations and resources throughout the state. MIHI has aligned the survey results with the covered populations they support, as shown in Appendix A-2.

Central to MIHI's approach to developing the asset inventory was the engagement with stakeholders, communities, and Tribal leaders throughout Michigan to gather a more comprehensive understanding of the state's resources, how those assets can be better utilized, and where asset gaps currently exist. MIHI is committed to addressing the existing asset gaps that were identified, while also maintaining efforts to eliminate the obstacles and barriers related to digital equity.

## Needs Assessment

With the goal of 95% statewide adoption of broadband, MIHI implemented a comprehensive community engagement strategy to address needs. As part of this strategy, a survey was conducted to collect information from community members and stakeholders on the barriers Michiganders face, especially covered populations, when accessing high-speed internet. The results of the needs assessment emphasized that the most significant barrier to internet adoption was the availability of broadband service. Affordability and the need for digital skills to effectively utilize the internet were also considered as significant concerns. These findings are guiding MIHI's efforts to develop targeted tactics and objectives that respond to the specific needs of these covered populations and to help achieve digital equity throughout Michigan.

## Coordination and Outreach Strategy

Core to MIHI's coordination and outreach strategy is MI Connected Future (MICF), an inclusive engagement model that aims to facilitate stakeholder and community engagement by promoting robust outreach and input, specifically targeted to covered populations. The MICF model has four primary components—community meetings, partnership roundtables, data collection, and public comment—that are crucial to its implementation. These components are designed to gather data and feedback from community members and organizations to further improve the Digital Equity Plan.



## Implementation Strategy

MIHI's implementation strategy is derived from the data and feedback gathered from community members and organizations during MICF. As a result, MIHI plans to implement a Digital Navigator Network that aims to promote community-based solutions, address the digital divide equitably based on individual community requirements, and facilitate high-speed internet access and digital skills training opportunities in urban, suburban, and rural areas. It will also be the role of Digital Navigators to collaborate with community-based nonprofits and other organizations working in the digital inclusion space. Each navigator will support the capacity building of individuals through digital skills training

and by providing resources for device access and affordability. Navigators will also be charged with capacity-building assistance for the organizations where they will be hosted to support the sustainability of Digital Equity Act programming beyond the life cycle of available funding. Navigators will be instrumental in barrier removal for individuals and have an emphasis on supporting underrepresented communities and covered populations.

# 2. Introduction and Vision for Digital Equity

## 2.1 Vision

Broadband in the 21st century is a necessity, yet much of Michigan remains without access to an affordable or reliable broadband connection. Michigan recognizes the importance of broadband access to its citizens that promotes economic opportunity, educational attainment, health outcomes, and civic engagement. Michigan envisions a connected and inclusive future where every resident has an affordable high-speed internet connection available to them regardless of where they live, how much money they make, or what they look like.

**Digital equity in Michigan looks like statewide universal broadband availability, affordable broadband subscription plans for middle- and low-income households, at least one internet-enabled device per household, inclusive training, and technical support services for devices, digital skills, and personal cybersecurity.**

Digital equity is not something that can be accomplished with a one-size-fits-all approach. The needs of each corner of our state vary tremendously, as do they vary from household to household. For example, the Eastern Upper Peninsula lacks broadband infrastructure apart from portions of its towns, compared with Detroit, which has infrastructure but is met with affordability barriers for many of its residents. Michigan will not be satisfied with a blanket approach to digital equity wherein each region of our state has the same solution to close the divide. Digital equity means meeting communities and people where they are, connecting them to the resources that already exist, learning about problems that persist, and providing community-level technical support to encourage accessibility and promote adoption.

Communities know communities best. Michigan's vision is to approach the digital divide by employing a grassroots strategy where communities lead the conversation and work toward solutions in partnership with MIHI and other state agencies. Michigan will close the digital divide by 2030 by building on the existing work community leaders have already done and resources available locally, by providing support for technical assistance, and by fostering connections between communities and existing programs and services (state, regional, or otherwise), while following a coordinated approach.

## 2.2 Alignment with Existing Efforts to Improve Outcomes

MIHI recognizes the importance and impact of infrastructure deployment on digital equity. As such, the structure of the MIHI Office is designed in an intentional way wherein members of the Infrastructure team and the Digital Equity team collaborate on crossover projects and programs to ensure infrastructure deployment is conducted equitably. MIHI will cross-reference existing infrastructure with planned infrastructure and overlay it with feedback collected from the statewide engagement tour to ensure the needs of the community are being met in a holistic manner. Details regarding specifics of infrastructure rollout strategies will be provided in the Michigan Initial Proposal (BEAD program activity).

### MIHI operates based on two strategic state goals:

- 1 Universal availability of reliable internet service, and,
- 2 95% adoption of internet service at the home

**As of 2021, an estimated 30% of Michiganders struggle with some form of the digital divide,<sup>7</sup> but overwhelmingly, MIHI heard from communities that the lack of availability was the biggest concern.**

MIHI is working to braid existing American Rescue Plan Act–Coronavirus Capital Projects Funding (ARPA-CPF)<sup>8</sup> with future BEAD program dollars to support the buildout of a reliable high-speed internet network throughout the state. MIHI is confident that, with strategic planning and collaboration with internet service providers and communities, goal one will be accomplished by 2030. Additionally, once a plan has been developed to use BEAD funding to bring affordable, high-speed broadband service to all unserved and underserved locations, BEAD funding may be used for nondeployment uses such as digital skills training, education programs, affordability program enrollment assistance, and other digital equity uses that support adoption.

While it is easy to solve the availability problem, the adoption goal becomes increasingly complex. The American Community Survey monitors households that do not have an internet connection, but there is little information available as to why Michiganders don't have an internet connection at their home. Barriers to adoption come in many forms and are evidenced in the feedback MIHI collected as part of its MI Connected Future (MICF) statewide listening tour<sup>9</sup>; however, the most commonly identified barrier (second to availability) was affordability of service.

7. 2021 Update to the Michigan Broadband Roadmap. 2021. Michigan High-Speed Internet Office

8. Also known as the Realizing Opportunities through Broadband Infrastructure Networks (ROBIN)

9. MI Connected Future (MICF), an inclusive engagement model that aims to facilitate stakeholder and community engagement by promoting robust outreach and input, specifically targeted to covered populations. See Section 4 for a full description of this statewide listening tour.

MIHI is looking to solve the affordability gap through creative engagement with communities and service providers to share existing resources that support affordability of internet service for Michiganders and to explore options for provider-led affordability programs. Additionally, as MIHI toured the state to learn from Michiganders as to why they were not online, many communities provided their community plans for digital equity and infrastructure expansion. Some of those plans are referenced later in this document. MIHI will incorporate the content of the existing plans into the Digital Equity Act implementation activities by working with community task forces, Tribal nations, and municipalities seeking broadband expansion and digital equity initiatives.

The following provides a summary of other state planning efforts and the alignment of this plan, its goals, objectives, and outcomes with those existing efforts.

### **Economic and Workforce Outcomes**

MIHI is located within the Department of Labor and Economic Opportunity (LEO). The LEO strategic plan for FY2022-FY2026 emphasizes five strategic focus areas:

| <b>Focus Areas</b>   | <b>Description</b>  |
|--|---|
| <b>Close equity gaps</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prioritize closure of socioeconomic/demographic opportunity gaps in all decision-making</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Protect and enhance health, safety, and economic security for workers</b>             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure safe working conditions, fair wages, and labor protections</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Educate Michiganders and grow the middle class by removing barriers to employment</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support education, training, on-ramps, certifications to make sustaining wages more attainable</li> <li>• Address barriers including housing, transportation, healthcare, child care, language, and placement</li> <li>• Address talent shortages in current and future growth sectors in every region of the state</li> </ul> |

| Focus Areas  | Description  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>Create better jobs and support small businesses</b></p>        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Become the benchmark of economic development by supporting the creation of good and promising jobs that make Michigan’s economy more resilient, while implementing the state’s first small business strategy that includes focusing on microbusinesses</li> <li>• Address talent shortages in current and future growth sectors in every region of the state</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Build strong communities and have great places to live</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create a strong foundation for communities to grow by making historic investments in broadband, housing, and other critical infrastructure</li> <li>• Invest in developing vibrant places with rich amenities</li> </ul>  |

Table 1: LEO strategic plan FY2022-FY2026 focus areas

Worker attraction is paramount to the success of the LEO strategic plan, but to attract workers, the state must also attract employers. Many parts of rural and Northern Michigan lack broadband infrastructure, making it nearly impossible to motivate a business to locate in these areas. For the growth of e-commerce, digitization of business practices, and even the automation of worker-facing platforms, the internet is key to running a successful small (or large) business. Michigan also recognizes the importance of attracting workers equitably and removing barriers to entry for historically underrepresented communities, including English-language learners, women, and people of color.



In addition to barrier removal, worker retraining and upskilling will be necessary to fill looming employment gaps in the trades industry, which is crucial to the success of the ARPA-CPF and BEAD programs. The National Telecommunications Information Administration (NTIA) projects a labor shortfall of more than 11% over the next five years for laborers and material movers, and a shortfall of nearly 10% for inspectors. MIHI is partnering with existing state programs to elevate the importance of the trades and the programs available currently that will remove barriers to entry for Michiganders, like MiSTEM, MiYARN, and other LEO-based programs.

## Educational Outcomes

Households with a broadband connection make, on average, over \$2,000 more per year than households that do not have a broadband connection.<sup>10</sup> Similarly, the National Skills Coalition researched the differences in wages among workers with no digital skills, workers with likely digital skills, and workers with up to nine digital skills (Figure 1).<sup>11</sup> The wage differences between a job requiring no digital skills and a job requiring nine digital skills equate to 143%.

### As more digital skills are required, median hourly wage rises (2021)




Figure 1: National Skills Coalition Data on Digital Skills Impact on Median Hourly Wage  
Source: National Skills Coalition

Michigan recognizes how foundational digital skills are to increasing household income and educational attainment and aims to incorporate digital skills standards and competencies into K-12 education settings to improve employment outcomes for workers. Employment and education are connected tremendously in this regard. The incorporation of digital skills into the classroom so that they are foundational to the success of education means workers will have the digital skills competencies needed to attain higher wages when they enter the workforce.



10. 2021 Update to the Michigan Broadband Roadmap. 2021. Michigan High-Speed Internet Office

11. Closing the Digital Skill Divide—National Skills Coalition

## Health Outcomes

The Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS) elevated the connection between health outcomes and the digital divide as part of the June 2022 Health Information Technology Commission report.<sup>12</sup> This five-year strategy roadmap emphasizes the need to address “Michigan’s digital divide to help address disparities in healthcare and social services in rural parts of the state.” The Health IT Commission highlights the need for online accessibility among patients and their healthcare provider, given the recent transition to many online patient management systems. Many health systems exclusively utilize online health information portals that require an internet connection and some level of digital skills in order to view and/or manage. Additionally, the Health IT Commission references challenges in a health IT system regarding consumer cybersecurity and legality of health information exchange.



Figure 2: Social Determinants of Health

12. CY2022 Bridge to Better Health Final Draft Document (michigan.gov)

The Health IT Commission also identifies the need for online data services to promote capacity building for “more complete insight into utilization, quality improvement, and evidence-based intervention design.” The purpose of this initiative is to promote holistic wellness and health outcomes and monitor the improvement of health among rural residents. Michigan supports the use of telemedicine wherever possible to improve patient outcomes, particularly to enhance patient access, improve care, and reduce costs (direct or indirect) to the patient. Telemedicine cannot be utilized in a community lacking broadband infrastructure or affordable access to said infrastructure, and as such, health disparities will continue to occur in rural and underrepresented populations if not deployed equitably.

It is also important to note there are medical researchers and medical professionals (and the National Digital Inclusion Alliance) who identify broadband access as a “super social determinant of health” because of its ability to impact all other social determinants of health (SDOH).

## **Civic and Social Engagement**

Voter records and registrations are managed by an electronic pollbook system in Michigan, which means rural communities will need sustained access to a reliable internet connection to ensure safety of the elections over the course of the nine-day early voting period.

Photo IDs are a requirement to vote in Michigan. Photo IDs can be obtained by visiting Secretary of State branches; however, one must schedule an appointment to avoid spending an afternoon in a government office waiting to receive the ID. Appointments can only be booked online. The Michigan Department of State is transitioning some services online, including registering to vote and renewing one’s photo ID or driver’s license. The online transition allows for expanded access for Michiganders to obtain the photo ID needed to engage in elections (among other activities) on their own time and in their own home. The same is not true, however, for those lacking a reliable internet connection in their home.

In addition to online civil engagement, many government assistance programs utilize online application systems for those seeking assistance. Those without internet are not only unable to apply for the benefits they need but also may be unaware that benefits even exist.



## 2.3 Strategy and Objectives

To realize the vision for Michigan, MIHI aims to employ a holistic strategy focused on meeting the needs of communities by community members themselves. MIHI will serve as a resource and facilitator and provide support to remove barriers. Partnership with existing state agencies and communities will be crucial to maximizing the reach of the Digital Equity Act and its subsequent funding. Outlined below are the strategies Michigan will utilize to close the digital divide, followed by how MIHI will measure the progress of the goals with Indicator Scores. Indicator Scores are crucial to measuring success of the holistic approach and effectiveness of closing the digital divide for Michiganders by focusing on the availability of and affordability of access to fixed and wireless broadband technology, the online accessibility and inclusivity of public resources and services, digital literacy, securing online privacy of individuals, and the availability and affordability of consumer devices and technical support for those devices.

| Goal  | Strategy  |
|---|---|
| 1. Ensure all Michiganders have access to an affordable, reliable high-speed internet connection at their home          | 1.1 Collaborate and align efforts between DEA planned activities with BEAD planned activities and partner with communities, Tribal governments, and state agencies to align similar goals and timelines for infrastructure deployment and digital equity initiatives. |
| 2. Attract workers and employers to Michigan  | 2.1 Coordinate, partner, and support existing workforce development strategies and programs housed within LEO and other relevant state agencies   |
| 3. Improve educational attainment including removing barriers for credentialed workers and in postsecondary achievement | 3.1 Collaborate and partner with Michigan Department of Education to elevate online learning opportunities and additional pathways to digital skills development for adults   |
| 4. Improve overall health outcomes, particularly with improvement in rural areas and in underrepresented populations    | 4.1 Coordinate and collaborate with the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services to monitor health outcomes pre- and post-deployment of broadband projects impacting covered populations  |
| 5. Educate Michiganders about the online services available to them as a resident                                       | 5.1 Coordinate and collaborate with the Michigan Department of State to provide trainings to Michiganders about their digital residency and to support inclusive initiatives for covered populations  |

Table 2: MIHI Goals and Strategies to Close the Digital Divide in Michigan

## 2.3.1 Strategies

### **1.1 Collaborate and align efforts between DEA planned activities with BEAD planned activities and partner with communities, Tribal governments, and state agencies to align similar goals and timelines for infrastructure deployment and digital equity initiatives.**

Michigan recognizes and values the work municipalities, counties, Tribal governments, and other state agencies have already done to close the digital divide in their respective communities. Michigan also recognizes the importance of collaboration in order to implement BEAD deployment dollars into the communities that need the infrastructure the most. Collaboration with local units of government is paramount to the success of the Digital Equity Act and BEAD.

The structure of MIHI is intentionally designed in such a way that the Infrastructure team works closely with the Digital Equity team to ensure both teams are aligned on timelines, upcoming projects, and existing community plans so as to not invalidate the community's work on a project. Throughout the MICF listening tour, the MIHI team heard about the work already happening throughout Michigan and wants to ensure projects (particularly BEAD deployment projects) align with the goals of the community task forces already in place. Universal availability cannot be accomplished without the voice of the community, and Michigan aims to work in partnership with community leaders to deploy infrastructure and digital equity initiatives.

Equitable implementation and alignment of the DEA and BEAD requires an equitable approach for each region of our state. The digital equity needs of the Upper Peninsula vary greatly from those of Detroit, and it is a goal of Michigan to support communities by developing a unique solution to each community's needs.

Geographic barriers are important; however, they are not the only barrier many communities face when looking at solutions to closing the digital divide. Historically underrepresented communities and covered populations (aging individuals, people of color, non-English speakers, to name a few) have unique barriers to full participation in the digital world. Collaboration with organizations and agencies that are composed of or represent covered populations are also imperative to the success of the DEA and BEAD alignment and implementation. MIHI continues to collaborate with and learn from organizations that serve covered populations so as to incorporate barrier-removal strategies that may not have been initially considered.

Michigan aims to holistically align and implement efforts funded by the DEA and BEAD to the best of its ability, with the recognition that community involvement is the key to its long-term success at closing the digital divide. MIHI will actively work to elevate the voices of underrepresented communities and populations throughout the planning and implementation process for DEA- and BEAD-funded programs.

## **2.1 Coordinate, partner, and support existing workforce development strategies and programs housed within the LEO and other relevant state agencies.**

Additionally, MIHI collaborates with other state agencies supporting infrastructure deployment activities to ensure projects are planned with similar timelines and cohesiveness. State agencies include the Michigan Infrastructure Office, the Michigan Department of Transportation, the Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy, the Department of Natural Resources, LEO, and the Executive Office of the Governor. The strategies and objectives Michigan will employ to achieve its goal of attracting workers and employers to the state and to improve economic and workforce outcomes in Michigan include emphasis on strong labor standards; attraction, retention, and transition of skilled workers; and outlining the importance of partnership with in-house training organizations and community colleges to achieving the goal.

MIHI and the Department of Labor and Economic Opportunity support all efforts to promote strong labor standards to ensure worker safety. The workforce and labor division of LEO focuses on “ensuring workplace safety and equitable labor relations for employees and employers.” MIHI plans to require potential subgrantees to comply with the strong labor standards outlined in the BEAD NOFO, including using a directly employed workforce; compliance with Davis-Bacon Act requirements\* (including the collection of certified payrolls); using project labor agreements, local hire provisions, and union neutrality commitments from all subgrantees; and requiring proof of an appropriately skilled and credentialed workforce. To support employers unfamiliar with Davis-Bacon Act requirements, MIHI will conduct a series of technical assistance webinars tailored to employers to prevent compliance failures. MIHI will continue to collaborate with workforce and labor division leadership to ensure accuracy of information and equitable outreach to industry leaders.

Additionally, LEO identifies safe working conditions, fair wages, and labor protections for workers in its five-year operational plan. One relevant strategy to achieving this goal in the context of the DEA is through strategic promotion of the workplace rights one-stop site, which emphasizes responsibilities, rights, compliance requirements, and regulations. The one-stop site is a resource for employers and employees to ensure safe working conditions and strong labor practices. MIHI will encourage subgrantees to utilize the workplace rights one-stop site and to promote it to their workforce.

---

\*At the time of the Michigan Digital Equity Plan submission for approval, the Davis-Bacon Act laws were the standard for wages on Bipartisan Infrastructure Law projects. In Michigan, prevailing wage has been defined in MCL 10 of 2023 and shall be considered to be the law which determines worker wages.

LEO prioritizes talent and worker attraction within Michigan as evidenced in its five-year operations plan. As a division of LEO, MIHI operates under the same goals. Additionally, LEO has established the Infrastructure Workforce Taskforce (IWT) following the passage of the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL). MIHI is a member of the IWT, which operates with the goal to “identify opportunities and develop plans for increasing talent pipeline for infrastructure jobs to:

- 1 Translate unprecedented BIL resources into good-paying jobs and career pathways with diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility focus, and;
- 2 Mitigate labor market inflation at height of BIL investments in order to improve effectiveness economy-wide.”

The IWT consists of LEO division heads and representatives from the Michigan Infrastructure Office (MIO) to ensure a coordinated approach to workforce attraction plans across the state. **Outlined below are relevant plans, strategies, and programs LEO and other State of Michigan Departments have in place. This list is not exhaustive in nature.**

| Agency   | Strategy/Plan/Program  |
|--|--|
| Michigan Economic Development Corporation (MEDC)                           | \$34 million talent attraction and retention strategy targeting students, job seekers and industry professionals in key growth areas (e.g., EV mobility and semiconductor industries).   |
| MEDC   | STEM-Forward Internship program connects students who attend Michigan colleges and universities with paid internship opportunities in STEM-focused careers.  |
| LEO – Michigan Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (MiSTEM) Network | Removing barriers to employment by increasing implementation of project-, problem-, and place-based education instruction in K-12 schools in Michigan and expose 200,000 students to STEM careers.   |
| LEO – Workforce Development, Education and Training (E&T)                  | Addressing talent shortages by engaging and creating customized targeted solutions to meet employer needs by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishing and strengthening existing employer-led collaboratives (ELCs).</li> <li>• Aligning career pathways and educational credentials that lead to transferrable skills and increased wages for job seekers.</li> </ul> |

| Agency   | Strategy/Plan/Program   |
|--|---|
| LEO – E&T; MEDC                                | <p>Expand talent in Michigan by upskilling and reskilling Michiganders and leverage resources resulting in 7,500 postsecondary credentials by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoting tuition-free pathways to obtain postsecondary credentials;</li> <li>• Expanding relationships with secondary and postsecondary education providers to improve job outcomes for students with disabilities; and,</li> <li>• Boosting apprenticeship opportunities to obtain industry-recognized credentials.</li> </ul>  |
| LEO – E&T; Michigan Works! Agencies            | <p>Expand Michigan’s labor force by providing job-readiness services to 800 people by conducting outreach activities and supporting eligible persons experiencing barriers to employment to reenter the labor force.</p>  |
| LEO – Office of Prosperity; Women’s Commission | <p>Help 50,000 Michigan women reenter or remain in the workforce with support of the Tri-Share Child Care program and the MI Fostering Access, Rights and Equity (MI FARE) program. MI FARE is designed to educate women workers about their employment rights and benefits.</p>  |
| Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC)      | <p>MDOC operates a skilled trades training program that aims to provide a positive learning community for prisoners who are serious about completing career and technical education. Prisoners complete training at the vocational village located in the state prison facilities. Career paths include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commercial Driving License and Forklift Operation</li> <li>• Carpentry</li> <li>• Electrical</li> <li>• Computer Coding</li> <li>• Computer Numerical Control Machine Tooling and Robotics</li> <li>• Line Clearance and Tree Trimming</li> </ul> |

**Table 3: Existing Plans, Strategies, and Programs to Support Workforce Development in the State of Michigan**

MIHI is aware of several internet service providers that conduct in-house training programs, as well as labor unions that support training programs. MIHI will require any subgrantee to outline their in-house training programs to determine appropriate skilling for the projects for which they are seeking funding.

Workforce gaps are top of mind for Michigan policymakers and agencies, especially as Michigan is entering the time for unprecedented BIL buildouts. MIHI is plugged in to existing workforce development structures within the state given the vast network stewarded by our Workforce Development Division. Partners in this space are eager to engage with MIHI to support workforce growth in their respective capacities.

MIHI partners with LEO E&T to support relationship building among the Michigan Community College Association, the Michigan Association of Intermediate School Administrators, and Michigan Occupational Dean's Advisory Council. Additionally, LEO houses the Michigan Office of Registered Apprenticeships, which provides supportive services and funding for employers of apprentices. The GoingPRO Talent fund supports employers in reskilling new workers and ensures a pathway to credentialing as part of the involvement in the program. GoingPRO is housed in the Workforce Development Division. Other programs include the Michigan Youth Apprenticeship Readiness Network (MiYARN), which aims to expand youth registered apprenticeships by partnering with regional entities, and the Michigan Learning and Education Advancement Program (MiLEAP), which supports the transition from education and training programs to high-wage jobs. MiLEAP focuses on underrepresented populations, particularly those of economically distressed rural and urban areas.

### **3.1 Collaborate and partner with Michigan Department of Education to elevate online learning opportunities and additional pathways to digital skills development for adults.**

The Michigan Department of Education's (MDE) Top 10 Strategic Plan was approved in August 2020 and provides direction to the Michigan education community.<sup>13</sup> MDE aims to be a Top 10 education state in 10 years and employs the strategic education plan to monitor growth and progress on its eight goals. Three of MDE's goals most relevant to the work at MIHI are:

- Expand secondary learning opportunities for all students.
- Increase the percentage of all students who graduate from high school.
- Increase the percentage of adults with a postsecondary credential.

The following provides an overview of how MIHI can impact/influence MDE's goals:

---

<sup>13</sup>.Michigan's Top 10 Strategic Education Plan

## **Expand secondary learning opportunities for all students**

MDE focuses on six specific areas for secondary learning opportunities:

1. Career and Technical Education
2. Early Middle College
3. Advance Placement
4. International baccalaureate
5. Dual Enrollment
6. Secondary Transition



Closing the digital divide is important for all six focus areas and supports growth and progress not only by boosting the number of skilled workers able to build the infrastructure needed to close the availability gaps, particularly in Michigan’s rural communities, but by also ensuring more educational opportunities for individuals looking to advance their education but who may be limited by their school district’s course offerings.

Dual enrollment, for example, showcases a strong argument and need for closing the digital divide. When COVID-19 shut down schools and learning transitioned online, those who were dual enrolled were now at risk of losing not only their high school credential but also their college credits or even degree if they did not have reliable access to the internet. According to MDE, in the 2018-19 school year, 4.1% of students across all Michigan schools were dual enrolled. Enrollment declined to 3.7% during 2020-21 and remained lower into 2021-22. Subsequently, school districts that offered a dual-enrollment opportunity also declined and have not yet met pre-pandemic numbers.<sup>14</sup>

## **Increase the percentage of all students who graduate from high school**

Access to the internet and high school graduation rates may not be directly correlated; however, a recent study found a correlation between internet access and grade point average (GPA). According to the Quello Center at Michigan State University, students with a “fast” internet connection at home report a GPA of 3.18 compared with a 3.10 GPA reported by their counterparts with “slow” internet connections at home. Additionally, students with no internet access at home reported a 2.81 GPA and those who had only cell phone access to the internet reported a 2.75 GPA.<sup>15</sup> MIHI will work with MDE to incorporate awareness campaigns for parents and students about the importance of an at-home internet connection and provide a pathway to support the affordability of and access to a reliable broadband connection, including affordability of and access to internet-enabled devices. This holistic approach will provide families with the resources needed to get online and support their scholars in school.

---

<sup>14</sup><https://www.mischooldata.org/dual-enrollment/>

## **Increase the percentage of adults with a postsecondary credential**

MDE and LEO are partnering to achieve Governor Whitmer’s Sixty by 30 initiative. Sixty by 30 is a program with the goal of supporting 60% of Michiganders achieving a postsecondary credential or college degree by 2030 by removing barriers to attainment. Educational attainment and economic growth correlate closely, particularly in the earned wages for individuals with a postsecondary degree or credential.

MIHI is working to expand the broadband skilled trades workforce through partnerships among industry leaders and community colleges to ensure Michigan has the skilled workforce needed to build out the robust broadband network necessary to reach universal availability. This means credentialed workers will earn more in their lives, and Michigan will be one step closer to closing the digital divide.

In addition to the Top 10 Strategic Plan, MDE adopted a set of competencies to support consistent digital skills for K-12 schools in 2016. The International Society for Technology in Education standards have been adopted in Michigan as the Michigan Integrated Technology Competencies for Students (MITECS) to support the Top 10 Strategic Plan.<sup>16</sup>

MITECS has been utilized as a guide in Michigan schools to integrate digital skills and technology literacy for K-8 students. The Regional Educational Media Center Association of Michigan also provides resources to support the integration of digital literacy and technological skills instruction by providing micro-credentialing for educators and educational content to improve students’ technology proficiency. These competencies work to integrate technology into learning for students as a way to enhance their education. Overall, 81% of workforce sectors indicated the MITECS competencies reflect “high” or “very high” alignment with the skills needed in their workforce.

MIHI aims to continue collaboration with MDE to meet the digital skills gap and promote workforce development for K-12 students but will also work to ensure adult learners and covered populations have ready access to a digital skills curriculum regardless of enrollment status in a postsecondary education program. MIHI and the State of Michigan Library plan to incorporate free access to a digital skills learning platform via local libraries and Michigan Works! Associations.

---

15. Hampton, K. N., Fernandez, L., Robertson, C. T., & Bauer, J. M. Broadband and Student Performance Gaps. James H. and Mary B. Quello Center, Michigan State University. <https://doi.org/10.25335/BZGY-3V91>

16. MITECS

#### **4.1 Coordinate and collaborate with the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services to monitor health outcomes pre- and post-deployment of broadband projects impacting covered populations.**

The Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS) operates with the vision to “deliver health and opportunity to all Michiganders, reducing intergenerational poverty and promoting health equity.” With broadband indicated as a super social determinant of health (SDOH), it is imperative to equitably roll out broadband infrastructure and the necessary technical support to areas where covered populations will be impacted. Particular emphasis is to be paid to Michigan’s Tribal communities, given their simultaneous rurality and historic underrepresentation.

MIHI and MDHHS will work together to support the monitoring and tracking of health outcomes in areas both pre- and post-deployment through existing health monitoring and could expand to new data sets, as needed. Continued partnership with the Health IT Commission is vital to improving health outcomes for Michigan. Additionally, MIHI will work with MDHHS to promote and improve the way in which benefits such as SNAP, FAP, Medicare, and Medicaid are accessed by improving the MIBridges portal to improve accessibility for individuals with few digital skills. MIHI and MDHHS will work to promote relevant programs to MIBridges users, such as the Affordable Connectivity Program.

#### **5.1 Coordinate and collaborate with the Michigan Department of State to provide trainings to Michiganders about their digital residency and support inclusive initiatives for covered populations.**

With the rise of political and civic engagement transitioning to exclusively online mechanisms, it is imperative to support covered populations in getting involved in the services provided by the state. The Michigan Department of State (MDOS) emphasizes equity in engagement and utilizes a team of individuals to specifically reach out to historically underrepresented communities regarding the changes MDOS is implementing and how they will affect them. MIHI and MDOS will work closely to educate Michiganders on the tools available to engage digitally, as well as support inclusive initiatives surrounding education of MDOS services, including voter rights and online Secretary of State vehicle services.

Additionally, to promote safety and security of covered populations, MIHI will work with MDOS to educate individuals on the importance of protecting online activities and how to do so. Many Michiganders indicate that they refrain from using online services due to cybersecurity concerns. By utilizing preventive education, the online transition will promote better civic engagement for Michigan through ease of access and barrier removal to voter registration and/or license renewals.

## 2.3.2 Indicator Scores and Measurable Objectives

### Indicator Scores

The goals and strategies outlined above detail the holistic ways in which MIHI will work to support the systematic changes needed to close the digital divide effectively and permanently. In keeping with this vision of closing the digital divide, MIHI has developed a series of key “Indicator Scores” that will progress toward zero as the Digital Equity Plan is successfully implemented.

In many cases, multiple key indicators will be affected by MIHI’s progress toward each goal and strategy outlined in Section 2.3.1. For example, the goal of attracting workers and businesses to Michigan will be affected as MIHI improves the availability and affordability of high-speed internet service throughout the state, particularly in our rural areas. More availability will empower more Michiganders to work from home, increasing their income, options for educational advancement, and so forth.

These Indicator Scores draw from the NTIA Computer Use Supplement data from November 2021 and respond directly to Section 60304(c)(1)(B) of the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law. They will document the progress we make in addressing the connectivity needs of each covered population identified in the Digital Equity Act, although in many cases, multiple indicator scores will be affected by MIHI’s work toward each goal and strategy outlined in Section 2.3.1.

The specific variables used in identifying each population and calculating each score are detailed below. We have used the best information available to represent the definitions of each covered population, although limitations in the data (that is, an absence of appropriate variables within the Computer Use Supplement) have prevented us from producing Indicator Scores for individuals with a language barrier or for justice-involved/incarcerated individuals and have caused us to approximate the Notice of Funding Opportunity definitions for other covered populations:

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Rural Individuals</b>  | In the Notice of Funding Opportunity, “rural” generally means an area other than a city or town with a population over 50,000 or an urbanized area adjoining such a city/town. Our analysis includes November 2021 Computer Use Survey respondents from Michigan who are not within a Core-Based Statistical Area of 100,000 or greater (GTCBSASZ). |
| <b>Ageing Individuals</b> | Our analysis includes November 2021 Computer Use Supplement respondents from Michigan who indicated that their age was over 65 (PRTAGE).  |

|                                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Covered Households</b>            | In the Notice of Funding Opportunity, “covered households” are those below 150% of federal poverty guidelines. Our analysis includes November 2021 Computer Use Survey respondents from Michigan who indicated a household income of \$39,999 or lower (HEFAMINC) as an approximation for this criterion because 150% of FPL for a household of three would be \$37,290 in annual income. |
| <b>Racial/Ethnic Minorities</b>      | Our analysis includes November 2021 Computer Use Survey respondents from Michigan who indicated a race other than “white alone” (PTDTRACE) as well as those who indicated Latino, Hispanic, or Spanish origin (PEHSPNON).   |
| <b>Veterans</b>                      | Our analysis includes November 2021 Computer Use Supplement respondents from Michigan who indicated that they were a veteran (PEAFEVER).  |
| <b>Individuals with Disabilities</b> | Our analysis includes November 2021 Computer Use Supplement respondents from Michigan who indicated that they were not in the labor force because of a disability (PEMLR).  |

**Table 4: Indicator Scores by Covered Population**

MIHI plans to establish a baseline for incarcerated individuals and for individuals with a language barrier during the Capacity Grant by partnering with the Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC) and the Office of Global Michigan (OGM). MIHI will collaborate with MDOC particularly on the digital government accessibility, digital participation, digital security, and device distress scores through education and in-reach programs. MIHI will work to provide consumer education regarding affordability of service for incarcerated individuals post-release to ensure returning citizens have a full understanding of what types of internet service they are paying for and that it is in their budget. Many returning citizens participate in the MDOC Offender Success program post-release. Offender Success is designed to prevent recidivism and support returning citizens find housing and employment, as well as provides general barrier removal support. Information is collected by Offender Success programs and MIHI will ensure the metrics pertaining to the five indicator scores will be included as part of that information by MDOC.

The OGM is the resource for new Americans moving to Michigan as refugees, and leads the work supporting language access for all Michigan residents. MIHI will collaborate with OGM to establish the baseline for all five indicator scores for individuals with a language barrier by utilizing their existing resources designed to support the new American population. Additionally, MIHI will utilize US Census data to determine the regional densities of individuals with a language barrier and ensure the Digital Navigator Network outlined in section 5.1 support multilingual populations with resources accessible to them in their preferred language.

After the baseline for each of the scores is determined, MIHI will set goals for improvement following the bi-annual structure outlined below.

## **AFFORDABILITY SCORE: The availability of, and affordability of access to, fixed and wireless broadband technology**

The Affordability Score combines:

1. The percentage of households that do not use the internet at home because they cannot afford it.
2. The percentage of households that temporarily lost their internet connection due to inability or difficulty paying for the subscription.

This score represents how likely it is that affordability barriers are keeping covered populations from digital equity. A score of zero indicates that both lower- and higher-income households are equally likely to have high-speed internet service, while a score of 100 would indicate that lower-income households are being blocked from taking advantage of the myriad resources available online. This score is calculated by determining the sum of (1) the percentage of the covered population that lost their internet connection at some point in the last six months due to difficulty in paying for the subscription (HNETST) and (2) the percentage of the covered population that indicated that they do not use the internet at home because they cannot afford it (HENOHM response 2). That is,

**Affordability Score = HNETST + HENOHM response 2**

| <b>Covered Population</b>     | <b>Affordability Score</b> | <b>2025</b> | <b>2027</b> | <b>2029</b> |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Rural Individuals             | 13.76                      | 9.50        | 3.25        | <0.50       |
| Aging Individuals             | 17.48                      | 15.00       | 9.25        | <1.00       |
| Covered Households            | 35.98                      | 20.50       | 12.20       | <5.50       |
| Racial/Ethnic Minorities      | 25.59                      | 18.50       | 11.00       | <3.50       |
| Veterans                      | 28.72                      | 19.75       | 12.50       | <3.75       |
| Individuals with Disabilities | 62.53                      | 38.75       | 20.00       | <8.50       |

**Table 5: Affordability Score by Covered Population**

The Affordability Score and the progress made upon the score will impact the ability for covered populations to engage with resources previously inaccessible due to the cost of internet service at home. MIHI anticipates the Affordability Score to directly impact Goal 1 of this Digital Equity Plan, and to indirectly impact Goals 2 through 5. Goal 1 will be directly impacted as it pertains exclusively to the affordability of internet service for covered populations. Goal 2 will be indirectly impacted because of the variety of services offered online by workforce agencies, including job boards, trainings, and networking opportunities. Goals 3, 4, and 5 will be similarly impacted indirectly because of the plethora of resources available from education institutions, health providers, and government agencies.

## DIGITAL GOVERNMENT ACCESSIBILITY SCORE: The online accessibility and inclusivity of public resources and services

The Digital Government Accessibility Score compares the likelihood that each covered population is accessing government services online with how likely they are to use telehealth, online banking, or online consumer services.

This score represents how likely a person in each covered population who engages in commercial, financial, or health transactions online is to also access government services online. A score of zero would represent equal frequency between the identified transactions and government services, while a score of 100 represents a population engaging in identifiable transactions but not accessing any government services online. One covered population (racial/ethnic minorities) currently shows a negative result in this indicator score, indicating that this population is more likely to be accessing government services online than to be engaging in the other types of transactions that are considered in this score. This current score results from the fact that this covered population is significantly less likely to be engaging in financial services online than in accessing government services online.

The first step in calculating this score is dividing the percentage of the covered population that used the internet for accessing government services, such as registering to vote or renewing their driver's license (EGOVTS), by the percentage of that same population that engaged in each of four other kinds of activities they might do online:

- Online shopping, travel reservations, or other consumer services (ECOMME).
- Financial services such as banking, investing, paying bills online, or sending money to other people (FINANC).
- Accessing health records or health insurance records (MEDREC).
- Communicating with a doctor or other health professional (MEDDOC).



The single Digital Government Accessibility Score for each covered population is the mean of these four comparisons. That is,

**Digital Government Accessibility Score = Mean of (PEEGOVTS/PEECOMME, PEEGOVTS/PEFINANC, PEEGOVTS/HEMEDREC, PEEGOVTS/HEMEDDOC)**

| Covered Population            | Affordability Score | 2025  | 2027  | 2029  |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Rural Individuals             | 29.61               | 19.50 | 11.00 | <1.25 |
| Aging Individuals             | 29.76               | 19.75 | 11.25 | <2.00 |
| Covered Households            | 19.71               | 12.75 | 6.25  | <1.0  |
| Racial/Ethnic Minorities      | -16.69              | ≤0    | ≤0    | ≤0    |
| Veterans                      | 45.55               | 30.55 | 12.25 | <5.00 |
| Individuals with Disabilities | 12.00               | 9.75  | 5.00  | <1.50 |

**Table 6: Digital Government Accessibility Score by Covered Population**

The Digital Government Accessibility Score and the progress made upon the score will directly impact Goal 4 and Goal 5 of this Digital Equity Plan. MIHI anticipates impact on Goal 4 will positively trend toward an increase of covered populations utilizing online health benefits to access websites and resources managed by governmental agencies, namely MDHHS. Additionally, MIHI anticipates a positive trend toward the number of covered populations who choose to shift their healthcare billing, scheduling, or appointments to an online nature. MIHI anticipates impact on Goal 5 to show an increase in covered populations who choose to register to vote online as opposed to appearing in person at a Michigan Secretary of State office location.

## DIGITAL PARTICIPATION SCORE: Digital Literacy

The Digital Participation Score compares the proportion of each covered population that is engaging in various online activities with the proportion of the general Michigan population that is engaging in those same online activities.

This score represents how each covered population uses the internet, as compared with the overall population of the State of Michigan. A score of zero indicates that the covered population is just as likely as the overall population to use the internet for various tasks included in the Computer Use Supplement, while a score of 100 indicates the covered population was not using the internet for any of the tasks that were asked about.

There is one covered population (racial/ethnic minorities) that currently shows a small negative Digital Participation Score; this covered population is more likely than the general Michigan population to do some activities online (including videoconferencing, job searching, and shopping) but less likely to do others (including email, telework, engaging in online government services, and engaging in personal finance tasks).

The first step in calculating this score is computing the difference between how frequently this covered population engages in each of 23 different online activities that are tracked in the Computer Use Survey and how frequently the general population of Michigan does so. The final Digital Participation Score is the mean of these 23 comparisons. That is,

### Digital Participation Score = Mean of the following:

- *PEEMAIL for all Michiganders minus PEEMAIL for Covered Population*
- *PETEXTIM for all Michiganders minus PETEXTIM for Covered Population*
- *PEGAMING for all Michiganders minus PEGAMING for Covered Population*
- *PECONFER for all Michiganders minus PECONFER for Covered Population*
- *PEVIDEO for all Michiganders minus PEVIDEO for Covered Population*
- *PEAUDIO for all Michiganders minus PEAUDIO for Covered Population*
- *PEPUBLISH for all Michiganders minus PEPUBLISH for Covered Population*
- *PETELEWK for all Michiganders minus PETELEWK for Covered Population*
- *PEJOBSCH for all Michiganders minus PEJOBSCH for Covered Population*
- *PEEDTRAI for all Michiganders minus PEEDTRAI for Covered Population*
- *PEEGOVTS for all Michiganders minus PEEGOVTS for Covered Population*
- *PEUSESVC for all Michiganders minus PEUSESVC for Covered Population*
- *PEESVCS for all Michiganders minus PEESVCS for Covered Population*
- *PEECOMME for all Michiganders minus PEECOMME for Covered Population*
- *PEEGOODS for all Michiganders minus PEEGOODS for Covered Population*
- *PEFINANC for all Michiganders minus PEFINANC for Covered Population*
- *PEVOICEA for all Michiganders minus PEVOICEA for Covered Population*
- *PEHOMIOT for all Michiganders minus PEHOMIOT for Covered Population*

- *HEMEDREC for all Michiganders minus HEMEDREC for Covered Population*
- *HEMEDDOC for all Michiganders minus HEMEDDOC for Covered Population*
- *HEMEDINF for all Michiganders minus HEMEDINF for Covered Population*
- *HEMEDMON for all Michiganders minus MEMEDMON for Covered Population*

The definitions for the list of variables are in Appendix 1: Digital Participation Score Definitions.

| <b>Covered Population</b>     | <b>Digital Participation Score</b> | <b>2025</b> | <b>2027</b> | <b>2029</b> |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Rural Individuals             | 5.97                               | 4.25        | 2.75        | <0.25       |
| Aging Individuals             | 10.40                              | 8.50        | 5.50        | <3.00       |
| Covered Households            | 10.28                              | 8.25        | 5.25        | <2.75       |
| Racial/Ethnic Minorities      | -0.98                              | ≤0          | ≤0          | ≤0          |
| Veterans                      | 9.14                               | 7.25        | 4.00        | <1.50       |
| Individuals with Disabilities | 16.64                              | 12.50       | 8.00        | <3.50       |

**Table 7: Digital Participation Score by Covered Population**

Given the broad scope of activities analyzed as part of the Digital Participation Score, ranging from leisure activities like online shopping (e-commerce) and video streaming, to civic activities like accessing government services online, MIHI expects the Digital Participation Score to improve the outcomes of Goals 2, 4, and 5 of this Digital Equity Plan directly. The Digital Participation Score encompasses job searching and teleworking activities, which will directly support the workforce goals and strategies as described in Goal 2 of this plan. The Digital Participation Score analyzes the likelihood of each covered population to use telehealth services (including online bill pay), which will directly impact Goal 4 of this Digital Equity Plan and support improved health outcomes for covered populations. Goal 5 of this plan will be directly impacted by the Digital Participation Score, in that the likelihood of utilizing government services is a factor in its calculation. As MIHI improves the Digital Participation Score, more Michiganders will be utilizing online government services, thereby improving the progress made toward the civic engagement goals outlined in Goal 5 of this plan. Additionally, MIHI anticipates the Digital Participation Score will have an indirect impact on Goal 3 of this plan, as the data used for calculating the score encompasses activities considered essential for education (email, videoconferencing) but that are not exclusively pertaining to educational settings.

**DIGITAL SECURITY SCORE: Awareness of, and the use of, measures to secure the online privacy of, and cybersecurity with respect to an individual**

The Digital Security Score combines:

1. The percentage of each covered population that has refrained from one or more online activities due to cybersecurity concerns.
2. The percentage of each covered population that refrains from using the internet at all due to privacy or cybersecurity concerns.
3. The percentage of each covered population that has experienced an online security breach in the past year.

This score represents how likely it is that concern about cybersecurity is keeping covered populations from digital equity. A score of zero would result if no member of the covered population surveyed is refraining from online activity due to cybersecurity or privacy concerns or experienced a cybersecurity breach, while a score of 100 would indicate that every member of the covered population surveyed was doing so.

This score is calculated by determining the mean of the percentages of each covered population that has refrained from a variety of online activities (HEPSPRE responses 1-5) or from using the internet at all (HENOHM response 7) due to concerns about privacy or security, as well as those who have experienced an online security breach (HEPSCYBA). That is,

**Digital Security Score = Mean of (HEPSPRE response 1, HEPSPRE response 2, HEPSPRE response 3, HEPSPRE response 4, HEPSPRE response 5, HENOHM response 7, HEPSCYBA)**

| Covered Population            | Digital Participation Score | 2025  | 2027 | 2029  |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------|------|-------|
| Rural Individuals             | 11.98                       | 8.75  | 5.00 | <1.00 |
| Aging Individuals             | 15.44                       | 12.25 | 7.50 | <2.00 |
| Covered Households            | 16.23                       | 13.00 | 8.00 | <2.25 |
| Racial/Ethnic Minorities      | 12.61                       | 9.00  | 5.50 | <1.50 |
| Veterans                      | 13.05                       | 9.75  | 6.00 | <1.75 |
| Individuals with Disabilities | 11.69                       | 8.50  | 4.75 | <0.50 |

Table 8: Digital Security Score by Covered Population

MIHI anticipates that the progress made upon the Digital Security Score will indirectly improve outcomes relating to Goals 3, 4, and 5 of this plan. As more Michiganders learn more about how to improve their individual cybersecurity, it is anticipated that they will be more likely to participate in online education services, telehealth services, and civic engagement activities. As part of the MI Connected Future Listening tour (Section 4.1), many Michiganders expressed cybersecurity concerns as a reason for hesitation to engage online. MIHI believes that with targeted supports for each covered population aimed at addressing the specific cybersecurity concerns, coupled with relevant real-life practice lessons, there will be improvement on Goals 3, 4, and 5 of this plan.



## **DEVICE DISTRESS SCORE: The availability and affordability of consumer devices and technical support for those devices**

The Device Distress Score combines:

- The percentage of each covered population that has neither a desktop nor laptop computer.
- The percentage of each covered population that was unable to use a computer one or more days during the last six months because someone else was using it/it was elsewhere/it was otherwise inaccessible.

This score represents how frequently issues with access to or ability to use internet-enabled devices keep covered populations from digital equity. A score of zero would indicate that the population had full access to devices that worked well, and a score of 100 would indicate that a lack of access to workable devices kept members of that population from engaging in online activities.

This score is calculated as the sum of the percentages of each covered population that has neither a desktop nor a laptop computer (HEDESKTP, HELAPTOP) and the percentage of each covered population that was unable to use a computer for one or more days because someone else was using it, it was elsewhere, or it was otherwise inaccessible (HEDEVSTA responses 2-5). That is,

**Device Distress Score = HDESKTP + HELAPTOP + HEDEVSTA response 2-5**

| <b>Covered Population</b>     | <b>Digital Participation Score</b> | <b>2025</b> | <b>2027</b> | <b>2029</b> |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Rural Individuals             | 11.98                              | 8.75        | 5.00        | <1.00       |
| Aging Individuals             | 15.44                              | 12.25       | 7.50        | <2.00       |
| Covered Households            | 16.23                              | 13.00       | 8.00        | <2.25       |
| Racial/Ethnic Minorities      | 12.61                              | 9.00        | 5.50        | <1.50       |
| Veterans                      | 13.05                              | 9.75        | 6.00        | <1.75       |
| Individuals with Disabilities | 11.69                              | 8.50        | 4.75        | <0.50       |

**Table 9: Device Distress Score by Covered Population**

MIHI anticipates that the progress made upon the Device Distress Score will directly impact Goals 2 through 5 of this plan. In order to progress toward the accomplishment of Goals 2 through 5, Michiganders will need to have access to devices first, before they can access the other online services as outlined earlier in this plan (workforce programs, educational resources, telehealth services, and civic engagement activities). Improving the Device Distress Score is crucial to the success of the goals of this Digital Equity Plan.

As described in more detail in Sections 3 and 4 of this document, LEO has defined 10 multicounty economic “Prosperity Regions” as a basis for analysis and implementation. MIHI has adopted this regionalized perspective throughout its work to date—including while planning and carrying out the MI Connected Future community engagement tour and developing this Digital Equity Plan—and will maintain this framework as it moves forward. As described in more detail in Section 5 of this document, MIHI’s approach to Digital Equity Act implementation will be regionally driven and rooted in the “snowflake model” of community organizing.

Although limitations in the information about the location of Computer Use Supplement respondents prevent MIHI from producing regionalized scores for each covered population, information that was collected through surveys of the participants in the MI Connected Future community engagement meetings suggests both that (1) the digital equity priorities identified by covered populations in each region are sometimes different from the priorities identified by the regional population as a whole and (2) the digital equity priorities identified by each covered population sometimes differ region to region. These findings—which are included in the Digital Equity Priority Regional Profiles found in Section 3.1.1.3 of this document—have reinforced MIHI’s confidence in the regional implementation approach, which will allow MIHI’s work to be highly responsive to the needs of each covered population and each community.

## **Measurable Objectives and Activities That Support Our Goals**

MIHI has identified specific activities that will support progress in each of these indicator scores and included them in Table 13: Goals and Planned Activities in Section 5 of this document. Both the indicator scores and measurements of the work MIHI has done in each of those implementation activities (based on data reported by the Digital Navigators and Regional Digital Coordinators) will be published in an annual report by MIHI to the residents of Michigan. In addition, MIHI will track and publish its progress toward the overarching holistic goals and strategies identified in Section 2.3 of this document.

### **Goal 1: Ensure all Michiganders have access to an affordable, reliable high-speed internet connection at their home**

Strategy: Collaborate and align efforts between DEA planned activities with BEAD planned activities and partner with communities, Tribal governments, and state agencies to align similar goals and timelines for infrastructure deployment and digital equity initiatives.

#### **Near-Term Targets:**

1. Support development of a BEAD Final Proposal that will provide high-speed internet service to every BEAD-eligible home, business, and Community Anchor Institution in Michigan. Best estimates based on current information from the FCC’s Broadband Data Collection map are that Michigan currently has 375,000 unserved homes and businesses, 125,000 underserved homes and businesses, and 8,000 un- or under-served Community Anchor Institutions (as defined in MIHI’s Initial Proposal Volume 1). This baseline will be updated at the conclusion of the State Challenge Process that MIHI will administer in early 2024.

2. Prioritize affordability of service in the scoring of subgrant applications in Michigan's BEAD program.
3. Place a Digital Navigator in each Michigan Prosperity Region to support implementation of DEA planned activities and aligned BEAD planned activities.

**Long-Term Targets:**

1. Ensure that every home, business, and Community Anchor Institution in Michigan has access to an affordable, reliable high-speed internet connection.
2. Achieve a 95% adoption rate of high-speed internet service among Michigan households.

**Goal 2: Attract workers and employers to Michigan.**

Strategy: Coordinate, partner, and support existing workforce development strategies and programs housed within LEO and other relevant state agencies.

**Near-Term Targets:**

1. Partner with LEO's Employment and Training Division to establish an Employer-Led Collaborative focused specifically on meeting the workforce needs of Michigan's BEAD program subgrantees, and have at least 60% of subgrantees participate.
2. Prioritize strong labor standards and workforce protections throughout implementation of Michigan's BEAD program.

**Long-Term Target:** Translate the resources provided by the Digital Equity Act and the BEAD program into good-paying jobs and career pathways with diversity, equity, inclusion and accessibility focus.

**Goal 3: Improve educational attainment including removing barriers for credentialing workers and in postsecondary achievement.**

Strategy: Coordinate and collaborate with the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services to monitor health outcomes pre- and post-deployment of broadband projects in areas impacting covered populations.

**Near-Term Targets:**

1. Partner with MDE to incorporate awareness campaigns for parents and students about the importance of an at-home internet connection and provide a pathway to support the affordability of and access to a reliable broadband connection (including affordable internet-enabled devices).
2. Continue collaboration with MDE to meet the digital skills gap and promote workforce development for K-12 students as well as adult learners and members of each covered population.
3. Partner with the State Library of Michigan to incorporate free access to a digital skills learning platform via local libraries and Michigan Works! Associations.

### **Long-Term Targets:**

1. Expand secondary learning opportunities for high school students.
2. Increase the percentage of school districts utilizing the MTECS competencies.
3. Increase the percentage of adults with a postsecondary credential.

### **Goal 4: Improve overall health outcomes, particularly with improvement in covered populations.**

Strategy: Coordinate and collaborate with the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services to monitor health outcomes pre- and post-deployment of broadband projects in areas impacting covered populations.

### **Near-Term Targets:**

1. Partner with MDHHS and the Health IT Commission to support monitoring and tracking of health outcomes in areas both pre- and post-deployment through existing health monitoring.
2. Partner with MDHHS to promote and improve the way in which benefits such as SNAP, FAP, Medicare, and Medicaid are accessed through improvements in the MIBridges portal to improve accessibility for individuals with few digital skills.
3. Partner with MDHHS to promote relevant programs to MIBridges users, including the Affordable Connectivity Program.

**Long-Term Target:** Support MDHHS in delivering health and opportunity to all Michiganders, reducing intergenerational poverty and promoting health equity.

### **Goal 5: Educate Michiganders about the online services available to them as a resident of the state.**

Strategy: Coordinate and collaborate with the Michigan Department of State to provide trainings to Michiganders about their digital residency and support inclusive initiatives for covered populations.

### **Near-Term Targets:**

1. Work closely with MDOS (and its team that specifically reaches out to historically underrepresented communities) to educate Michiganders on tools available to engage digitally and support inclusive initiatives including education regarding voter rights and online Secretary of State services.
2. Work with MDOS to educate Michiganders on the importance of protecting online activities and on ways to do so.

**Long-Term Target:** Promote better civic engagement throughout Michigan through easing access and removing barriers.

# 3. Current State of Digital Equity: Barriers and Assets

## 3.1 Asset Inventory

The objective of this section is to provide an overview of the specific advantages that the State of Michigan has in terms of advancing digital equity for underserved communities. It aims to compile a comprehensive list of existing resources, programs, and strategies that contribute to digital inclusion and promote availability and adoption. The inventory encompasses both publicly and privately funded assets, as well as digital equity initiatives and plans initiated by various governmental entities such as municipal, regional, and Tribal governments, as shown in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Existing Digital Assets

By conducting this asset inventory, the State of Michigan aims to identify and highlight the key resources at its disposal, enabling the effective implementation of the Digital Equity Plan. This comprehensive approach aims to bridge the existing gaps and address the specific needs of the state to accomplish its goals and objectives for achieving digital equity.

### 3.1.1 Digital Inclusion Assets by Covered Population

#### 3.1.1.1 Introduction and Methodology for Identifying Digital Inclusion Assets

Leveraging existing assets is a key strategy for both the Digital Equity and BEAD programs. This is why MIHI developed a [Digital Inclusion Resource Map](#) in September 2022. The map serves as a tool for:

1. Collecting information regarding existing assets from the communities.
2. Understanding the current digital inclusion programs, offerings, and resources available in communities across Michigan.
3. Promoting these new and existing programs to communities.

The map was developed based on responses received to the Michigan Statewide Digital Inclusion survey developed by MIHI and distributed to key stakeholders and the public throughout the state. MIHI used several channels to engage stakeholders and encourage participation in the survey, including socializing it at community meetings as part of the MI Connected Future tour, Partnership Roundtables, and in the MIHI newsletter. Additionally, the survey is easily accessible and prominently displayed on the MIHI [website](#). By targeting stakeholders, such as nonprofit organizations, for-profit organizations, government agencies, colleges, universities, trade schools, public libraries, and K-12 schools, the survey seeks to determine the current state of digital equity and inclusion programs and identify key organizations involved in these efforts. Based on these insights, the Digital Inclusion Resource Map is continuously updated, providing an ongoing and up-to-date inventory of digital inclusion assets in Michigan.

In addition to the Digital Inclusion Resource Map, MIHI has independently developed a robust list of assets, plans, and programs that can support digital inclusion. To identify the resources, initiatives, and associated gaps in each, the MIHI Office developed a robust and innovative community and stakeholder engagement process called MI Connected Future (MICF). MICF aimed to holistically and authentically engage with communities and stakeholders to provide the state with input and direction needed to achieve universal broadband access and a more digitally equitable state. MIHI adopted the ethos of “listen first, plan second” to ensure the needs and current challenges of communities and stakeholders were collected and incorporated into the planning process equitably. This key initiative demonstrates that Michigan is at the forefront of the efforts to promote digital equity and inclusion. Michigan will continue working toward achieving its goal of a more connected and equitable future by maintaining a collaborative approach with stakeholders across the state and providing ongoing support for existing and emerging digital equity and inclusion assets, plans, and programs.

### **3.1.1.2 Digital Inclusion Assets**

In addition to the Digital Inclusion Resource Map and MICF, MIHI has identified other assets throughout Michigan that can play a significant role in closing the digital divide across the state. The assets identified in this section do not constitute an exhaustive list but represent a good-faith effort from the MIHI Office to identify key assets across state government.

In this section, a selection of the state’s digital inclusion assets were aligned with the covered populations they support, as outlined in Table 11. Additional assets identified through the Michigan Statewide Digital Inclusion survey are summarized in Appendix A-2. For clarity and context, a definition for each of the covered population categories is presented in Table 10, sourced from the Digital Equity Act (DEA). Despite not being a covered population as defined in the DEA, an at-risk youth category was added to the list based on the Digital Inclusion Resource Map survey, which reflected significant digital inclusion efforts in this area.

| Covered Population                 | Description  |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Covered households                 | Households with income no more than 150% of the federal poverty threshold.   |
| Aging Individuals                  | Individuals 60 years and older.  |
| Incarcerated individuals           | All persons in state prisons, local jails, and other municipal confinement facilities, correctional residential facilities, and correctional facilities intended for juveniles. This does not include individuals who are incarcerated in a federal correctional facility. |
| Veterans                           | All persons aged 18 years and older who served in the armed forces in the past but are no longer on active duty.   |
| Individuals with disabilities      | A person who has a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities, a person who has a history or record of such an impairment, or a person who is perceived by others as having such an impairment. <sup>17</sup>               |
| Individuals with language barriers | This includes:<br>a. English learners: individuals who speak a language other than English at home and speak English less than “very well.”<br>b. Have low levels of literacy: individuals below literacy proficiency.   |
| Racial or ethnic minorities        | Individuals who identify as a race other than White alone or as Hispanic or Latino of any race.  |
| Rural community                    | Individuals living outside of cities and towns with more than 20,000 residents or living outside larger cities and towns with more than 50,000 residents and their surrounding urban areas.  |
| At-risk youth                      | An individual who is less than 18 years of age who faces extreme threats to a successful transition into adulthood.  |

**Table 10: Definitions of Covered Populations**

<sup>17</sup>. Guide to Disability Rights Laws | ADA.gov

| Select Digital Inclusion Assets  | Covered Populations |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 |       |
|--|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------|
|  | Covered households  | Aging individuals | Incarcerated individuals | Veterans | Individuals with disabilities | Individuals with a language barrier | Racial/Ethnic minorities | Rural community | Youth |
| MI Dept. of Labor and Economic Opportunity (LEO), Michigan Poverty Task Force        | ✓                   | ✓                 | ✓                        | ✓        | ✓                             | ✓                                   | ✓                        | ✓               | ✓     |
| MI Dept. of Labor and Economic Opportunity (LEO), Office of Global Michigan          |                     |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     | ✓                        | ✓               |       |
| Michigan 2-1-1, 2-1-1 Assistance   | ✓                   | ✓                 | ✓                        | ✓        | ✓                             | ✓                                   | ✓                        | ✓               | ✓     |
| MI Public Service Commission (MPSC), Wi-Fi Hot Spot Map                              | ✓                   | ✓                 | ✓                        | ✓        | ✓                             | ✓                                   | ✓                        | ✓               | ✓     |
| MI Dept. of Technology, Management, and Budget (DTMB), Michigan Geographic Framework | ✓                   | ✓                 | ✓                        | ✓        | ✓                             | ✓                                   | ✓                        | ✓               | ✓     |
| DTMB, Michigan Public Safety Communications System (MPSCS)                           | ✓                   | ✓                 | ✓                        | ✓        | ✓                             | ✓                                   | ✓                        | ✓               | ✓     |
| MI Dept. of Health and Human Services, Community Information Exchange (CIE)          | ✓                   | ✓                 | ✓                        | ✓        | ✓                             | ✓                                   | ✓                        | ✓               | ✓     |

| Select Digital Inclusion Assets                          | Covered Populations |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 |       |
|--|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------|
|  | Covered households  | Aging individuals | Incarcerated individuals | Veterans | Individuals with disabilities | Individuals with a language barrier | Racial/Ethnic minorities | Rural community | Youth |
| Southeast Michigan Broadband Navigator                   | ✓                   | ✓                 | ✓                        | ✓        | ✓                             | ✓                                   | ✓                        | ✓               | ✓     |
| Washtenaw Community College, Fiber Optics Certifications | ✓                   | ✓                 | ✓                        | ✓        | ✓                             | ✓                                   | ✓                        | ✓               | ✓     |
| Closing the Digital Gap                                  | ✓                   | ✓                 |                          | ✓        | ✓                             | ✓                                   | ✓                        |                 | ✓     |
| Human-I-T  | ✓                   |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 |       |
| Michigan Public Libraries                                | ✓                   | ✓                 | ✓                        | ✓        | ✓                             | ✓                                   | ✓                        | ✓               | ✓     |
| Michigan K-12 Schools and School Districts               | ✓                   |                   |                          |          | ✓                             | ✓                                   | ✓                        | ✓               | ✓     |
| Community Centers  | ✓                   | ✓                 | ✓                        | ✓        | ✓                             | ✓                                   | ✓                        | ✓               | ✓     |
| Health Divisions/ Departments                            | ✓                   | ✓                 | ✓                        | ✓        | ✓                             | ✓                                   | ✓                        | ✓               | ✓     |

**Table 11: Select Digital Inclusion Assets by Covered Population**

A more detailed description of the select digital inclusion assets are included below:

| <b>MI Dept. of Labor and Economic Opportunity (LEO), Michigan Poverty Task Force</b> |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Covered Populations Served</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covered households</li> <li>• Aging individuals</li> <li>• Incarcerated individuals</li> <li>• Veterans</li> <li>• Individuals with disabilities</li> <li>• Individuals with a language barrier</li> <li>• Racial/Ethnic minorities</li> <li>• Rural community</li> <li>• Youth</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Services Provided</b>   | <p>The Michigan PTF is committed to finding ways to strengthen, broaden, coordinate, and streamline existing state efforts to ensure that Michigan families have access to the support they need. The Michigan PTF will work to evaluate measures and better understand poverty’s impact on Michigan families and communities, identifying root causes and opportunities to bring positive change. The PTF is creating a coordinated plan to help communities address the digital divide, which acts as a barrier for families in accessing available economic, educational, health, housing, and safety services, and it awarded funding to create a playbook for local communities to plan their broadband expansion efforts. The Michigan Poverty Task Force can help promote digital equity by identifying root causes of poverty, reducing access barriers, and streamlining efforts across the state to ensure accessibility to digital resources and technology for all covered populations.</p> |

| <b>MI Dept. of Labor and Economic Opportunity (LEO), Office of Global Michigan</b> |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Covered Populations Served</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individuals with a language barrier</li> <li>• Racial/Ethnic minorities</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Services Provided</b>   | <p>The mission of the Office of Global Michigan is to empower and engage the immigrant, refugee, and international community to make Michigan the home for opportunity. The office assists immigrant and refugee communities with connectivity needs, as well as licensing, workforce training, education, housing, healthcare, and quality of life. The office also works with state agencies that provide services to immigrants and refugees and strives to minimize or eliminate barriers to accessing those state services.</p> |

**Michigan 2-1-1, 2-1-1 Assistance**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>Covered Populations Served</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covered households</li> <li>• Aging individuals</li> <li>• Incarcerated individuals</li> <li>• Veterans</li> <li>• Individuals with disabilities</li> <li>• Individuals with a language barrier</li> <li>• Racial/Ethnic minorities</li> <li>• Rural community</li> <li>• Youth</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Services Provided</b></p>          | <p>Michigan 2-1-1 provides individuals with a confidential and free-to-use service (by simply calling or texting 2-1-1 or visiting their website), connecting all covered populations with local community-based organizations offering thousands of programs and services. 2-1-1 Assistance is a robust information and referral system that provides users with information on a range of services, including the Affordable Connectivity Program, and assistance with needs such as food, housing, financial aid, employment, child care, education, healthcare, and mental health, as well as household needs and utility payments. Michigan 2-1-1 serves as a connectivity tool for individuals seeking help and resources within their community. The accessibility of this service, one of 2-1-1’s guiding principles, on a digital platform helps promote digital equity and ensure that all individuals have access to critical resources.</p> |

**MI Public Service Commission (MPSC), Wi-Fi Hot Spot Map**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>Covered Populations Served</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covered households</li> <li>• Aging individuals</li> <li>• Incarcerated individuals</li> <li>• Veterans</li> <li>• Individuals with disabilities</li> <li>• Individuals with a language barrier</li> <li>• Racial/Ethnic minorities</li> <li>• Rural community</li> <li>• Youth</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Services Provided</b></p>          | <p>During the COVID-19 pandemic, MPSC partnered with Connected Nation Michigan to create a map of known public Wi-Fi hot spots to support those without a home connection. The resulting interactive broadband map enables all covered populations to search for broadband availability by street address, view the types of broadband available, and locate providers offering service at their home or business.</p> |

**MI Dept. of Technology, Management, and Budget (DTMB),  
Michigan Geographic Framework**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>Covered Populations Served</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covered households</li> <li>• Aging individuals</li> <li>• Incarcerated individuals</li> <li>• Veterans</li> <li>• Individuals with disabilities</li> <li>• Individuals with a language barrier</li> <li>• Racial/Ethnic minorities</li> <li>• Rural community</li> <li>• Youth</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Services Provided</b></p>          | <p>DTMB supports the business operations of state agencies through services such as the management of a variety of geospatial datasets, enterprise software licenses, aerial photography, and other remote sensing products that can be used for various purposes. The Michigan Geographic Framework serves as the digital base map for state government and assists in maintaining core enterprise spatial assets. The Michigan Geographic Framework is an integrated and centralized place to store and maintain data, where it can also be standardized and shared with other entities to create accurate geographic information systems (GIS) maps.</p> |

**DTMB, Michigan Public Safety Communications System (MPSCS)**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>Covered Populations Served</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covered households</li> <li>• Aging individuals</li> <li>• Incarcerated individuals</li> <li>• Veterans</li> <li>• Individuals with disabilities</li> <li>• Individuals with a language barrier</li> <li>• Racial/Ethnic minorities</li> <li>• Rural community</li> <li>• Youth</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Services Provided</b></p>          | <p>The MPSCS is a network of over 300 towers and more than 14,000 radios located throughout the state that supports public safety communications, such as first responders in their service to citizens. These towers can also be used as colocation points for wireless broadband facilities. MPSCS also provides interoperable voice and data communications to federal, state, local, and private public safety agencies all over the state of Michigan.</p> |

| <b>MI Dept. of Health and Human Services, Community Information Exchange (CIE)</b> |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Covered Populations Served</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covered households</li> <li>• Aging individuals</li> <li>• Incarcerated individuals</li> <li>• Veterans</li> <li>• Individuals with disabilities</li> <li>• Individuals with a language barrier</li> <li>• Racial/Ethnic minorities</li> <li>• Rural community</li> <li>• Youth</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Services Provided</b>   | <p>CIE is a localized effort to create and sustain the technology and relationships required to support social determinants of health (SDOH) needs of both individuals and communities. CIE maximizes a person-centered approach by ensuring social care information for all covered populations is collected only as needed and is stored safely. CIE’s initiatives encompass a wide range of objectives related to digital equity, including expanding broadband access, supporting digital literacy, and promoting patient agency in accessing and mediating their health and social care data.</p> |

| <b>The Michigan Association of Regions (MAR)</b> |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Covered Populations Served</b>                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covered households</li> <li>• Aging individuals</li> <li>• Incarcerated individuals</li> <li>• Veterans</li> <li>• Individuals with disabilities</li> <li>• Individuals with a language barrier</li> <li>• Racial/Ethnic minorities</li> <li>• Rural community</li> <li>• Youth</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Services Provided<sup>18</sup></b>            | <p>The Michigan Association of Regions (MAR) serves as a comprehensive resource for the state’s regional councils, working to promote effective communication and policy-level relationships between state-designated planning regions and state and federal governments. Through advocacy, research, training, networking, and liaison to national associations, MAR seeks to advance regional programs and provide planning expertise for communities across Michigan. Moreover, MAR offers a platform for regional councils to collaborate on common challenges, develop policy recommendations, and establish standards and practices. As part of their efforts to reduce access barriers and promote digital equity, MAR is also piloting a regional Digital Navigator program in Regions 2, 3, and 8, with a focus on community needs and BEAD preparation. The program is funded through CDBG.</p> |

<sup>18.</sup> About the Michigan Association of Regions ([miregions.com](http://miregions.com))

| <b>Southeast Michigan Broadband Navigator</b> |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Covered Populations Served</b>             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covered households</li> <li>• Aging individuals</li> <li>• Incarcerated individuals</li> <li>• Veterans</li> <li>• Individuals with disabilities</li> <li>• Individuals with a language barrier</li> <li>• Racial/Ethnic minorities</li> <li>• Rural community</li> <li>• Youth</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Services Provided</b>                      | <p>The Southeast Michigan Broadband Navigator is a resource that provides information on broadband availability, digital literacy, equity, inclusion, cybersecurity, funding, and programs. It is a resource for communities, governments, educators, and stakeholders by providing data and maps on broadband availability and usage. The Navigator will be regularly updated and expanded to address emerging issues and respond to feedback from stakeholders. The intent of the Navigator is to help Michigan residents answer questions related to broadband access, availability, and affordability, as well as provide information on resources and policies to increase equitable broadband access.</p> |

| <b>Washtenaw Community College, Fiber Optics Certifications</b> |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Covered Populations Served</b>                               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covered households</li> <li>• Aging individuals</li> <li>• Incarcerated individuals</li> <li>• Veterans</li> <li>• Individuals with disabilities</li> <li>• Individuals with a language barrier</li> <li>• Racial/Ethnic minorities</li> <li>• Rural community</li> <li>• Youth</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Services Provided</b>  | <p>Washtenaw Community College offers certification courses for fiber optic technicians, fiber specialists in testing and maintenance, and fiber specialists in splicing. The comprehensive training program combines theory and hands-on learning experiences to prepare any individual, with a high school diploma, to take the Certified Fiber Optic Technician exam.</p> |

| <b>Closing the Digital Gap (CTDG)</b> |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Covered Populations Served</b>     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covered households</li> <li>• Aging individuals</li> <li>• Veterans</li> <li>• Individuals with disabilities</li> <li>• Individuals with a language barrier</li> <li>• Racial/Ethnic minorities</li> <li>• Youth</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Services Provided</b>              | <p>CTDG is a nonprofit corporation headquartered in Lansing. Closing the Digital Gap provides computer training, computer ownership, and internet access to small nonprofit organizations and individuals in Michigan who may be unemployed, underemployed, low-income, single parents, disabled, veterans, immigrants, at-risk youth, or seniors. Its mission is to provide low-to-moderate-income residents of the service area the opportunity to earn or purchase a low-cost computer, receive computer/internet training, and access internet services for low cost, along with assisting participants in making connections with community resources through referrals for further training or resources that may lead to employment and/or educational enrichment for participants and their families. CTDG further services micro-enterprises/entrepreneurs and small nonprofits to support with technology and training in Michigan both online, in person, and through a blended delivery of training, programs, and services.</p> |

| <b>Human-I-T</b>                  |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| <b>Covered Populations Served</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covered households</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Services Provided</b>          | <p>Human-I-T is an organization that believes removing systemic social and economic barriers is essential to shrinking the digital divide. They are committed to shrinking the digital divide by providing communities with equitable access to opportunity through devices, internet access, digital skills training, and tech support. The organization has distributed 318K tech items, assisted 105K households with internet, and provided digital literacy training to 7K learners. The organization runs an online store, HITConnect.org, which offers laptops, desktops, and tablets for as low as \$50 per device to Detroiters. They also offer Detroit households eligible for Comcast Internet Essentials high-speed home Wi-Fi for \$9.95 a month.</p> |

| Michigan Public Libraries         |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Covered Populations Served</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covered households</li> <li>• Aging individuals</li> <li>• Incarcerated individuals</li> <li>• Veterans</li> <li>• Individuals with disabilities</li> <li>• Individuals with a language barrier</li> <li>• Racial/Ethnic minorities</li> <li>• Rural community</li> <li>• Youth</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Services Provided</b>          | <p>Across the state, Michigan has 665 public libraries, which are integral to supporting digital equity and inclusion efforts. Michigan public libraries commonly offer public computers and free internet access through wireless connections (Wi-Fi). Although the availability of services and technologies may differ across locations, the overarching aim is to provide individuals with access to resources and information, both in physical and digital formats. For instance, the Elk Rapids District Library has allowed library cardholders to access Wi-Fi hot spots for the past six years due to the high cost and unreliable nature of rural internet. Similarly, the Kent District Library provides an array of digital and technical resources, such as one-on-one technology tutoring, classes for seniors learning computer basics, and computer software tutorial courses. Hence, libraries play an integral role in building digital literacy, engaging in workforce development, and expanding access to the internet across the state.</p> |



## Michigan K-12 Schools and School Districts

|                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Covered Populations Served</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covered households</li> <li>• Individuals with disabilities</li> <li>• Individuals with a language barrier</li> <li>• Racial/Ethnic minorities</li> <li>• Rural community</li> <li>• Youth</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Services Provided</b>          | <p>Primary and secondary institutions play an integral role in developing digital literacy skills for children and adolescents. There are a total of 899 districts in Michigan, with 3,400 public schools serving over 1.4 million students. The Michigan Integrated Technology Competencies for Students (MITECS) is a statewide effort spearheaded by the Michigan Department of Education to focus on learning enhanced by technology by integrating technology competencies across all areas. Digital literacy plays a large part in the effort, centralizing on responsible digital citizenship and the utilization of digital tools to solve problems and achieve goals in a creative, innovative, and collaborative manner. Additionally, some school districts, such as the Detroit Public Schools Community District, have device lending programs that allow students to borrow laptops and Wi-Fi hot spots to use in and outside classroom settings.</p> <p>K-12 schools also play a large role in providing internet to students, faculty, and staff. During the COVID-19 pandemic, devices such as laptops, wireless tablets, and Wi-Fi hot spots were loaned to students to complete coursework through distanced learning. Certain schools, such as schools in St. Clair County, installed wireless hot spots to provide 24-hour internet access across the county to students, faculty, and staff. K-12 institutions provide the foundation to develop digital skills through expanding training and access.</p> |



| <b>Community Centers</b>          |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Covered Populations Served</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covered households</li> <li>• Aging individuals</li> <li>• Incarcerated individuals</li> <li>• Veterans</li> <li>• Individuals with disabilities</li> <li>• Individuals with a language barrier</li> <li>• Racial/Ethnic minorities</li> <li>• Rural community</li> <li>• Youth</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Services Provided</b>          | <p>Community centers, including those that provide social, educational, or recreational activities, generally provide services to individuals of all ages and often serve as locations where information and resources can be accessed. For instance, the Martin Luther King Community Center in Jackson has a dedicated computer center and provides Wi-Fi to the public. During the COVID-19 pandemic, many community centers, such as the New Troy Community Center in New Troy and Baxter Community Center in Grand Rapids, were transformed into “Lift Zones.” Lift Zones were a partnership with Comcast where free Wi-Fi hot spots were provided to allow for free access to the internet. Community centers are playing an increasingly large role in expanding digital equity and access.</p> |

| <b>Health Divisions/Departments</b> |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Covered Populations Served</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covered households</li> <li>• Aging individuals</li> <li>• Incarcerated individuals</li> <li>• Veterans</li> <li>• Individuals with disabilities</li> <li>• Individuals with a language barrier</li> <li>• Racial/Ethnic minorities</li> <li>• Rural community</li> <li>• Youth</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Services Provided</b>            | <p>There are 43 Health Divisions and Departments across the state of Michigan, all tasked with the promotion of public health and wellness. An essential component of the promotion of public health is health equity—ensuring all individuals have access to needed resources. Hence, several Health Divisions and Departments provide services to aid individuals with online enrollment in public assistance programs. For example, the Grand Traverse County Health Department has developed the Michigan Child Collaborative Care (MC3) Telemedicine Program, which provides psychiatric support to primary care providers in Michigan managing patients with behavioral health problems. The program supports telehealth by offering same-day phone consultations and remote psychiatric evaluation via video telepsychiatry. Moreover, the COVID-19 pandemic has increased the use of telehealth to provide needed services to the general population. Telehealth can be beneficial for many populations, such as those living in rural areas, are low-income, lack transportation, and are disabled, as many such barriers can be removed using telehealth.</p> |



## 3.1.2 Existing Digital Equity Plans

### 3.1.2.1 Existing State Plans

As a way to coordinate existing state efforts to create a more digitally equitable future, MIHI initiated a review of available state plans that identified digital equity as a key component to achieving better outcomes. MIHI obtained existing state plans through internal research and through coordination with state agencies, such as the Michigan Department of Education and the Department of Labor and Economic Opportunity Workforce Development Division, among others. During the review of the state plans, MIHI focused on the goals and strategies related to digital equity to help inform the development of the State Digital Equity Plan. Across these plans, there are common themes to expand broadband access to create better outcomes that promote social and economic development, components that are integral to the State Digital Equity Plan.

Listed below are the existing state plans that have been identified to date with goals and strategies dependent on or impacted by improved digital equity.

#### 2021 Michigan Broadband Roadmap

To bridge the digital divide and improve digital equity and inclusion, MIHI has committed to implement strategies to ensure that every Michigander, business, institution, and community can meaningfully adopt high-speed internet service. In support of this mission, MIHI developed a Michigan Broadband Roadmap, which established four core goals related to digital equity and inclusion as mentioned below:

1. Ensure high-speed internet is available to every household, business, anchor institution, and community in the state.
2. Create a more digitally equitable Michigan.
3. Improve the state's broadband ecosystem.
4. Enhance and coordinate Michigan's broadband-related investments with other investments in social programs, education, and economic equity and development.

## Michigan Poverty Task Force Report

The Michigan Poverty Task Force issued its second report with recommendations aimed at lifting Michiganders out of poverty, connecting families in every corner of Michigan with economic opportunity, improving quality of life, improving outcomes, and creating real change. The following selection of recommendations from the report are relevant to supporting the work MIHI is undertaking in the successful implementation of the DEA and BEAD programs:

1. Increase investments in a universal benefit application so Michigan residents can apply for resources in one place, which can promote digital equity by enhancing residents' access to digital resources and services.
2. Establish a highly visible education and awareness effort to boost participation in and access to a formal network of Community-Based Education and Training Information Portals, which can establish an accessible resource for residents to access education, training, career resources, and other digital resources.
3. Develop a coordinated strategy to help communities address the digital divide, including identifying best practices and effective measures to provide digital resources, access to training and education, and other tools necessary to bridge the digital divide and promote digital equity.

The report includes other recommendations that are indirectly related to the success of the DEA and BEAD programs, and could be implemented more effectively by ensuring every home, business, and institution in the state has access to affordable and reliable high-speed internet.

## Michigan Economic Development Corporation (MEDC) Five-Year Strategic Plan

The MEDC is Michigan's economic development lead with a mission to achieve long-term economic prosperity for Michiganders by investing in communities, enabling the growth of good-paying jobs, and promoting Michigan's strong image worldwide. The strategic focus areas rely heavily on achieving universal broadband availability and improved digital equity by adopting the following activities:

1. Attract, keep, and grow businesses in industries that support maximum growth in jobs, wages and investments.
2. Cultivate the skills and talent needed for in-demand and high-growth occupations statewide.
3. Collaborate with local communities and partners to create places in which people and talent want to live, work, visit, and play.
4. Support entrepreneurial growth to enable commercialization and new high-tech business creation.
5. Promote Michigan's image as a world-class business location and travel destination.
6. Help existing small and microbusinesses grow and thrive and improve economic prosperity for all through small business ownership.

## Michigan's Statewide Housing Plan

The Statewide Housing Plan of Michigan, the first of its kind for the state, focuses on creating housing stability for all residents. The plan includes five statewide housing targets, eight priority areas, 37 goals, and 134 suggested strategies to address complex and intersecting challenges related to achieving housing stability. Feedback from thousands of residents, hundreds of organizational partners, public surveys, focus groups, meetings, and interviews informed the five-year plan. Broadband infrastructure is a key priority with the goal of increasing affordable high-speed internet access. One strategy is to coordinate with MIHI and others to improve accessibility and affordability of high-speed internet. The plan also includes a strategy to offer extra points when awarding contracts for projects that provide high-speed internet access, particularly in rural and low-connectivity areas.

## Education Equity in Michigan Plan

Created by the Michigan Civil Rights Commission in September 2022, the Education Equity in Michigan Plan recommends that the Michigan Department of Civil Rights expand the existing Council for Government and Education on Equity and Inclusion to include representatives of the Michigan Department of Education and establish the Council as the entity responsible for implementing and overseeing the following recommendations for action:

1. Develop a Statewide Educational Equity Plan to enhance policies, accountability, and opportunities for all, using a holistic approach to inform the Michigan Department of Civil Rights, the State Department of Education, and schools statewide.
2. Encourage schools across the state to create local school equity plans and contribute information and resources to encourage and support equitable practices and opportunities for schools.
3. Increase internet access for students and families and develop an easily accessible electronic outreach and inclusion model that is available to everyone involved in the education process.

Given the necessity of high-speed internet connectivity and digital inclusion in the P-20 environment, this plan supports the vision and mission of MIHI for the State Digital Equity Plan to create a more digitally equitable state by ensuring equity of access across several aspects of the education ecosystem.

## Michigan's Top 10 Strategic Plan

The Top 10 Strategic Plan has a vision that states, "Every learner in Michigan's public schools will have an inspiring, engaging, and caring learning environment that fosters creative and critical thinkers who believe in their ability to positively influence Michigan and the world beyond."

One of the key guiding principles of the plan is that students should be provided every opportunity to achieve the broadest range of life dreams, and a selection of key goals seek to 1) expand early childhood learning opportunities; 2) improve the health, safety, and wellness of all learners; 3) expand secondary learning opportunities for all students; and 4) increase the percentage of adults with a postsecondary credential. While high-speed internet access isn't explicitly called out in the plan, equitable and affordable access and use are inherent in supporting Michigan's achievement of the goals outlined in the plan.

## Health Information Technology Roadmap

This roadmap is maintained and implemented by the Policy and Planning, Strategic Engagement, and Alignment section of the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services. The Health Information Technology Roadmap identifies several relevant goals, objectives, and strategies that impact and are impacted by the state digital equity programs:

1. Address Michigan's digital divide by ensuring that all communities have equal access to important public health information and resources.
2. Improve onboarding and technical assistance by providing the necessary training and support to individuals and communities on how to effectively use digital health tools.

While the deployment of universal high-speed internet service and addressing digital equity contribute to each of these objectives, the objective from the roadmap to address Michigan's digital divide directly aligns with the vision and goals of Michigan's Digital Equity Plan and BEAD.

## Michigan Roadmap to Healthy Communities

The Michigan Roadmap to Healthy Communities aims to address the social determinants of health (SDOH) through a collaborative, upstream approach to remove barriers to social and economic opportunity, improve health outcomes, and advance equity. Phase I of the SDOH Strategy promoted the alignment of efforts at the state, local, and community level and the improvement of programs and policies through an in-depth internal review. It prioritized efforts in three focus areas: health equity, housing stability, and food security. Phase II of the SDOH Strategy builds on improvement and alignment efforts from Phase I, with a focused effort on health equity through multisector collaboration and supporting holistic solutions.

A key component of the roadmap is the development of a Community Information Exchange (CIE). A CIE is an evolving set of best practices and technology guided by the goal of identifying and addressing social needs. As identified in the plan, a successful CIE requires widespread access to broadband and technology and a workforce trained in its use, agreed protocols around data collection and coding, staff with dedicated time to facilitate the referral process, and a robust network of referral partners. The success of this plan is heavily reliant on the universal availability of high-speed internet service.

## MI Healthy Climate Plan

The Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy (EGLE) published the MI Health Climate Plan in April 2022. This plan lays out a broad vision for fulfilling the governor’s fall 2020 commitment for Michigan to achieve 100% economy-wide carbon neutrality by midcentury—the global science-based benchmark for reducing greenhouse gas emissions to avoid the most devastating and costly impacts of climate change. The plan establishes ambitious goals and strategies for achieving the plan’s vision.

Broadband internet access is crucial to achieving the goals laid out in the MI Healthy Climate Plan as it enables people to access the latest climate science, connect human activities to climate impacts, and make informed decisions. It is important to advocate for equitable access to this information, so that all residents can make informed decisions regarding climate change.

## Thirty-Year Integrated Infrastructure Plan

Developed by the Michigan Infrastructure Council, this plan includes the state’s dig-once strategy to collocate facilities during construction within state and local rights-of-way. The strategies in the Integrated Infrastructure Plan, including dig-once and ROW access, are also identified in the Broadband and Digital Equity (BEAD) Five-Year Action Plan as strategies to help remove obstacles to broadband deployment and adoption in historically marginalized and underserved communities. This plan enables the efficient deployment of broadband networks and universal availability of broadband access, which are key factors to achieving digital equity. This plan is currently under development.



## Michigan Public Service Commission (MPSC) Strategic Plan

The mission of the MPSC is to serve the public by ensuring safe, reliable, and accessible energy and telecommunications services at reasonable rates. While the MPSC does not regulate broadband, the commission intersects with the goals, vision, and objectives of the MIHI Office, the BEAD plan, and this plan. By working toward the goal of expanding broadband access, the MPSC is supporting the overall efforts of the MIHI Office to promote digital equity and inclusion across the state. The following are selected key goals and strategies of the MPSC Strategic Plan that support the efforts of the MIHI Office.

1. Empower customers to make informed utility choices
  - a. Publish accurate information on energy and telecommunications programs
  - b. Promote Connect Michigan broadband expansion
  - c. Collaborate with other state departments and stakeholders
  - d. Develop energy and technology pilots
2. Ensure safe, secure, and reliable utility services and infrastructure
  - a. Issue a Telecommunications Assessment
  - b. Define roles for telecommunications outage monitoring
  - c. Support the transition to IP-911
3. Ensure accessible and affordable utility services through regulatory oversight
  - a. Administer and promote customer programs
4. Cultivate open and diverse communication and education
  - a. Establish and encourage virtual stakeholder participation in workgroups and proceedings
  - b. Engage partners on informational webinars/forums
  - c. Evaluate communication and outreach programs and efforts

## Michigan Future Mobility Plan

The Michigan Office of Future Mobility and Electrification oversees the Michigan Future Mobility Plan. This plan identifies several objectives to position the state as a leader in next-generation mobility. A few of the objectives are impacted by digital equity programs, including deploying EV chargers, ensuring mobility as a service (MaaS), and reducing congestion and traffic crashes.

Mobility and electrification are heavily reliant on the availability of wired and wireless connections to provide real-time data, enable transactions, and monitor the electrical grid and associated systems. Universal connectivity and adoption are important for the operations of EV chargers and transit access. Having large green sites that are attractive for automotive investments in the future will mean looking outside of traditional urban areas to parts of the state that aren't connected today. The operations of intelligent transportation systems and connected/automated vehicle tech rely on the reliable availability of the internet of things (IoT) and edge computing across cellular-vehicle-to-vehicle/everything (CV2V/CV2X) systems. Michigan's digital equity programs directly support the success of the Michigan Future Mobility Plan.

## Michigan Mobility 2045 Plan

Michigan's State Long-Range Transportation Plan (MM2045) is an essential element of Michigan's transportation planning and program development process. The public- and stakeholder-driven plan provides a foundation for developing Michigan's transportation programs, including MDOT's Five-Year Transportation Program (5YTP) and the statewide, rural, and metropolitan transportation improvement programs, and presents the social and economic cases for transportation investment in Michigan. The universal availability of high-speed internet is recognized as a key requirement for the successful implementation of the MM2045 Plan. Additionally, the plan contains the following strategies that are relevant to the digital equity programs and work of the MIHI Office:

1. Identify opportunities to expand fiberoptic, broadband, and 5G connections through coordination or partnerships.
2. Leverage technology to improve passenger transportation availability and services.
3. Invest in data, data collection, analytics, and information systems to advance data-informed decisions.
4. Extend opportunities to share data and information for improved efficiency, accountability, and transparency across all of Michigan's transportation partners.
5. Implement and expand a real-time Transportation Infrastructure Data Exchange (TIDE) system to function as a centralized platform to support continuous exchange of transportation data among MDOT and other stakeholders.

## Michigan Workforce Development Plan

The Michigan Workforce Development Plan is maintained and implemented by the Employment and Training Division of LEO, the same agency the MIHI Office is part of. The plan identifies a projected worker shortage in 12 NTIA-identified occupation groups. The most significant occupation groups impacted by projected shortfall are “laborers and material movers,” “trenchers,” and “inspectors,” which are facing an 11.9%, 10.4%, and 9.8% shortfall, respectively. The Michigan Workforce Development Plan outlines several steps to address the projected shortage that could impact the expansion and access to digital resources statewide related to digital equity:

1. Engagement of underrepresented communities, unions, worker organizations.
2. Leveraging and partnering with subgrantees, contractors, subcontractors, educational institutions, supportive service providers, and workforce/labor training providers

MIHI is actively partnering with the Workforce Development Division of LEO to creatively solve these shortfall projections. Upcoming workforce strategies highlight the importance of diversity, equity, and inclusion to expand the labor pool to those not historically represented in the construction industry.

## Michigan Sixty by 30 Strategic Plan

The Michigan Sixty by 30 initiative aims to increase postsecondary educational attainment to 60% by 2030. The Sixty by 30 program is housed within LEO. The Sixty by 30 Strategic Plan outlines several focus areas that are impacted by the work of the MIHI Office, including boosting youth college-going rates, creating pathways for immigrants and international students, and addressing barriers to success, especially for students living below the ALICE threshold. Expanding access to high-speed internet and promoting digital equity contribute to the objectives of the Sixty by 30 initiative, which prioritizes student and career success.

### 3.1.2.2 Existing County, Township, Municipal, and Tribal Plans

In order to ensure alignment with the statewide Digital Equity Plan, MIHI conducted a review of available existing county, township, municipal, and Tribal plans. MIHI acquired existing plans from a multitude of avenues and sources, including conducting internal research to identify existing plans, direct submissions, and submissions through the Digital Equity Plan public comment process. For example, the Merit Network submitted a public comment that highlighted over a dozen existing county plans developed as part of its “Michigan Moonshot” program.

MIHI conducted a review of the available existing plans, specifically concentrating on the goals and objectives, to confirm that they were consistent with those of the Michigan Digital Equity Plan. In these plans, there is a strong emphasis on improving the accessibility, affordability, and availability of broadband technology to foster social and economic development—all essential components of this Digital Equity Plan. Additionally, MIHI assessed the methodologies and approaches the existing plans utilized to obtain data through surveys and to develop an effective action plan to address the current and future broadband needs of their respective community. MIHI deployed a similar approach utilized by the existing plans, by successfully gathering data through survey responses to develop an action plan.

Listed below are the existing county, township, municipal, and Tribal plans that have been identified, to date, as key elements in supporting and enabling state objectives related to digital equity and inclusion.

#### Existing County Plans — Connected Nation

ConnectedNation’s “Connected Community” program has partnered with 10 counties across the state of Michigan to conduct an assessment regarding the current status of broadband and to establish a broadband planning process. Through surveys of local residents, businesses, and organizations, the program aims to understand the existing resources and capabilities in place to support the access, adoption, and use of broadband technology in homes and businesses. Data obtained from this assessment is used to develop an appropriate action plan to improve the broadband ecosystem effectively, addressing the current and future broadband needs of these counties. The program’s aim is to enhance the accessibility, affordability, and availability of broadband technology in the counties, leading to social and economic development. Appendix A-2 provides additional information on the Technology Action Plan development of the 10 county plans listed below.

|                  |                |                |                |                |
|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Cheboygan County | Lapeer County  | Sanilac County | Lake County    | Oceana County  |
| Huron County     | Newaygo County | Eaton County   | Midland County | Tuscola County |

## Existing County Plans — Merit Networks

Merit Networks’ “Michigan Moonshot” program has partnered with over a dozen counties across the state of Michigan to conduct an assessment regarding the current status of broadband and to establish a broadband planning process. Through surveys of local residents and businesses, the program provides a statistically significant assessment of the current state of connectivity in the area, the internet use experience of connected residents, and the barriers preventing unconnected residents from participating in the digital community. The current state assessment is provided to the community along with educational programming and ongoing support for community-driven broadband solutions. Appendix A-2 provides additional information on the “Michigan Moonshot” program that developed the 12 county plans listed below.

|  |                   |  |
|--|-------------------|--|
| Benzie County  | Ingham County     | Ottawa County                                |
| Berrien County   | Kent County       | Saginaw Township                             |
| Calhoun County   | Lapeer County     | Tri-County (Macomb, Oakland, Wayne Counties) |
| Eastern UP Connect (Chippewa, Luce, Mackinac Counties) | Livingston County | Washtenaw County                             |

Please note that these are not the entirety of county plans that MIHI is aware of; rather, these are the 22 county plans that were developed by Connected Nation and Merit Network.

MIHI recognizes and commends the work that counties, townships, and municipalities have put in to develop digital equity plans. MIHI acknowledges that communities know their unique needs and challenges best, and to that end has adopted a community-based approach as part of this plan that seeks to provide resources and tools to communities, instead of enforcing a statewide one-size-fits-all solution. Therefore, as mentioned in the later sections of this plan, the role of Digital Navigators will be used to support communities in the implementation of their digital equity plans and provide support to communities that have not had the opportunity or resources needed to fully articulate and determine what digital equity looks like within their community.

## Tribal Digital Equity Plans

MIHI recognizes that Tribal communities may be developing or already have digital equity plans in place. While MIHI is not aware of any Tribal digital equity plans that have been shared with the state to date, MIHI remains fully committed to providing assistance and resources, as needed and requested, to support Tribal communities in the development and implementation of their digital equity plans.

## Washtenaw County Broadband Equity Subcommittee Final Report

The Washtenaw County’s Broadband Equity Subcommittee’s final report highlights how lack of broadband access is impacting residents across the county. The committee suggests several activities to achieve the goal of broadband access, such as defining the need, supporting best and emerging practices, seeking funding, changing or updating policies, and coordinating with local governments.

## Digital Equity and Inclusion—City of Detroit

The Office of Digital Equity & Inclusion in Detroit offers solutions and resources to bridge the digital divide in the city by providing affordable and quality high-speed internet, access to devices, digital literacy training, technical support, and upgraded internet infrastructure citywide.

The Office of Digital Equity and Inclusion developed an interactive digital dashboard that defines the needs of Detroit residents. The interactive dashboard provides transparency to the residents of Detroit concerning the allocation of resources and services geared toward closing the digital gap in the city. This data-driven approach will allow for the creation of customized digital equity plans for each district and neighborhood to meet the needs of the community.

## Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG)

SEMCOG developed “Broadband in Southeast Michigan,” a roadmap that identifies key challenges and opportunities, policy recommendations, and case studies for expanding broadband throughout the region. The goal of the roadmap is to promote accessibility of high-speed broadband to homes and businesses across Michigan to enhance community and economic development, improve quality of life, provide access to education and lifelong learning opportunities, support remote work demand, and promote equitable access to health. The four goals related to digital equity are:

1. Expand high-speed broadband availability throughout Southeast Michigan.
2. Improve data on broadband availability and access to reflect current conditions with accuracy.
3. Ensure equitable access to broadband and support digital literacy efforts for students, seniors, and households with limited access to resources.
4. Coordinate broadband efforts at the state level to support broadband development for community and economic development.

### 3.1.3 Existing Digital Equity Programs

In this section, MIHI has identified various existing state and local digital equity programs and outlined how each initiative enables or supports Michigan’s digital equity and inclusion goals. Although this is not an all-encompassing list, it reflects Michigan’s commitment to identifying and leveraging existing programs and initiatives across state and local government as part of the strategies to closing the digital divide. Understanding the strengths and potential gaps in service of these various programs is crucial in advancing Michigan’s broader digital inclusion goals and ensuring a cohesive and coordinated approach to achieving digital equity across the state. By identifying areas of convergence and potential collaboration across programs, Michigan can leverage existing resources, expertise, and momentum, while avoiding duplication of efforts, especially with the nondeployment aspect of the BEAD program and maximizing the impact of state investment in digital inclusion.

#### Affordable Connectivity Program

Eligible Michiganders may qualify for monthly assistance toward paying their monthly home internet bill under the federal Affordable Connectivity Program (ACP). The Affordable Connectivity Program is a \$14.2 billion benefit program that helps ensure that households can afford the broadband they need for work, school, healthcare, and more. The benefit provides a discount of up to \$30 per month toward internet service for eligible households and up to \$75 per month for households on qualifying tribal lands. Eligible households can also receive a one-time discount of up to \$100 to purchase a laptop, desktop computer, or tablet from participating providers if they contribute more than \$10 and less than \$50 toward the purchase price. The Affordable Connectivity Program is limited to one monthly service discount and one device discount per household.

Eligibility for the ACP program is based on household income. ACP-eligible households include families with incomes at or below 200% of the federal poverty level and those who qualify for Lifeline, SNAP, Free and Reduced-Price School Lunch, WIC, and other government-funded programs. Essentially, the covered population that this program is geared toward is the households with lower incomes. An estimated 1,685,725 households in Michigan are eligible for the ACP program. As of April 1, 2023, 604,108 households are enrolled in the program, which constitutes approximately 35.8% of the estimated eligible households.

## MI Dept. of Education, E-Rate Support

E-rate is a federal program that provides reduced rates on internet access and internal connections for schools and libraries. The discount rate, which ranges between 20% and 90%, is based on the number of schoolchildren in the area who are eligible for a free or reduced lunch, and E-rate can save libraries money through lower fees for these vital services. The funding for the E-rate program is determined based on the level of demand, up to an annual cap of \$4.456 billion.

If a state provides eligible schools and libraries with funding for special construction charges for high-speed broadband that meets the FCC's long-term connectivity targets, the E-Rate program will increase an applicant's discount rate for these charges up to an additional 10% to match the state funding on a one-to-one-dollar basis. For Tribal schools and libraries, the E-Rate program will also match special construction funding provided by states, Tribal governments, or other federal agencies on a one-to-one basis, up to an additional 10% for the applicant's discount rate. Total E-Rate support with matching funds may not exceed 100%. Discounts for support depend on the level of poverty and whether the school or library is in an urban or rural area.

## Michigan Public Service Commission, Utility Assistance Programs

The Michigan Public Service Commission (MPSC) is the regulatory authority for all utility providers in the state. The MPSC maintains a database of utility assistance programs to support consumers. The purpose of the assistance program is to establish and administer programs statewide that provide energy assistance and self-sufficiency services to eligible low-income households. Self-sufficiency services include assisting participants with the following: paying their utility bills on time, including broadband; budgeting for and contributing to their ability to provide for energy expenses, which may include enrollment into an affordable payment plan (APP); and utilizing energy services to optimize energy efficiency. Additionally, the assistance program allows low-income residents who fall behind on their gas and electric bills to stay safely in their homes and become energy self-sufficient through utility bill payment assistance and an array of other support programs, including the Affordable Connectivity Program (ACP), which offers monthly assistance toward broadband or internet bills.

Michigan Public Act 95 allows the MPSC to approve a low-income energy assistance "funding factor" (a surcharge on utilities), not to exceed \$50 million, every year to fund the program. In 2017, the MPSC established a monthly 93-cents-per-meter surcharge on all participating electric utilities that have opted in to fund the program.

## Connecting Michigan Communities Grant Program

The Michigan Department of Technology, Management, and Budget is providing a grant opportunity to extend broadband service into unserved areas in Michigan. The grant funds are available to middle-mile and last-mile projects that demonstrate collaboration to achieve community investment and economic development goals of the area impacted.

CMIC was created in late 2018 as Michigan's first broadband infrastructure grant program and seeded with \$20M in initial funds. An additional \$14.3M was added to the program in mid-2020. The program has issued three rounds of grants, with the last occurring in 2022. The program is currently housed at the MI Dept. of Technology, Management, and Budget, but recent discussion may shift administration of the program to MIHI. No additional grant awards are anticipated from the program. The intended outcome of the program is to connect more than 17,000 locations to high-speed internet.

## Realizing Opportunity with Broadband Infrastructure Networks (ROBIN) Broadband Infrastructure Grant Program

ROBIN is a high-speed internet last-mile and middle-mile infrastructure competitive grant program with \$238M in project funds from the U.S. Treasury as part of the Coronavirus Capital Projects Fund. ROBIN provides funds to internet service providers and public-private partnerships for the expansion of broadband infrastructure to unserved areas. Up to 35% of ROBIN funds can be used for middle-mile projects that support deployment of broadband service to unserved areas, while the remainder is dedicated for last-mile service projects. The program is designed to connect locations currently without 100/20 Mbps service. Ultimately, the goal is to connect 60,000-75,000 locations with high-speed internet service with this grant.

## Tribal Broadband Connectivity Program (TBCP)

The NTIA's Tribal Broadband Connectivity Program is an initiative that provides grants to support broadband deployment and adoption in tribal communities across the United States. The program offers \$1 billion in funding to tribal governments and tribal organizations to expand access to high-speed internet and improve digital inclusion. The grants can be used for a range of activities, such as building and upgrading broadband infrastructure, establishing public computer centers, and providing digital skills training. These grants will expand high-speed internet network deployment and digital skills training to improve access to education, jobs, and healthcare on Tribal lands.

Two tribes in Michigan received grants from the TBCP. The Nottawaseppi Huron Band of the Potawatomi project was awarded about \$1.2M and proposes to upgrade existing local fiber optic infrastructure that currently serves Tribal government offices, Tribal businesses, and community anchor institutions in addition to 35 Tribal households. These upgrades will assist Tribal members in gaining better access to telehealth, distance learning, and economic and workforce development, in addition to digital inclusion efforts. In addition, the Match-E-Be-Nash-She-Wish Band of Pottawatomi Indians (Gun Lake) was awarded around \$500K, which will connect 17 households in the Gun Lake tribe that lacked access to broadband to qualifying broadband service.

### 3.1.4 Broadband Adoption

As of 2023, more than 492,000 households are unserved (locations without 25/3 Mbps service available) or underserved (locations without 100/20 Mbps service available) by high-speed internet infrastructure. Another 730,000 households face barriers related to affordability, adoption, device access, digital literacy, or a combination thereof. Taken together, this means that approximately 30% of Michigan households struggle with some form of the digital divide. MIHI has actively been working with internal and external agencies to ensure that Michiganders are aware of the programs and resources that can subsidize internet service plans and internet-enabled devices.



### 3.1.4.1 Affordable Connectivity Program\*

The Affordable Connectivity Program is administered by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and provides financial assistance (\$30 per month, or up to \$75 per month for qualifying Tribal households) and a one-time discount to purchase an internet-enabled device for eligible households and households on qualifying Tribal lands (FCC.gov). The Affordable Connectivity Program is open to households with an income of 200% or less of the Federal Poverty Guidelines. It is also available to households that have a member who accesses any of the following programs: Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP); Medicaid; Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC); Supplemental Security Income (SSI); Federal Public Housing Assistance (FPHA); Veterans Pension and Survivors Benefit; Free and Reduced-Price School Lunch Program or School Breakfast Program; and Federal Pell Grant (received in current award year).

### 3.1.4.2 Other Initiatives

Michigan supports promotion of the ACP enrollment process for Michiganders, by partnering with EducationSuperHighway to coordinate a statewide ACP awareness campaign. EducationSuperHighway is a national nonprofit that has worked in the broadband space for decades and has recently shifted their focus to the digital divide. Another program that assists in the promotion of ACP is Lifeline. Through this service, Michigan senior citizens have access to a phone landline and are also eligible for the Affordable Connectivity Program.

Michigan currently leverages a Digital Navigator program funded by Community Development Block Grant dollars from the CARES Act and administered in partnership with the MEDC. The program is hosted in three of the 10 economic Prosperity Regions. The primary goal of this program is to increase awareness of broadband opportunities and events, to provide technical assistance for broadband-related skills, and to identify resources to subsidize internet service plans. Michigan will scale the Digital Navigator program to a statewide offering covering each of the 10 Prosperity Regions with a focus on underrepresented and underserved communities and on covered populations.

MIHI has partnered with the State of Michigan Library and the Michigan Department of Education to leverage resources and expand digital learning opportunities for communities. For decades, Michigan's statewide libraries have provided a physical space and digital learning opportunities for community members. More recently, many libraries have also been a provider of loaner internet-enabled devices and mobile hot spots. The MDE has adopted the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) standards as digital literacy competencies that are implemented at various grade levels for students in kindergarten through secondary schools.

---

19. Data for number of unserved and underserved locations comes from the June 15, 2023, data published by the Federal Communications Commission that represents availability reported by internet service providers as of December 31, 2022.

20. 2021 Update to the Michigan Broadband Roadmap (2021), Michigan High-Speed Internet Office

\*As of February 7, 2024 the Federal Communications Commission ceased enrollment of new households into the Affordable Connectivity Program. Effective April 1, 2024, the Affordable Connectivity Program no longer provides monthly internet subscription support. Bipartisan and bicameral support for continuing the ACP is gaining momentum in the US Congress, however as of publication of this document, no continuation efforts have been successful.

Michigan works to collaborate and coordinate with local nonprofit organizations that are operating in the device ecosystem, workforce, and digital skill development space. One such collaboration is with Human-I-T. Detroit’s Human-I-T creates equitable access to technology in several ways. The most notable strategies are providing low-cost devices, internet access, digital skills training, and tech support. Human-I-T also works with companies to recycle internet-enabled devices. A multitiered approach will be considered to scale the work of Human-I-T to more Detroiters and Michiganders.

During the MI Connected Future Tour, MIHI learned that communities want to get involved and develop relationships that will aid them in competing in the BEAD subgrantee process. The current landscape of broadband adoption allows MIHI to support digital inclusion virtually by way of a Digital Inclusion Playbook, which is a five-step framework to address digital equity in communities. The playbook guides communities on how to identify key stakeholders, create the coalition, collect data, and establish goals. These are all critical components to creating a more digitally inclusive community.

Additionally, MIHI has created an asset inventory that allows organizations/companies to share their information, including the digital services they provide. Once complete, the organization can be located by anyone inquiring about their services in an online map.

### **3.1.5 Broadband Affordability**

MIHI provides resources and outreach toolkits that are available electronically via the Labor and Economic Opportunity website. MIHI also references the Affordable Connectivity Program (ACP) on the website and as part of the resources toolkits. Enrollments in the ACP in Michigan are among the highest nationally. According to EducationSuperHighway, 1,690,382 Michigan households are eligible for the ACP, yet only 826,291 (48% of those eligible as of December 2023) have enrolled. Without high-speed internet access at home, Michigan households can’t work remotely; can’t access healthcare, job training, the social safety net, or critical government services; and their children can’t complete schoolwork outside the classroom. The MIHI website links several internet service providers directly for Michiganders to enroll in low-cost opportunities. MIHI intends to sustain a low-cost internet service plan model that is required by the BEAD program.

In addition, several organizations and municipalities were awarded federal grants toward ACP promotion through the Affordable Connectivity Outreach Grant Program. The grantees were United Way of Southeastern Michigan, Wayne County, City of Flint, and Literacy Center of West Michigan. Each of the awardees will serve as trusted community institutions that will implement strategies to reach unserved and underserved households.

---

21. LEO—Michigan Digital Inclusion Resources

22. <https://www.educationsuperhighway.org/no-home-left-offline/acp-data/>

The State of Michigan has provided additional support to low-income households. The Michigan Energy Assistance Program (MEAP) administers statewide programs that provide energy assistance and self-sufficiency services to eligible households. MEAP acknowledges that concerns about gas, electric, telecommunications, and broadband services affect Michiganders. According to the MEAP website, self-sufficiency services include assisting eligible households with paying energy bills on time, budgeting for and contributing to their ability to provide for energy expenses, assistance in enrollment into an affordable payment plan, and utilizing energy services to optimize on energy efficiency. MEAP carefully outlines a step-by-step process for participants to employ and to be proactive. Additionally, MEAP outlines an outreach toolkit and links to resources, including MIBridges, the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services-led program. Using MEAP, Michiganders can also discover energy assistance resources available to them in their area.

## **3.1.6 Asset Gaps**

### **3.1.6.1 Digital Equity Plans**

Based on the identification of existing digital equity plans in the state, Michigan recognizes the need for additional local, county, and municipal digital equity plans to help ensure local and community needs are identified and there is a plan in place to close the gap. Developing digital equity plans will provide a means to build partnerships and collaborate with various stakeholders to implement digital inclusion activities at the local level effectively. As part of the implementation plan, MIHI plans to deploy Digital Navigators to partner with communities and support the identification of needs and build capacity for communities to implement local digital equity plans. These plans will then in turn help to define the specific digital equity programs and support required in each community, which can again be supported through the Digital Navigator program.

### **3.1.6.2 Digital Equity Plans**

MIHI recognizes the affordability gap that exists in Michigan. Affordability was identified as the second-most-prevalent barrier to access during the MICF tour. In response to this, MIHI aims to tackle this issue through innovative community and service provider engagement, including exploring the potential for provider-led affordability programs. In addition, MIHI recognizes that digital skills training and education programs are lacking in the state. MIHI understands that bridging the gap in digital skills education and training programs will equip people with the necessary skills to reduce the digital divide. MIHI plans to deploy Digital Navigators to support communities in building their capacity while identifying needs and moving toward implementation of digital equity plans.

### 3.1.6.3 Digital Inclusion Assets

The results of the Digital Inclusion Resource Map, in Appendix A-2, revealed asset gaps primarily related to incarcerated individuals, veterans, and individuals with disabilities. Although the Digital Inclusion Resource Map is not a complete list of organizations supporting digital inclusion throughout the state, out of the 208 organizations that completed the survey, only four organizations indicated serving incarcerated individuals, and five organizations indicated serving veterans and individuals with disabilities. The organizations supporting these individuals mainly focused on providing services related to digital access.

During the Partnership Roundtable meetings that discussed obstacles and barriers to broadband deployment and adoption, participants were asked to share their thoughts and ideas regarding digital equity, focusing on device access, digital skills and proficiency, affordability, relevance/awareness, and inclusivity. After analyzing the feedback gathered from these discussions and responses, we identified several common themes related to asset gaps that emerged across these discussions. The following is a summary of these themes, which can guide us as we work toward addressing these issues and achieving greater digital equity and inclusion in our communities.

- Rural communities are often left behind when it comes to access to high-speed internet and other digital services due to the higher costs associated with providing these services in remote areas. This lack of access can have a significant impact on economic development, education, healthcare, and social connectivity in these rural communities.
- In addition to access issues, the cost of service is often higher in rural areas than in urban areas. Internet service providers have to invest more to build the necessary infrastructure in remote areas, and due to smaller populations, they may not be able to achieve the same economies of scale as they do in urban areas. This cost burden is usually passed on to the consumers, making the service more expensive for those who live in rural areas.
- Many individuals do not have access to high-speed internet, which is necessary to access telehealth services. This creates a significant gap in healthcare accessibility and highlights the need for increased focus on expanding access to telehealth services.



- Deploying broadband infrastructure is a complex and time-consuming process that requires significant investment and coordination from stakeholders. Waiting for broadband infrastructure to be deployed can result in significant opportunity costs, including lost economic development, healthcare, and educational opportunities.
- Digital literacy and training is a crucial asset gap, especially notable for older generations. Digital literacy training can include basic computer skills, internet browsing, digital data entry, and file management. Offering digital literacy training in person may be essential to serving aging individuals.
- Digital safety is another critical concern. With the risk of cyberattacks and digital fraud, it is essential to educate people on digital safety best practices. Older generations may be particularly vulnerable to scams and fraud.

Michigan is committed to addressing the digital asset gaps that affect covered populations, including veterans, incarcerated individuals, and those with disabilities, while also prioritizing removing the obstacles and barriers related to digital equity. The asset gaps and themes identified during the Digital Inclusion Resource Map and Partnership Roundtable discussions provided key insights for addressing challenges related to broadband deployment and adoption, access and affordability, digital literacy and training, digital safety, and more. By recognizing these challenges and working together to develop comprehensive solutions, plans, and programs, Michigan can achieve digital equity and inclusion in our communities and bridge the digital divide.

Similar to how MIHI will deploy Digital Navigators to support the development and implementation of county, township, and municipal digital equity plans, the strategy to support the closing of gaps for covered populations, especially for those groups identified to have the least amount of existing digital inclusion resources (incarcerated individuals, veterans, and individuals with disabilities), will also be supported using Digital Navigators. Digital Navigators will support the implementation of targeted initiatives based on the needs identified by each respective covered population. Digital Navigators will be placed at host sites such as nonprofit organizations or local units of government. MIHI also recognizes the laudable efforts existing organizations have engaged in to close digital equity gaps within covered populations. The Digital Navigators will remain available to provide assistance and support to organizations representing and serving covered populations, with a focus on covered populations that have an identified digital equity asset gap, with the goal of expanding the available resources and services to mitigate and address the gaps.

## 3.2 Needs Assessment

MIHI instituted a comprehensive community engagement strategy wherein community members and Partnership Roundtable attendees shared their biggest broadband barriers via surveys and qualitative sharing. MIHI conducted 31 in-person community meetings, throughout each of the 10 Prosperity Regions in Michigan. The data collected during these meetings is the source of the information below. The cities selected for




Figure 4: MI Connected Future Tour Stops Visited from January to July of 2023

community meetings were targeted based on their rurality, status of internet availability, and historically underrepresented populations.

Section 3.2.1. below summarizes the results of those surveys by region and covered population, including:

- Income below 150% of the poverty line
- Aging Individuals
- Veteran Status
- Disabled Individuals
- English-Language Learners
- Racial/Ethnic Minorities
- Rural Residents

### 3.2.1 Covered Population Needs Assessment

The MIHI Office examined the needs of each covered population and mapped out the gaps by region using the 10 multicounty economic prosperity regions defined by LEO as a basis for analysis and implementation across programs. The regional boundaries are depicted in Figure 5 below.

The profiles begin with that of Michigan as a whole, followed by a similar profile for each of the 10 regions. The purpose of these profiles is to establish a baseline for understanding the unique digital equity and connectivity needs of the state and each region. Each profile contains a digital equity analysis that identifies the covered populations as defined by the Digital Equity Act, as well as the current state and needs for broadband availability and the priorities defined by each region during MIHI’s MICE listening tour. The following describes each of the data points found in the profiles. If a metric is highlighted in a regional profile, the rate of that metric in the region is higher/lower than the state average, which may indicate a need for additional focus on this covered population or element of digital equity.

### 3.2.1.1 Digital Equity Profile

The Digital Equity Profile identifies and enumerates the various Digital Equity Act-covered populations within each region. These metrics are critical for identifying the unique digital equity needs throughout the state that can drive future digital inclusion program implementation.




Figure 5: Covered Population Needs Assessment Map

| Covered Populations | Description   |
|---------------------|---|
| Population          | The total population of the area from the American Community Survey 2021 5-Year Estimates.  |
| Rural               | The total number and percentage of the population residing in rural areas of the region as defined by the USDA 2013 Rural-Urban Continuum Code. |
| Age 60+             | The total number and percentage of the population aged 60 years or more in the region from the American Community Survey 2021 5-Year Estimates. |

| Covered Populations      | Description  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Below Poverty            | The total number and percentage of the population living below the federal poverty guideline in the region from the American Community Survey 2021 5-Year Estimates.   |
| ALICE Population         | The total number and percentage of the population defined as Asset Limited, Income Constrained, Employed (ALICE) in the region as defined by the United Way. Data is from 2021.  |
| Non-White                | The total number and percentage of the population identifying as a race other than white, not including those of Hispanic descent, in the region from the American Community Survey 2021 5-Year Estimates.   |
| Hispanic                 | The total number and percentage of the population identifying as being of Hispanic descent in the region from the American Community Survey 2021 5-Year Estimates.   |
| Foreign-born             | The total number and percentage of the population in each region born outside the United States from the American Community Survey 2021 5-Year Estimates.  |
| Limited English-Speaking | The total number and percentage of the population in each region that identify as being limited English speakers. This data was derived by identifying the number of households in each region identifying as such and multiplying it by the average household size for each region to determine the estimated population that are limited English speakers. Data is from the American Community Survey 2021 5-Year Estimates. |
| Veterans                 | The total number and percentage of the population in the region that indicate past military service from the American Community Survey 2021 5-Year Estimates.  |
| Disabled                 | The total number and percentage of the population in the region that indicate that they have mental or physical disability from the American Community Survey 2021 5-Year Estimates.   |

| Covered Populations             | Description   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Living in Correctional Facility | The total number and percentage of the population in the region that is living in a correctional facility. This data comes from the 2020 Decennial Census. The data does not differentiate between those in federal or state correctional facilities. |

Table 12: Digital Equity Profile Covered Population Metrics

### 3.2.1.2 Covered Population Needs Assessment

#### Rural Individuals

#### Needs Assessment

Rural Individuals are those living in a jurisdiction with a population density less than 100 persons per square mile or in a county smaller than 225 square miles. The state of Michigan is unique in that it has two peninsulas, with varying population densities and topography. Both peninsulas, but especially the Upper Peninsula, are composed of many rural households with houses spread out over greater distances and higher populations of aging individuals. The topography of the Upper Peninsula and other areas of the state mean that rural individuals require internet access that will meet their needs but that service may not have been accessible or reliable in the past. These individuals need to have high-speed internet to access job opportunities, use internet-enabled health devices, procure goods and services that may not be available locally, have access to telehealth appointments, and communicate with friends and family who live farther away.

#### Barriers for Rural Individuals

The availability of high-speed internet and the infrastructure needed to provide reliable service was identified as the number one barrier for Michiganders during the MI Connected Future Listening Tour (MICF). Lack of infrastructure, high cost of broadband service, and low population density are other challenges rural individuals face related to accessing and adopting high-speed internet. These barriers inhibit rural individuals from fully participating in the digital economy, accessing educational resources, and connecting with loved ones. Some attendees of the MICF Listening Tour in the Upper Peninsula expressed affordability of high-speed internet as another barrier. The high cost was often related to extending infrastructure to their homes from the street lines. Several remote workers in attendance mentioned the high cost of connecting their homes as a barrier to their employment. Residents in rural areas are less likely to subscribe to broadband service, which, in turn, makes building out infrastructure in rural areas less favorable for internet service providers.<sup>23</sup>

23. Anna Read, Kelly Wert, 2023 Broadband Access Still a Challenge in Rural Affordable Housing: More subsidies and government funding needed to encourage providers to serve communities.

## Aging Individuals Needs Assessment

Aging individuals are adults who are 60 years of age or older. According to the U.S. Census Bureau and Michigan.gov, around 25% of Michigan's total population, or over 2.5 million residents, are 60 years of age or older.<sup>24</sup> Baby boomers, who are individuals born between 1946 and 1964, make up a significant percentage of Michigan's working-age population. This introduces new challenges as members of this demographic move toward retirement.<sup>25</sup> Although aging individuals have a wealth of experience and knowledge, they may not see the benefits of utilizing the internet until resources are shared with them. Upon seeing that many services have shifted to online platforms, including telemedicine, bill payment, and shopping, aging individuals feel the pressure to use the internet to perform necessities that were previously handled offline.



## Barriers for Aging Individuals

Many factors contribute to aging individuals' low or slow adoption to the internet. These factors include lack of education, limited financial resources, declining physical abilities (e.g., hearing and vision), fear of using devices without assistance, and limited or no digital skills.<sup>26</sup> These factors were shared during the MICF tour discussion groups. Additionally, a report by Pew found that aging individuals struggled with using the internet; this was often because the technology was not tailored to seniors and their specific needs.<sup>27</sup> Using touch screens, navigating overwhelming interfaces, and remembering log-in credentials are additional barriers for this population to overcome.<sup>28</sup>

24. U.S. Census Data 2022. <https://data.census.gov/table/ACSSSTIY2022.S0102?q=michigan%20aging%20individuals>

25. Samuel Robinson, 2023 Census Data: Michigan is getting older. [Census data: Michigan is getting older - Axios Detroit](https://www.axiosdetroit.com/news/census-data-michigan-is-getting-older)

26. Why do many seniors have trouble using technology? | No Isolation. <https://www.noisolation.com/research/why-do-many-seniors-have-trouble-using-technology#:~:text=Most%20technology%20is%20not%20tailored,user%20interfaces%20can%20be%20overwhelming>.

27. Attitudes, Impacts, and Barriers to Adoption | Pew Research Center. Aaron Smith, 2014 Attitudes, Impacts, and Barriers to Adoption: Many seniors face challenges using new digital devices <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2014/04/03/attitudes-impacts-and-barriers-to-adoption/>

28. Attitudes, Impacts, and Barriers to Adoption | Pew Research Center. Aaron Smith, 2014 Attitudes, Impacts, and Barriers to Adoption: Many seniors face challenges using new digital devices <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2014/04/03/attitudes-impacts-and-barriers-to-adoption/>



## Covered Households

### Needs Assessment

Covered households are defined as those at 150% above the poverty line. Census data shows that nearly 23% of Michigan households with a collective income of \$20,000 or less are not connected to the internet at all.<sup>29</sup> This population often struggles with affording their household needs and may also struggle with having stable housing. This means that affordable and flexible internet service rates are critical.

During the MICF tour, youth participants shared concerns related to stable housing. This means that internet packages that required people to be locked into long-term, location-bound subscriptions were not ideal. Many of the youth participants and their household members relied upon having cell phones for internet access.

### Barriers for Covered Households

MIHI's MICF tour found that availability of internet service and service cost were the two most significant barriers to connectivity for covered households. In fact, 69% of respondents surveyed within covered households specifically pointed to service cost as being a substantial barrier to connectivity, while 65% of respondents surveyed noted that availability of internet is also a substantial barrier. Throughout the MICF tour, participants stated that the Affordable Connectivity Program (ACP) helps ensure that more people have a home internet connection; this is supported by data from ACP recipients. Many Michiganders fear that losing the subsidy will negatively impact their access to telehealth, government services, online banking, educational resources, employment opportunities, and other necessities. Research shows that students who were given hot spots at the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic had increased access to the internet; however, after budgets began to decrease and hot spots were no longer shared, not every impacted household adopted new internet services and 12% of households lost internet access due to affordability or other factors.<sup>30</sup>

29. U.S. Census Data. 2022. [https://data.census.gov/table/ACSSTIY2022.S2801?q=broadband&g=040XX00US26\\_ACSSTIY2019\\$S2801](https://data.census.gov/table/ACSSTIY2022.S2801?q=broadband&g=040XX00US26_ACSSTIY2019$S2801)

30. Quello Center. 2023. <https://quello.msu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/Broadband-and-Student-Performance-Gaps-After-the-COVID-19-Pandemic.pdf>

## Racial/Ethnic Minorities

### Needs Assessment

Racial/ethnic minorities are defined as individuals who identify as a race other than white alone. Racial/ethnic minorities represent about 21.2% of Michigan’s population or 2,127,000 people and have lower rates of broadband adoption compared with the overall state population.<sup>31</sup> Accessing reliable and affordable high-speed internet is a need for racial/ethnic minorities. Historically, racial/ethnic minorities earn far lower average incomes than individuals who identify exclusively as white. Low-income families may struggle with affording reliable internet.<sup>32</sup> The COVID-19 pandemic highlighted the need for closing the digital divide in communities where many racial/ethnic individuals reside.

### Barriers for Racial/Ethnic Minorities

MIHI’s MICEF tour found that availability of internet service and service cost were the two most significant barriers to connectivity for this population. All told, 74% of respondents surveyed within racial/ethnic minorities shared availability as a substantial barrier to connectivity and 63% of respondents surveyed noted that service cost was a substantial barrier to connectivity. Research suggests that the barriers that exist are a series of systemic challenges. Racial and ethnic minorities face challenges that go beyond income and even include internet service providers’ use of strategies that impact supply and demand in communities, credit checks, and differences in quality of service in schools and workplaces.<sup>34</sup> Individuals of this population may also face similar internet subscription prices that provide slower speeds and less reliable connections.<sup>33</sup>



### Individuals with a Language Barrier Needs Assessment

Individuals within this group are defined as English learners or individuals who have low literacy rates. Individuals with language barriers are not a monolith and represent immigrants who have come to Michigan later in life as well as individuals who grew up speaking another language at home. In Michigan this includes community college students studying English as a second language (ESL), immigrant agricultural workers, and stay-at-home spouses who travel to the U.S. with their partners for employment.

31. Census Data. 2022. <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/MI/RHI125222>

32. The Racial Digital Divide Persists | Free Press. 2018. <https://www.freepress.net/blog/racial-digital-divide-persists>.

33. The Markup. 2022. <https://themarkup.org/still-loading/2022/10/19/dollars-to-megabits-you-may-be-paying-400-times-as-much-as-your-neighbor-for-internet-service>

The needs are diverse. Some individuals may need help with accessing affordable technology to translate documents, whereas others require reliable internet connections to talk with loved ones, access healthcare, and send remittances back to family in other countries.

## **Barriers for Individuals with a Language Barrier**

The greatest barriers identified for this group during the MICF tour are the service cost of internet closely followed by the availability of service. Nearly 57% of respondents surveyed who have a language barrier specifically pointed to affordability as being a substantial challenge to connectivity. Also, 69% of MICF respondents surveyed noted that availability of internet is a substantial obstacle. Another barrier shared by a U.S. Department of Education publication shows that educators who teach ESL often use digital resources to instruct English learners within the classroom but not in out-of-school time. The use of these resources is not encouraged as often outside the classroom because educators and leaders within school districts perceive English learners to lack internet access and the required technology at home.<sup>34</sup>

## **Veterans**

### **Needs Assessment**

Veterans are defined as individuals who served in the active military and were not dishonorably discharged. In Michigan, 5.8% of residents are veterans.<sup>35</sup> Veterans often require access to more medical care due to their military service. Veterans Affairs (the VA) has made recent efforts to increase digital equity and connect veterans to telehealth services due to the restrictions of the pandemic on in-person visits.<sup>36</sup> At the beginning of the pandemic, in-person medical appointments were limited to emergency visits; veterans at homes that were unserved had to rely upon phone visits with medical professionals.<sup>37</sup> Access to online job boards, employment resources, and virtual training opportunities are necessary for veterans to fully participate in civilian life.

### **Barriers for Veterans**

MIHI's MICF tour found that individuals who identified as veterans ranked the availability of high-speed internet as the most significant barrier to connectivity; cost was perceived to be the second most significant barrier to connectivity. Some research notes that veterans often have social networks to rely upon if they need to use the internet, but the inconvenience and inability to readily access the internet prohibits the ability to meet an immediate need if necessary.<sup>38</sup> Veterans who live in census blocks that are considered unserved compared with served were 50% less likely to partake in telehealth appointments.<sup>39</sup> Lack of connectivity is a barrier to getting veterans the health outcomes that they need.

---

34. Department of Education. 2019. <https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/title-iii/180414.pdf>

35. Census Data. 2022. <https://data.census.gov/table/ACSST1Y2022.S2101?g=040XX00US26>

36. The VA. 2023. <https://news.va.gov/121095/va-helps-veterans-bridge-the-digital-divide/>

37. Journal for the American Medical Association. 2022. <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamanetworkopen/fullarticle/2797400>

38. National Institute of Health. 2016. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5143468/>

39. Journal for the American Medical Association. 2022. <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamanetworkopen/fullarticle/2797400>

## Individuals with Disabilities

### Needs Assessment

Individuals with disabilities are defined as any person with a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits their life activity. According to census data, slightly over 14% of Michiganders have a disability.<sup>40</sup> Americans with disabilities are three times as likely to never go online compared with individuals without a disability.<sup>41</sup> Even when individuals with disabilities can connect online, they may find that websites are not accessible. A recent study concludes that less than 4% of the top 1 million website homepages are ADA compliant and free of accessibility concerns.<sup>42</sup> Digital skills and education must address the specific needs of individuals with disabilities. Access to resources that allow for diverse forms of communication, like American Sign Language, or an understanding of the accessibility features with certain technologies are necessary for equitable communication. Connecting educators and their learners with the proper resources will aid in ensuring all Michiganders can access the internet.

### Barriers for Individuals with Disabilities

MIHI's MICEF tour found that the most important barrier for this group is the availability of service, with 76% of respondents surveyed citing it as a significant barrier. Nearly 65% of respondents surveyed pointed to service cost as being a significant barrier to connectivity. Individuals with disabilities often struggle to use the internet or devices if they are inaccessible. Issues with screen readers, low-contrast text, empty links, and missing buttons are just several issues that can impact individuals who have a disability.<sup>43</sup> If individuals cannot connect online due to availability of service or service cost, they may travel to coffee shops, libraries, or local community centers to use the internet. This adds a further layer of complication as individuals with disabilities may need to navigate areas that can accommodate their needs, such as wheelchair ramps and accessible bathrooms.

## Justice-Involved/Incarcerated Individuals

### Needs Assessment

Justice-involved individuals, as defined by the Digital Equity Act NOFO, are incarcerated people who are not in a federal corrections facility. As of May 2023, the Michigan Department of Corrections reported that 74,915 justice-involved individuals were in its system. This includes 32,654 incarcerated individuals, 33,091 probationers, and 9,170 parolees.<sup>44</sup> Justice-involved individuals preparing for reentry into society often lack the training and professional skills needed to obtain employment once they are released.

---

40. Michigan Census Data. 2022. <https://data.census.gov/profile/Michigan?g=040XX00US26#health>

41. PEW Research. 2021. <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2021/09/10/americans-with-disabilities-less-likely-than-those-without-to-own-some-digital-devices/>

42. WebAIM 2023 Report on Accessibility. <https://webaim.org/projects/million/>

43. WebAIM 2023 Report on Accessibility. <https://webaim.org/projects/million/>

44. Michigan Legislature Bill Analysis for MDOC. 2023. <https://www.legislature.mi.gov/documents/2023-2024/billanalysis/House/pdf/2023-HLA-0191-F320B1C2.pdf>

The longer individuals have been separated from the nonincarcerated population, the more help they may need with utilizing technology and learning digital skills to adapt to the demands of the new workforce. Transition-to-reentry programs have existed for years, but there is need to ensure that education and training is openly available for justice-involved individuals.

## **Barriers for Justice-Involved/Incarcerated Individuals**

The barriers to accessing broadband that incarcerated individuals face are due to systemic challenges that include not having access to the internet, lack of devices, and sometimes lack of familiarity with devices. Security routines in prisons and the concerns around internet safety inhibit incarcerated individuals from using the internet. Some prisons allow incarcerated individuals to use computers and the internet only two or three months before their release date, and only for the purpose of seeking employment.<sup>45</sup> In a society that relies upon digital job applications, online job interviews, and LinkedIn profiles, not having access to technology that is beneficial to finding work sets up burdensome hurdles that are difficult to overcome.

Despite the obstacles, there can be opportunities to overcome these barriers for incarcerated individuals. The Michigan Department of Corrections opened a first-of-its kind Vocational Village in 2016. The innovative program provided incarcerated individuals at a level II facility the opportunity to participate in skills trade classes in a positive learning community.<sup>46</sup> Since then, the program has expanded to several more prisons throughout the state. The Vocational Village at the Parnall Correctional Facility has innovative programming from tree trimming to software development. One of the most innovative components is the connection to employers and employment opportunities after release. The continued growth of facilities of this nature provides justice-involved individuals with training and education in preparation for reentry into society.<sup>47</sup>

## **Overlapping Experiences—Covered Populations**

A consideration that should be noted is that many Michiganders meet the criteria for more than one of the covered populations. The overlap of experiences certainly exacerbates the circumstances surrounding the need for reliable high-speed internet, access to internet-enabled devices, and digital skills. The 2018 article “The Racial Digital Divide Persists” highlighted that the disparities in broadband adoption stem from income inequality and from factors such as systemic racial discrimination.<sup>48</sup> Another example can point directly to aging individuals and the percentage that classify themselves as disabled. According to a 2014 Pew Center Report, 29% of those 65 and older “have a disability, handicap, or chronic disease that prevents them from fully participating in many common daily activities.”<sup>49</sup>

---

45. Leah Wang, 2023 Prison Policy Initiative Graphic and Information. [https://www.prisonpolicy.org/graphs/correctional\\_control2023/MI\\_incarceration\\_2023.html](https://www.prisonpolicy.org/graphs/correctional_control2023/MI_incarceration_2023.html)

46. Michigan Department of Corrections <https://www.michigan.gov/corrections/offender-success>

47. Michigan Department of Corrections Offender Success Program. <https://www.michigan.gov/corrections/offender-success>

48. The Free Press. 2018. <https://www.freepress.net/blog/racial-digital-divide-persists>

49. Attitudes, Impacts, and Barriers to Adoption | Pew Research Center. Aaron Smith, 2014 Attitudes, Impacts, and Barriers to Adoption: Many seniors face challenges using new digital devices <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2014/04/03/attitudes-impacts-and-barriers-to-adoption/>

Many daily activities require access to the internet and, unfortunately, covered populations are in many cases unserved or underserved. During the MICF Listening Tour, Michiganders cited access to reliable and affordable high-speed internet as top priorities. Many Michiganders are part of one or more covered populations and have unique and specific broadband needs. To best address those needs, MIHI strives to collect good data, continually grow the office's understanding of covered populations, and bolster analytical skills to see larger patterns within and across covered populations. Understanding the individuals who reside within different groups allows MIHI to create tailored resources that can be more impactful for specific populations.

These solutions will not only be more impactful because of a better understanding of specific groups but also more equitable because individuals will receive the resources they require to meet their connectivity needs. As MIHI considers gaps in broadband needs like availability, affordability, access to technology, or digital skills, every covered population and multiple groupings of covered populations will have their needs addressed differently. For example, aging individuals who have disabilities will not receive the same resources as formerly incarcerated individuals who are within a covered household, and racial/ethnic minorities with a language barrier will not receive the same resources as veterans in rural areas. Solutions will be developed to support the unique needs of Michiganders who are considered to be part of one or more covered populations.

### **3.2.1.3 Broadband Availability**

This section identifies the total number of residential and business broadband serviceable locations (BSL) identified on the BSL Fabric developed and maintained by the Federal Communications Commission. The number and percentage of unserved (locations without 25/3 Mbps service available) and underserved (locations without 100/20 Mbps service available) BSLs are included for each region. This information comes from the June 15, 2023, data published by the FCC that represents availability reported by internet service providers as of December 31, 2022. These metrics are critical for understanding the service availability needs and gaps within each region.

### **3.2.1.4 Digital Equity Priorities**

This data is derived from the MICF statewide community listening tour MIHI conducted in early 2023. Community meetings were held in each Prosperity Region and participants were asked to prioritize the importance of four primary barriers to digital equity: 1) Availability; 2) Affordability; 3) Digital Literacy/Skills; and 4) Devices. Participants were asked to rank these topics in order of importance to their experience with a dot voting exercise. Each colored dot represented a rank (e.g., red dots = most important; blue dots = least important). Votes were weighted according to their importance and the results averaged to determine the overall importance of each topic on a scale of one to four, with four being the most important and one being the least important. This data helps identify the most critical issues for those living in each region of the state.

# State of Michigan


Includes all the 83 counties of the State of Michigan. Michigan has an ever-changing tapestry of residents that evokes an evolving approach to addressing the digital equity needs of the state.



## Digital Equity Profile

**10,062,512**  
Population

- Nearly one-quarter of the state's residents are aged 60 or more, and nearly one-quarter are non-white.
- Additionally, while 13% of the population lives at or below the federal poverty line, approximately one-quarter of the state's residents are part of the asset limited, income constrained, employed (ALICE) population.
- These characteristics, as well as those of the other covered populations outlined in the Digital Equity Act, suggest a set of diverse digital inclusion needs that span across the state.



## Broadband Availability

**4,027,591**  
Total Broadband Serviceable Locations

### Broadband Serviceable Locations

Unserved, 368,388

Underserved, 123,935

## Digital Equity Priorities by Covered Population (1-4 scale)

| Digital Equity Priorities | Overall Importance Rank | Income Below 150% of Poverty Line | Aging Individuals | Veterans | Disabled | English Lang. Learners | Racial-Ethnic Minority | Rural |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|----------|----------|------------------------|------------------------|-------|
| Affordability             | 3.59                    | 3.63                              | 3.52              | 3.47     | 3.58     | 3.43                   | 3.63                   | 3.63  |
| Availability              | 3.55                    | 3.42                              | 3.58              | 3.61     | 3.58     | 3.37                   | 3.26                   | 3.67  |
| Devices                   | 2.65                    | 2.85                              | 2.55              | 2.58     | 2.83     | 2.73                   | 3.10                   | 2.53  |
| Digital Literacy/Skills   | 2.73                    | 3.00                              | 2.74              | 2.66     | 2.93     | 2.51                   | 3.11                   | 2.70  |

- According to the latest FCC data, Michigan has nearly 500,000 homes and businesses that are either unserved or underserved by high-speed internet infrastructure. This is a higher proportion of un- and underserved locations than is found in other states with comparable population sizes, as evidenced by the fact that Michigan received the fourth-largest allocation of BEAD funding despite having the tenth-largest population.

Higher than state average

# Prosperity Region One: Upper Peninsula


Includes the counties of: Alger, Baraga, Chippewa, Delta, Dickinson, Gogebic, Houghton, Iron, Keweenaw, Luce, Mackinac, Marquette, Menominee, Ontonagon, and Schoolcraft and represents the entirety of Michigan's Upper Peninsula.



## Digital Equity Profile


**303,102**  
Population

The region has a significant rural population, as well as an older and less affluent one compared to the state, (the region has a lower rate of those at the federal poverty line, but a higher ALICE population). It also has a higher concentration of veterans and those with disabilities, as well as those living in correctional facilities.



## Broadband Availability

**180,746**  
Total Broadband Serviceable Locations



## Digital Equity Priorities by Covered Population (1-4 scale)

| Digital Equity Priorities | Overall Importance Rank | Income Below 150% of Poverty Line | Aging Individuals | Disabled | English Language Learners | Racial-Ethnic Minority | Rural |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|----------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------|
| Affordability             | 3.63                    | 3.57                              | 3.52              | 3.45     | 3.67                      | 3.60                   | 3.64  |
| Availability              | 3.71                    | 3.64                              | 3.60              | 3.64     | 4.00                      | 3.73                   | 3.61  |
| Devices                   | 2.61                    | 3.07                              | 2.39              | 2.73     | 3.00                      | 2.80                   | 2.62  |
| Digital Literacy/Skills   | 2.86                    | 3.15                              | 2.64              | 3.00     | 2.38                      | 2.79                   | 2.81  |

- As expected, a more rural population equates to more un/underserved locations..
- These data points are reflected in the region's high prioritization of availability, affordability, and digital skills during the MIHI listening tour.

Higher than state average  
Higher than region average

# Prosperity Region Three: Northeast


Includes the counties of: Alcona, Alpena, Cheboygan, Crawford, Iosco, Montmorency, Ogemaw, Oscoda, Otsego, Presque Isle, and Roscommon.



## Digital Equity Profile

**202,634**  
Population

The region is in the northeastern part of Michigan's Lower Peninsula and includes the cities of Alpena and Rogers City. Region Three has a high concentration of rural older, and less affluent Michiganders than the state as a whole, and a higher rate of veterans and those with disabilities than most other regions.



## Broadband Availability

**163,801**  
Total Broadband Serviceable Locations



## Digital Equity Priorities by Covered Population (1-4 scale)

| Digital Equity Priorities | Overall Importance Rank | Income Below 150% of Poverty Line | Aging Individuals | Disabled | English Language Learners | Racial-Ethnic Minority | Rural |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|----------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------|
| Affordability             | 3.56                    | 3.50                              | 3.44              | 3.50     | 3.75                      | N/A                    | 3.50  |
| Availability              | 4.00                    | 4.00                              | 4.00              | 4.00     | 4.00                      | N/A                    | 3.93  |
| Devices                   | 2.44                    | 2.75                              | 2.61              | 2.25     | 2.00                      | N/A                    | 2.32  |
| Digital Literacy/Skills   | 2.50                    | 0.65                              | 2.61              | 2.75     | 2.00                      | N/A                    | 2.46  |

• While a priority for devices was not reflective in their region's priorities, there is a strong desire and priority for improving availability.

Higher than state average  
Higher than region average

# Prosperity Region Four: West


Includes the counties of: Allegan, Barry, Kent, Ionia, Lake, Mason, Mecosta, Montcalm, Muskegon, Newaygo, Oceana, Osceola, and Ottawa.



## Digital Equity Profile

**1,619,257**  
Population

The region is in the middle and western areas of the Lower Peninsula bordering Lake Michigan and includes the Grand Rapids metropolitan area. While the region has large rural areas, the majority of the population residents in the Grand Rapids area. The region has a higher proportion of Hispanic residents than the state as a whole, as well as those living in correctional facilities.



## Broadband Availability

**619,080**  
Total Broadband Serviceable Locations

### Broadband Serviceable Locations



## Digital Equity Priorities by Covered Population (1-4 scale)

| Digital Equity Priorities | Overall Importance Rank | Income Below 150% of Poverty Line | Aging Individuals | Disabled | English Language Learners | Racial-Ethnic Minority | Rural |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|----------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------|
| Affordability             | 3.52                    | 3.56                              | 3.52              | 3.33     | 3.25                      | 3.54                   | 3.60  |
| Availability              | 3.84                    | 3.44                              | 3.61              | 4.00     | 2.75                      | 3.46                   | 3.77  |
| Devices                   | 2.54                    | 1.86                              | 2.28              | 2.60     | 2.33                      | 2.67                   | 2.45  |
| Digital Literacy/Skills   | 2.55                    | 0.96                              | 2.50              | 3.00     | 2.75                      | 3.07                   | 2.64  |

This reflected the region's priority for availability (higher than the state average but lower than other, more rural regions), and higher priority for devices.

Higher than state average  
Higher than region average

# Prosperity Region Five: East Central


Includes the counties of: Arenac, Bay, Clare, Gladwin, Gratiot, Isabella, Midland, and Saginaw, and is located in the middle of Michigan's Lower Peninsula.



## Digital Equity Profile

**556,618**  
Population

The region is more rural than the state as a whole and has a higher concentration of aging residents. While the ALICE population is similar to the state, the region has a higher proportion of those living at or below the federal poverty line. The region also has slightly more veterans and disabled individuals than the state.



## Broadband Availability

**255,046**  
Total Broadband Serviceable Locations

### Broadband Serviceable Locations



## Digital Equity Priorities by Covered Population (1-4 scale)


| Digital Equity Priorities | Overall Importance Rank | Income Below 150% of Poverty Line | Aging Individuals | Disabled | English Language Learners | Racial-Ethnic Minority | Rural |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|----------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------|
| Affordability             | 3.51                    | 3.50                              | 3.50              | 3.50     | 3.50                      | 2.75                   | 3.68  |
| Availability              | 3.50                    | 3.50                              | 3.50              | 4.00     | 2.50                      | 3.25                   | 3.89  |
| Devices                   | 2.53                    | 3.00                              | 2.74              | 2.25     | 3.00                      | 1.75                   | 2.47  |
| Digital Literacy/Skills   | 2.69                    | 1.21                              | 3.09              | 2.67     | 2.50                      | 2.00                   | 2.79  |

• These data points are reflected in region's prioritization of affordability, digital literacy/skills, and devices at similar rates (or lower than) that of the state overall.

■ Higher than state average  
■ Higher than region average

# Prosperity Region Six: East Michigan


Includes the counties of: Genesee, Huron, Lapeer, Sanilac, Shiawassee, St. Clair, and Tuscola.



## Digital Equity Profile

**848,973**  
Population

The region is located in the eastern part of Michigan's Lower Peninsula, often referred to as Michigan's "Thumb," and includes the Flint metro area. The region has a smaller rural population than more northerly regions but has a higher proportion of aging individuals and those in poverty and defined as ALICE.



## Broadband Availability

**384,174**  
Total Broadband Serviceable Locations

### Broadband Serviceable Locations



## Digital Equity Priorities by Covered Population (1-4 scale)

| Digital Equity Priorities | Overall Importance Rank | Income Below 150% of Poverty Line | Aging Individuals | Disabled | English Language Learners | Racial-Ethnic Minority | Rural |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|----------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------|
| Affordability             | 3.61                    | 3.75                              | 3.52              | 3.64     | 3.67                      | 3.88                   | 3.60  |
| Availability              | 3.69                    | 3.53                              | 3.67              | 3.91     | 2.67                      | 3.31                   | 3.56  |
| Devices                   | 2.46                    | 2.87                              | 2.21              | 2.82     | 3.33                      | 3.47                   | 2.19  |
| Digital Literacy/Skills   | 2.43                    | 0.63                              | 2.37              | 2.64     | 3.17                      | 2.93                   | 2.52  |

- The region prioritized availability and affordability higher than the state average.

Higher than state average  
Higher than region average

# Prosperity Region Seven: South Central


Includes the counties of: Clinton, Eaton, and Ingham and is in the southern part of Michigan's Lower Peninsula and includes the Lansing metro area.



## Digital Equity Profile

**473,527**  
Population

The region has a higher rate of poverty than the state average, as well as a higher proportion of Hispanic and limited-English speaking residents.



## Broadband Availability

**165,439**  
Total Broadband Serviceable Locations

### Broadband Serviceable Locations

Unserved, 10,781

Underserved, 8,196

## Digital Equity Priorities by Covered Population (1-4 scale)

| Digital Equity Priorities | Overall Importance Rank | Income Below 150% of Poverty Line | Aging Individuals | Disabled | English Language Learners | Racial-Ethnic Minority | Rural |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|----------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------|
| Affordability             | 3.46                    | 3.63                              | 3.30              | 3.25     | 2.33                      | 3.67                   | 3.67  |
| Availability              | 3.58                    | 3.13                              | 3.43              | 4.00     | 3.33                      | 4.00                   | 2.67  |
| Devices                   | 2.44                    | 2.63                              | 2.55              | 1.75     | 2.00                      | 2.83                   | 2.67  |
| Digital Literacy/Skills   | 2.56                    | 0.97                              | 2.80              | 2.00     | 2.67                      | 3.00                   | 3.33  |

The regional priorities are slightly elevated for availability, but overall, closely match the state average priorities.

Higher than state average  
Higher than region average

# Prosperity Region Eight: Southwest


Includes the counties of: Berrien, Branch, Calhoun, Cass, Kalamazoo, Van Buren, and St. Joseph and is in the southwestern part of Michigan's Lower Peninsula.



## Digital Equity Profile

**782,437**  
Population

Region has scattered aging, rural population that's less affluent than state. The region also has high proportion of Hispanic residents and veterans.



## Broadband Availability

**332,518**  
Total Broadband Serviceable Locations

### Broadband Serviceable Locations



## Digital Equity Priorities by Covered Population (1-4 scale)

| Digital Equity Priorities | Overall Importance Rank | Income Below 150% of Poverty Line | Aging Individuals | Disabled | English Language Learners | Racial-Ethnic Minority | Rural |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|----------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------|
| Affordability             | 3.56                    | 4.00                              | 3.51              | 3.82     | 3.13                      | 3.82                   | 3.64  |
| Availability              | 3.64                    | 3.67                              | 3.64              | 3.64     | 3.75                      | 3.36                   | 3.58  |
| Devices                   | 2.65                    | 3.17                              | 2.61              | 3.09     | 2.50                      | 3.09                   | 2.84  |
| Digital Literacy/Skills   | 2.70                    | 1.00                              | 2.80              | 2.73     | 1.88                      | 3.18                   | 2.87  |

Regional priorities elevate availability over the state average, but priorities among the four digital equity priorities close match those of the state as a whole.

Higher than state average  
Higher than region average

# Prosperity Region Nine: Southeast Michigan


Includes the counties of: Hillsdale, Jackson, Lenawee, Livingston, Monroe, and Washtenaw and is located in the southeastern corner of Michigan's Lower Peninsula.



## Digital Equity Profile

**1,025,514**  
Population

Much of the region is representative of the statewide proportions of covered population, with the exception of those living in correctional facilities.



## Broadband Availability

**383,024**  
Total Broadband Serviceable Locations

### Broadband Serviceable Locations



## Digital Equity Priorities by Covered Population (1-4 scale)

| Digital Equity Priorities | Overall Importance Rank | Income Below 150% of Poverty Line | Aging Individuals | Disabled | English Language Learners | Racial-Ethnic Minority | Rural |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|----------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------|
| Affordability             | 3.52                    | 3.50                              | 3.40              | 3.50     | 3.00                      | 3.31                   | 3.63  |
| Availability              | 3.47                    | 3.50                              | 3.43              | 3.88     | 4.00                      | 3.31                   | 3.13  |
| Devices                   | 2.59                    | 2.25                              | 2.43              | 2.75     | 1.50                      | 2.92                   | 2.13  |
| Digital Literacy/Skills   | 2.64                    | 1.15                              | 2.79              | 3.00     | 2.00                      | 3.00                   | 2.13  |

Availability and affordability have been identified as regional priorities.

Higher than state average  
Higher than region average

# Prosperity Region Ten: Detroit Metro


Includes the counties of: Macomb, Oakland, and Wayne and is located in the southeastern part of Michigan and is home to the state's largest city, Detroit, and its metropolitan area.



## Digital Equity Profile

**3,940,887**  
Population

The region has a higher proportion of those in poverty and ALICE. The region is also more demographically diverse with higher proportions of non-white, foreign-born, and limited English-speaking residents than the state as a whole.



## Broadband Availability

**1,359,185**  
Total Broadband Serviceable Locations

### Broadband Serviceable Locations

Unserved, 4,706

Underserved, 3,840

## Digital Equity Priorities by Covered Population (1-4 scale)


| Digital Equity Priorities | Overall Importance Rank | Income Below 150% of Poverty Line | Aging Individuals | Disabled | English Language Learners | Racial-Ethnic Minority | Rural |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|----------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------|
| Affordability             | 3.66                    | 3.56                              | 3.68              | 3.64     | 3.50                      | 3.67                   | 3.00  |
| Availability              | 3.13                    | 3.00                              | 3.17              | 2.81     | 2.91                      | 3.01                   | 3.67  |
| Devices                   | 3.27                    | 3.17                              | 3.31              | 3.29     | 3.18                      | 3.31                   | 2.00  |
| Digital Literacy/Skills   | 3.29                    | 2.04                              | 3.43              | 3.52     | 3.09                      | 3.31                   | 2.33  |

• Region Ten did not prioritize availability as high as other regions, but affordability, digital literacy/skills, and devices are more a priority for this region than the state as a whole.

Higher than state average  
Higher than region average

### 3.2.2 Broadband Adoption

The MIHI Office recognizes that the following challenges exist for Michiganders: availability of affordable high-speed internet, accessible internet-enabled devices, and digital skills. Addressing these barriers across all sectors is essential. The Needs Assessment/MI Connected Future Listening Tour of 31 cities highlighted some critical data points regarding the barriers. The 778 surveys collected during the Listening Tour produced the following:



With the goal of 95% adoption of broadband, MIHI intends to take careful consideration of covered populations, which may overlap with unserved and underserved communities. MIHI intends to prioritize the barriers above based upon the responses of Michiganders to address adoption. Additionally, MIHI recognizes that using digital skills requires the availability of internet service, having affordable options, and having access to internet-enabled devices. A holistic approach to meeting the needs of covered populations is necessary. Working with trusted institutions or CAIs requires a focus on statewide, regional, and local partners that are already working to improve adoption in ways previously discussed. Digital programs, digital skills-based nonprofits, and library systems currently exist. By providing additional data and resources, MIHI can leverage these partnerships and scale the availability of services to covered populations. MIHI has also developed partnerships with agencies focused on aging populations, individuals with disabilities, veterans, members of racial minority groups, and individuals in rural areas. Improving digital literacy and increasing broadband subscribers has also been a focus.

### 3.2.3 Broadband Affordability

#### The Affordable Connectivity Program (ACP)

The ACP, a program that allows for at least a \$30 monthly subsidy for eligible households toward internet bills, is now utilized in more than 40% of all eligible households in Michigan.<sup>9</sup> To increase the remaining percentage of eligible households not yet enrolled, the State of Michigan partnered with EducationSuperHighway to coordinate an ACP seminar on June 26, 2023. The ACP faces uncertainty of continued funding, with some projections showing the funds running out by early 2024. This would leave the 278,000 Michigan households that currently receive funds and more who will apply for funding with an additional monthly cost.<sup>50</sup>

#### Increased Technical Assistance

The MIHI Office has been offering technical assistance and answering queries for Michiganders who send in questions related to finding affordable service and signing up for the ACP. Currently, MIHI works with three Digital Navigators who are located within three regions of Michigan. The state will need more Digital Navigators who will support communities and supply information about what is available, as well as ask questions about what users can afford to pay for certain services. Digital Navigators will be familiar with regional ISPs, costs, and how to sign up for programs like the ACP.

#### Creating Different Broadband Service Plans

Michiganders attending MI Connected Future events spoke about receiving poor service quality at costs ranging from \$70 to over \$100 a month. The cost for internet is a recognized problem for many Michigan households. The NTIA's Computer Use survey further validates that 18.7% of people who did not have internet pointed to the cost.<sup>51</sup> Creating more-affordable plans and having a middle-class affordability plan will help to ensure that the needs are met for all Michiganders. Affordability is a top priority for the MIHI Office and solutions supporting low-cost plans will be addressed as part of the BEAD Initial Proposal.

#### Lack of Standardization—Broadband Consumer Labels

While touring the state, many Michiganders expressed frustration about costs or knowledge of increased fees. For example, a modem/router combo from many ISPs will cost an additional \$10 a month. The explanation for such information is not always simple and many internet users do not realize that purchasing their own modem and router can save money in the long term. Broadband labels not only provide information on prices, service speeds, and the type of service, but also allow consumers to compare one internet service plan with another with ease.<sup>52</sup>

---

50. <https://acpdashboard.com/>

51. Ibid.

52. <https://www.fcc.gov/broadbandlabels>

# 4. Collaboration and Stakeholder Engagement

## 4.1 Coordination and Outreach Strategy

MIHI strove to develop a coordination and outreach strategy that recognized and captured the unique challenges and different digital equity priorities for each region and covered populations in Michigan, with the ultimate goal of receiving feedback in a comprehensive and equitable manner. Based on the foundational understanding that communities know communities best, MIHI adopted the ethos of “listen first, plan second” and developed a grassroots strategy where communities led conversations and were empowered to identify their unique challenges. MIHI placed a strong emphasis on creating opportunities for engagement with covered populations and historically marginalized individuals by inviting organizations that represent these populations to participate in engagement opportunities such as community meetings and roundtable discussions. Additionally, sites were selected through an informal analysis of covered population representation and broadband infrastructure availability. MIHI aimed to support a target audience of individuals directly impacted by lack of availability and to support equitable feedback from covered population representation.

The coordination and outreach strategy was developed with the goal of creating holistic and long-term engagement. The aim was to build trust, mutual respect, and lasting relationships with communities, especially for covered populations, that will continue through the implementation of the plan. MIHI’s robust and innovative community and stakeholder engagement process is called **MI Connected Future (MICF)**. MICF consists of three core elements that are each described below in more detail:

|   |                                 |
|---|---------------------------------|
|  | <b>Community Listening Tour</b> |
|  | <b>Partnership Roundtables</b>  |
|  | <b>Tribal Consultations</b>     |

Results of MIHI’s efforts will be available to the public and continuously updated on our website. Additionally, MIHI has included an appendix of the List of Organizations engaged throughout MIHI’s coordination and outreach strategy. The required attachment has been included as Appendix A-6: List of Organizations.

## Community Listening Tour

The MIHI Office conducted a collaborative statewide tour to engage with communities to build trust and long-term relationships, support quality data collection and analysis, highlight stories of needs and success, and emphasize cyclical input. The listening tour consisted of 40 community meetings, distributed across the 10 multicounty economic “Prosperity Regions.” As evidenced in the regional profiles in Section 3.2.1, each Prosperity Region has unique demographics and characteristics; some areas have large rural and aging populations while others may have a high portion of limited-English-speaking residents. Understanding this, the strategy aimed to collect information on these regional variations. Each region and community in the state is unique and approaching the needs of each in the way that serves them best promotes equity. MICF supports equitable engagement by respecting the unique needs of each community. This manifests as relationship building with community leaders prior to hosting community meetings in their towns. Buy-in is crucial for the success of MICF, and ultimately for the success of the BEAD and DEA programs. In the conversations leading up to formal community meetings, MIHI acted within its capacity to understand the issues that are important to the community, including critical context regarding past and current broadband and digital equity and inclusion activities. MIHI tailored the approach to the community meeting based on the information gathered prior to the event; however, the feedback prompts during the meetings remained the same for all stakeholders to gather consistent data that could be analyzed.

MIHI deployed MICF using a phased approach, initially visiting 30 locations across Michigan to solicit input and feedback from each Prosperity Region. Utilizing the data gathered during the 30 locations, MIHI integrated the findings into a draft of the BEAD Five-year Action Plan to help establish the state broadband goals and priorities that were directly informed by the grassroots organizations and community stakeholders. Afterward, MIHI conducted an additional 10 meetings to present the draft Five-Year Action Plan across the state of Michigan. Each of Michigan’s Prosperity Regions was visited by MIHI at least four times.

Locations of community meetings were determined in conjunction with input from community leaders and organizations. The community meetings were scheduled at various times of the day, including the morning, afternoon, and evening, providing the opportunity for all individuals, including those with nontraditional work schedules, to attend the meetings.



In an effort to engage covered populations, MIHI initiated specific callouts for engagement with local, regional, and tribal governments and organizations that represent and serve covered populations and underrepresented groups. This approach allowed MIHI to meet and engage with stakeholders within the communities they reside, deepening the relationship between MIHI and the community with a focus on covered populations.

During the meetings, community members were given the opportunity to share their thoughts on prioritizing BEAD program funding to deliver affordable, equitable, and reliable high-speed internet service throughout Michigan. MIHI divided the community meeting portion of MICF into two phases: initial data collection and public comment/feedback. Phase one consisted of 31 MICF stops throughout all 10 economic Prosperity Regions in Michigan. Phase two consisted of an additional 10 stops to collect public comment and feedback on the draft BEAD Five-Year Action Plan and the Digital Equity Plan.

MIHI created additional opportunities for engagement with special MICF sessions with youth in Flint and Wayne State University and through the Community Meeting in a Box (CMIB) program. CMIBs provided advocacy groups and communities with an opportunity to engage in the MICF process if they were not able to attend one of the in-person sessions. CMIBs contained all of the presentation and data collection materials, along with a meeting facilitation guide for hosting local MICF events without MIHI staff present. Forty-five CMIBs were sent to organizations and communities during the MICF listening tour.



Various approaches were used to promote participation in the Community Listening Tour meetings, including through various media channels, including local news media such as print, news spots, and radio shows, email campaigns, and distribution of flyers. Special attention was placed on creating opportunities for engagement with covered populations and historically marginalized populations who have been underrepresented in community decision-making. These groups included low-income individuals, aging adults, rural residents, members of covered households, members of racial or ethnic minority groups, veterans, people with disabilities, those with language barriers, and incarcerated individuals. Members of these groups were targeted to participate in the community meetings by promoting the meetings to organizations who represent these populations. MIHI leveraged state partners such as MDE, LEO Workforce Development, MDOS, MDOC, and LEO Communications to identify organizations that represent various community populations and promote community meetings to them.

The initial data collection phase of MICF aimed to gather feedback from Michiganders regarding their biggest broadband barriers and their priorities for addressing digital equity. Collection of quality data is crucial for determining the correct baseline for broadband service in Michigan. Quality data also supports an equitable deployment strategy in both the infrastructure and digital equity programs. Questions asked and feedback requested from community members were consistent throughout the statewide tour; however, the context in which the questions were delivered was unique to the type of participants MIHI was engaging.



Figure 6: Summary of MIHI's Statewide Tours and Participation

The MIHI team has analyzed feedback from and engaged with other professional organizations to ensure analysis accurately reflects the data collected. MIHI plans to engage with experts in the digital equity field and assess existing digital equity indices to highlight areas of need in a geospatial format to support the implementation of both the BEAD and the DEA programs. The results of the priority identification and rankings data gathered during the listening tour can be found in the regional profiles in the Needs and Gaps Assessment section.

## Partnership Roundtables

Partnership Roundtables represent MIHI's work to regularly convene a wide variety of stakeholders to provide feedback and input on various activities related to BEAD and DEA. A series of virtual Partnership Roundtables were convened monthly from January 2023 to July 2023 to gather input from the wider external stakeholders throughout Michigan irrespective of location. Participants of the Roundtables consisted of representatives from community anchor institutions, Tribal nations, organizations representing covered populations, internet service providers, local government, and many others. Participants were identified and invited to the roundtables through various means, including through collaboration with other state departments, self-identification to the MIHI Office, and research into existing organizations involved in broadband access and infrastructure. Additionally, several meetings were facilitated between MIHI and other organizations, providing a platform to share pertinent information about the roundtables and community listening tour.

The cross-sectoral format aimed to share information and resources, raise awareness of potential issues concerning infrastructure deployment and digital inclusion, and provide MIHI with policy and operational guidance for the development and implementation of the BEAD program.

The Partnership Roundtables met regularly throughout the development of the BEAD Five-Year Action Plan and will continue through the development of the Initial Proposal and BEAD implementation. Each meeting focused on a topic or theme. Participants were asked targeted questions to which MIHI would collect responses. The first meeting was used to level-set the BEAD program goals and requirements, introduce the format of the discussions, and seek participants' input on ultimate goals. The subsequent meetings focused on different themes, such as deployment equity/infrastructure availability, affordability, workforce development, and digital skills. The discussions allowed stakeholders to provide direct input on equitable solutions and strategies regarding broadband deployment in underserved Michigan areas, affordability program ideas, and structures for execution, workforce development investment, digital skills training, and curriculum. Future meetings will focus on the impact of the program and whether participants are witnessing improvements in digital connectivity and equity.

## **Tribal Consultations**

Tribal Consultation was held on June 15, 2023, with Tribal leaders and representatives with both in-person and virtual attendance opportunities. These discussions focused on critical issues related to BEAD and digital equity and invited Tribal representatives to provide advice and insights on how best to get tribal communities connected. MIHI requested Tribal input on key considerations regarding digital equity for Tribal nations, identification of unserved and underserved areas, listing of community anchor institutions eligible for funding, and broadband deployment and digital equity projects within Tribal nations. MIHI seeks to collaborate with Tribal nations on the Digital Equity Plan to provide digital access and connectivity to all of Michigan's tribes. The following Tribal nations were invited to participate in the consultation; an asterisk indicates their participation.



|   |  |
|---|--|
| Bay Mills Indian Community*   | Little Traverse Bay Bands of Odawa Indians           |
| Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians*                 | Match-e-be-nash-she-wish Band of Potawatomi Indians* |
| Hannahville Indian Community  | Nottawaseppi Huron Band of Potawatomi                |
| Keweenaw Bay Indian Community*                                      | Pokeagon Band of Potawatomi Indians                  |
| Lac Vieux Desert Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Michigan | Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan*           |
| Little River Band of Ottawa Indians                                 | Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians*          |

Additionally, Tribal nations participated in other stakeholder engagement activities. For example, six tribal nations attended Partnership Roundtables and a tribal representative attended a community engagement meeting. MIHI staff also attended and presented at the United Tribes of Michigan meeting in Manistee, Michigan, on June 1, 2023.

MIHI is providing additional documentation from the formal tribal consultation process, including the formal tribal consultation meeting invitation, meeting agenda, meeting notes, key takeaways, and participation list. This has been included as Appendix A-4: MIHI Tribal Consultation Invitation, Agenda, and Participation List and Appendix A-5: Tribal Consultation Notes.

## 4.2 Continued Coordination and Outreach

While MICF served as the initial coordination and outreach initiative, stakeholders will continue to be engaged during the development and deployment of BEAD and Digital Equity Act projects. Additional engagement will occur throughout the development of the BEAD Initial and Final Proposals through Partnership Roundtable discussions, which includes Tribal governments and groups that represent covered populations. MIHI intends to target Tribal governments that have not yet been engaged through proactive outreach efforts and leveraging existing relationships with Tribal representatives.

MIHI views continued coordination and outreach with stakeholders as essential to digital equity efforts and will continue to develop long-term relationships within all regions of Michigan through regional navigators. Each Prosperity Region in Michigan will have a dedicated regional navigator that would be tasked with overseeing coordination, outreach, and digital equity efforts within the region. Moreover, as outlined in the following section, Digital Navigators, who will be hired from the communities they are going to serve, will play an instrumental role in the continued coordination and outreach with stakeholders and will collaborate with community-based organizations, with a focus on serving covered populations to promote digital equity and continually assess and identify local needs.

# 5. Implementation

## 5.1 Implementation Strategy & Key Activities

MIHI takes every effort to utilize holistic strategies to close the digital divide and remove barriers in a nontraditional manner. The digital divide looks different to everyone depending on their community, their income, their race, or their education. A person may have easy access to the internet, but not have the digital skills to advance in their career. Another may not have the money to utilize public transportation to get to a library to complete their college courses. Closing the digital divide is not a “one-size-fits-all” solution and Michigan will not approach it as such. MIHI is aware of several local and regional partners that are currently offering digital opportunities to communities. With this in mind, MIHI intends to support and convene efforts on the local and regional level to scale programs statewide with an emphasis on building the capacity of organizations to be able to continue the advancement of digital equity beyond the life cycle of Digital Equity Act funding.

The main vehicle for closing the digital divide in Michigan will be through the implementation of a robust Digital Navigator Network. Information from state agencies pertaining to online accessibility of services, new opportunities for workforce or education, and affordable internet service plans and devices will be disseminated to communities through the Digital Navigator Network (the Network) through Regional Digital Coordinators. Community-based Digital Navigators will support the direct needs of communities with support from the Network to provide equitable resources and skills development based on specific needs. Community Digital Navigators will look like, speak like, and live in the communities where they will serve, thereby adding a layer of direct support to the individual. Community Digital Navigators will be the driving force behind the resource development at the regional level. Additionally, MIHI will ensure open lines of communication with the Community Digital Navigators regarding the needs of the community so that MIHI can provide additional support in the areas of need.

MIHI recognizes the digital divide is dynamic and needs are ever-evolving. MIHI will analyze and update its implementation strategy and plan on an annual basis to determine if efforts need to be adjusted to ensure the measurable objectives are being met while accounting for the dynamic needs of Michiganders.

## Digital Navigator Network

Each community is different and has key insights on how to solve challenges with broadband that suit their needs. During MIHI's MICF Listening Sessions, Michiganders expressed challenges like difficulty in accessing and/or utilizing high-speed internet or having the needed skills to use internet-enabled devices. MIHI staff also heard that many communities want to get involved in the digital inclusion space but are unsure of where to find appropriately scaled resources, funding for positions, or the individuals with the skills to teach others about the resources available to them.

To meet the needs of communities, and to close the digital divide, MIHI will implement a statewide Digital Navigator Network to serve as the vehicle for community-based solutions development. Digital Navigators will be based both regionally and within communities throughout the state. MIHI will implement the Digital Navigator Network using the "snowflake model" of community organizing (see Figure 7). This model allows communities to be engaged in the work to close the digital divide in an equitable manner, and one in which suits their community best but continues to align with the goals of this plan, BEAD, and statewide initiatives. By utilizing partnerships with local, trusted community institutions, MIHI will serve as the hub and the foundation of the vehicle providing support to the navigators and coordinating initiatives from within LEO and in partnership with other state agencies. The statewide Digital Navigator Network will promote equitable access to high-speed internet and digital skills training opportunities to Michiganders in urban, suburban, and rural areas. The program will target underrepresented, underinvested, and underserved communities. The Community Digital Navigators will aim to increase adoption of broadband and the skills needed to use devices, based on the needs in the community, including physical and virtual access to identified need-based programs. In collaboration with community leaders and local businesses, high-quality programming will center on barrier removal for access to high-speed internet, internet-enabled devices, applicable digital learning, and practical skill development, as needed in communities.

MIHI has reviewed existing local digital equity plans that have been shared with the office, and many of the perspectives, gaps, and needs identified in those plans are also captured here in this plan. While there are similarities across the state, these plans also emphasize the different needs and gaps that exist at the local and community level. This confirms and validates the regionalized approach to deploy Digital Navigators to address challenges on a community and localized basis.

Community Digital Navigators will be a key asset in identifying and addressing gaps and disparities within the communities they serve. They will work collaboratively with stakeholders and community members to assess the current state of digital equity plans, programs, and inclusion resources at the local level. They will be specifically targeting the needs and gaps for covered populations and build relationships with trusted organizations serving these populations.

Additionally, Community Digital Navigators will support digital equity planning efforts by working with community members and stakeholders to develop, implement, and monitor tailored digital equity plans designed to meet the specific needs of individual communities. By identifying gaps in local resources, Community Digital Navigators will work to create targeted solutions that truly address the unique challenges and needs of residents on a case-by-case basis.

Regional Digital Coordinators will serve as a layer of support to Community Digital Navigators by acting to ensure Community Digital Navigators have the resources needed based on the needs of the community but are also in line with progress points as outlined earlier in this plan. Regional Digital Coordinators will emphasize the tools that support capacity building for communities and for Community Digital Navigators so that the work toward closing the digital divide is not lost or stopped at the conclusion of Digital Equity Act-funded programs. Regional Digital Coordinators will convene regularly with MIHI staff to ensure statewide goals continue to progress and are coordinated with other state initiatives.

The digital divide is influenced by many factors beyond lack of access to a device or a broadband connection, and for many Michiganders, barriers such as child care or transportation impact their ability to get online. The Digital Navigator Network will not only fund the positions for Community Digital Navigators and Regional Digital Coordinators but will also support barrier removal activities such as providing bus passes or gas cards for individuals with transportation barriers, assistance devices for those with disabilities, or translation software for non-English speakers. The barriers for the individual will be unique, and as such, the removal of those barriers will be viewed by MIHI as a “strategic investment in human and community capacity.”<sup>53</sup>




Figure 7: Snowflake Model for Community Organizing

To scale the program throughout the state, Digital Navigators will be placed in each of the 10 Prosperity Regions and in larger municipalities, e.g., Detroit and Grand Rapids. Digital Navigators will facilitate need-based partnerships, programs, and digital skill development. They will also collect and provide information on the evolving workforce, telehealth platforms, virtual learning, and entertainment needs of covered populations in Michigan. By focusing the Digital Navigator program on the communities that have the most need, the digital divide can be positively impacted. MIHI will provide oversight as it relates to assigning measurable deliverables and reporting requirements for the Digital Navigators.

53. State Digital Equity Planning Grant Notice of Funding Opportunity, § (C)(1)(b)

Digital Navigators will be trained on the initiatives of the state and how to holistically implement the activities for communities by the Digital Inclusion Program Manager. Digital Navigators should use their discretion and understanding of community needs to implement the activities. For example, if affordability of devices is an identified community need in Region 8, the Community Digital Navigator will be expected to provide resources supporting device affordability based on existing resources and programs they have been trained on by their Regional Digital Coordinator. Initial reviews of the progress for the Digital Navigator Network will occur in the first 90 days of their placement and will occur every six months for the term of their placement. Navigators will be required to provide monthly reports on the status of progress for implementation, including qualitative reports and quantitative metrics aligned with the five Indicator Scores outlined earlier in this plan.

It should be highlighted that, while MIHI will provide overall guidance and support for the Digital Navigator Network, the program will look different in each region of the state, based on community need. MIHI will ensure progress toward closing the digital divide occurs at the local level, via metrics and reporting, but MIHI understands quantitative metrics are not the sole measure of progress. As such, qualitative information will be fundamentally considered as part of progress reports. To sustain the Digital Navigator Network, MIHI will build relationships with philanthropic organizations and Community Reinvestment Act participating banking institutions. The ability to create an endowment fund with DEA funding is something MIHI is also strongly advocating for to ensure long-term sustainability of not only the Digital Navigator Network but also other digital equity activities in the state.

It is anticipated that this plan will be reviewed annually to assess activities performed against those planned and make updates or adjustments to the plan, as required. The Indicator Scores will be evaluated annually and, where possible, quarterly, and will consist of data collected from the Digital Navigator Network as well as reporting from the Digital Equity Director regarding the progress of interagency coordination and implementation efforts. Progress on all Indicator Scores and other relevant state initiatives supporting closing the digital divide will be published in an annual report by MIHI to the residents of Michigan.

## **Addressing Gaps**

The results of the Asset Inventory highlight gaps in current services and resources within the state for digital inclusion, emphasizing three key gaps. The first gap identified is a lack of dedicated digital equity resources primarily related to incarcerated individuals, veterans, and individuals with disabilities. Secondly, the results of the Asset Inventory outlined a gap in existing local, county, and municipal digital equity plans throughout the state. And third, a lack of essential Digital Equity Programs, such as affordability and digital skills training and education initiatives, was also identified across the state.

These gaps will be addressed in several ways. Community Digital Navigators will be deployed to provide assistance and support to organizations representing and serving covered populations, with the aim of expanding the available resources and services, as well as identifying additional resources required to mitigate and address the gaps. Furthermore, the Regional Digital Coordinators will help communities identify their needs, develop their own digital equity plans, and implement digital equity programs while simultaneously supporting capacity-building efforts. These plans will also help define the necessary support required in each community and will be facilitated by the Digital Navigator Network. With respect to digital equity programs, MIHI plans to support communities in developing innovative approaches to meet identified community needs and to partner with organizations. Once again, Digital Navigators will be deployed to support communities, build their capacities, identify needs, and help move toward the realization of digital equity plans. The Needs Assessment highlighted specific needs and barriers faced by each of the covered populations, with particular emphasis on reduced access to essential resources for incarcerated individuals, veterans, and individuals with disabilities. For instance, the Journal of the American Medical Association reports that veterans who live in census blocks that are considered unserved compared with served 50% were less likely to utilize telehealth services.

Similarly, individuals with disabilities lack resources that support digital skills and education, largely fueled by the accessibility issues for devices and internet content, as reported by WebAIM within their 2023 Report on Accessibility.<sup>54</sup> Lastly, incarcerated individuals undergo significant hardships when they reenter society, and among the challenges they face is a lack of training and professional skills required to attain employment upon their release. It is imperative to ensure that education and training resources are readily available to justice-involved individuals aiming to improve their technological literacy and equip them with digital skills to adapt to the demands of the 21st-century workforce.

The Digital Navigator Network will play a significant role in reducing the barriers to connectivity, with a special focus on covered populations through targeted initiatives. Equipped with the knowledge that incarcerated individuals, veterans, and individuals with disabilities were identified as populations that are most in need of digital equity resources, the Network will collaborate with existing organizations that serve these populations to connect these individuals to resources.

---

54. WebAIM 2023 Report on Accessibility. <https://webaim.org/projects/million/>

Although not a complete list of organizations that support digital inclusion efforts across Michigan, MIHI identified existing digital inclusion assets by covered population within Appendix A-2.1, highlighting four organizations serving incarcerated individuals and five organizations serving veterans and individuals with disabilities. The Network can provide support to help these organizations expand their existing service offerings to a greater portion of underrepresented communities and covered populations.

The Needs Assessment has highlighted that the primary challenge faced by all covered populations in accessing broadband is the lack of available internet service. To bridge this gap, the BEAD program will play a significant role in deploying infrastructure to reach Michigan's 100% availability goal. Once the availability gap is closed, efforts will then need to focus on adoption, affordability, and digital skills, all areas this plan is aims to address.

The identification of the overlapping gaps provides critical foundational knowledge for MIHI's future efforts to close the digital divide, providing guidance on where additional resources may need to be allocated. By utilizing a grassroots and community-based solutions model, the Digital Navigator Network will assist communities in accessing affordability resources, provide support to communities so that they are able to implement digital equity plans, provide support to communities that have not had the opportunity or resources to identify and determine what digital equity looks like within their community, and promote equitable access to high-speed internet. Most importantly, the Digital Navigator Network will employ a collaborative approach with stakeholders and existing organizations to assist in the expansion of resources and access to broadband, and to build capacity at the local level with the ultimate goal of increasing the number of digital inclusion assets, plans, and programs across Michigan.

## Goals and Planned Activities

The following table outlines the goals for implementing the Digital Navigator program and the priorities, activities and roles of responsibility needed to achieve each goal. The five listed goals are based on the measurable objectives outlined in section **2.1.2. Indicator Scores and Measurable Objectives**. Each goal will be evaluated using the corresponding Indicator Score that will progress toward zero as the Digital Equity Plan is implemented.

## Affordability

### Indicator Score

The Affordability Score combines:

- The percentage of households that do not use the internet at home because they cannot afford it.
- The percentage of households who temporarily lost their internet connection due to inability or difficulty paying for the subscription.

### Priorities

- Empower communities through engagement and involvement.
- Leverage community inputs to drive program planning and implementation.
- Develop an approach for communities to define infrastructure and equity programs rollout.
- Include evidence of community support as part of subprogram requirements and partnerships for infrastructure deployment.
- Community involvement to ensure alignment between local plans and state plans.

### Activities

- Community Digital Navigators placed in statewide libraries and other CAIs to support local, low-cost broadband opportunities.
- Utilize Intake Form for each participant to provide insight on related points for the participants' Affordability Score.
- Promote low-cost broadband services to community members at host site, events, etc.
- Participate in local broadband-related events and meetings (e.g., broadband task force, committees).
- Evaluate the progress of adoption for community members who indicated affordability or availability as a barrier to adoption.

### Roles

- **Digital Inclusion Program Manager** will serve as the primary contact for each Regional Digital Coordinator. Will provide information on the status of the region as a baseline, the progress goals for the upcoming quarter, and the resources available for affordability and availability of broadband service to the Regional Digital Coordinator.
- **Regional Digital Coordinator** will serve as the primary contact for each of the Prosperity Regions and the larger municipalities in the state. Will report directly to the MIHI Office. Will flow information from the Digital Inclusion Program Manager regarding resources to the Community Digital Navigator. Will also share concerns with Digital Inclusion Program Manager from Community Digital Navigators as needed.
- **Community Digital Navigator** will serve as the leads in communities to support efforts to expand the impact of broadband in areas that will cover populations. Will report data directly to the Regional Digital Coordinator.

## Accessibility

### Indicator Score

A Digital Government Accessibility Score that compares the likelihood that each covered population is accessing government services online with how likely they are to use telehealth, online banking, or online consumer services.

### Priorities

- Empower individuals to utilize online services available from their healthcare provider, financial institution, or other online services as needed (e.g., Secretary of State appointments).
- Target covered populations, particularly geographically isolated and low-income households, to take advantage of the online services available to them to reduce unnecessary expenses relating to transportation or lost wages for services that can be conducted online.

### Activities

- Analyze webservices available throughout the state and create a resource bank of offerings available from the state for enrollment into assistance programs relating to workforce, education, healthcare access, and general civic engagement.
- Utilize Intake Form for each participant to provide insight on related points for the participants' baseline Digital Government Accessibility Score.
- Measure progress every two years and at program exit.
- Analyze webservices available throughout the region and create a bank of resources available from the region's healthcare systems, financial institutions, Tribal resources, municipal and county governments, and education institutions.
- Provide tailored resource guides for industry improvement of websites for improving their government accessibility score.

### Roles

- **MIHI**, with the help of other state agencies, will complete the analysis of statewide resources and their current digital government accessibility status. MIHI will develop the framework for analysis and provide a template to Regional Digital Coordinator to expand capacity for communities to utilize the template for local use.
- **MIHI**, with the help of relevant state agencies and external partners, will facilitate the creation of resource guides to support education, workforce, banking, healthcare, and other civic agencies to improve their accessibility.
- **Regional Digital Coordinator** will support Community Digital Navigator with training and resources to encourage community members to utilize the online services available to them.
- **Community Digital Navigator** will promote and encourage online services among targeted covered populations to telehealth, online banking, and consumer services resources available.

## Digital Literacy

### Indicator Score

The Digital Participation Score compares the proportion of each covered population that is engaging in various online activities with the proportion of the general Michigan population that is engaging in those same online activities.

### Priorities

- Promote digital equity and digital literacy.
- Target covered populations, especially those that are economically distressed, geographically distressed, and historically underrepresented.
- Support BEAD nondeployment subprograms that promote digital equity and literacy.
- Develop awareness strategies that improve digital literacy engagement and enrollment through marketing and communication.

### Activities

- Partner with the State of Michigan Library to identify and employ a digital skills training platform for adults.
- Partner with the Michigan Department of Education to promote digital skills competencies among K-12 students.
- Analyze regional and covered population data to focus resources in areas with lower rates of digital literacy.
- Evaluate digital literacy levels among participants in Digital Navigator-led activities.
- Convene a workgroup consisting of MIHI and MDE staff to provide quarterly status updates toward the status of digital literacy in Michigan among covered populations in K-12, postsecondary, and adult learning environments.

### Roles

- **MIHI** will convene education workgroups and monitor growth toward closing the digital literacy skills gap. Resources and updates to relevant educational programs will be provided to the Regional Digital Coordinator by the Digital Inclusion Program Manager.
- **Regional Digital Coordinator** will provide information updates to the Community Digital Navigator on programs relevant to their region/community. Regional Digital Coordinator will collect data from Community Coordinator and report back to MIHI staff.
- **Community Digital Navigator** will facilitate digital literacy programs for adult learners at community organizations and provide data and progress to Regional Digital Coordinator. Any challenges or barrier trends preventing adults from completing coursework will be shared with Regional Digital Coordinator and MIHI staff.

## Individual Cybersecurity

### Indicator Score

The Digital Security Score combines:

- The percentage of each covered population that has refrained from one or more online activities due to cybersecurity concerns.
- The percentage of each covered population that refrains from using the internet at all due to privacy or cybersecurity concerns.
- The percentage of each covered population that has experienced an online security breach in the past year.

### Priorities

- Target covered populations, specifically aging individuals, geographically isolated individuals, and formerly incarcerated individuals.
- Utilize Intake Form for each participant to provide insight on related points for the participants' Digital Security Score.
- Empower individuals to utilize online services available to them with confidence to keep their information safe and to minimize unnecessary expenses relating to transportation or lost wages for services that can be conducted online.

### Activities

- Develop communications strategy to promote safe online practices to targeted populations.
- Utilize practical examples of good cyber-hygiene to model behavior among target populations.
- Coordinate with Michigan Department of State and other relevant state agencies to communicate best practices when engaging online to protect personal information.
- Convene/attend relevant workgroup with appropriate state agencies to report the status of, and progress toward, Indicator Scores, specifically among targeted populations.

### Roles

- **MIHI** will convene/attend the relevant workgroup among state agencies to monitor progress of digital security among targeted populations. MIHI will report changes quarterly to show progress to the Indicator Scores. Communications strategy will be led by MIHI staff with resources disseminating to the Regional Coordinator and Community Digital Navigators.
- **Regional Digital Coordinator** will disseminate information to the Community Digital Navigator and provide support to Community Digital Navigator for any concerns regarding personal cybersecurity as they arise.
- **Community Digital Navigator** will disseminate information to community members regarding best practices to stay safe online and share concerns from the public with the Regional Digital Coordinator as needed.

## Device Access and Affordability

### Indicator Score

The Device Distress Score combines:

- The percentage of each covered population that has neither a desktop nor laptop computer.
- The percentage of each covered population that was unable to use a computer one or more days during the last six months because someone else was using it/it was elsewhere/it was otherwise inaccessible.

### Priorities

- Target covered populations, specifically aging individuals, individuals with disabilities, formerly incarcerated individuals, and low-income households.
- Coordinate outreach (and in-reach in the case of incarcerated individuals) and communication about how to purchase low-cost, refurbished devices or access free ones meeting the needs of the individual.

### Activities

- Partner with internal and external organizations currently refurbishing internet-enabled devices to expeditiously distribute devices to targeted populations.
- Utilize Intake Form for each participant to provide insight on related points for the participants' baseline Device Distress Score.
- Encourage responsible device ownership including the promotion of digital skills and cyber-hygiene best practices with every device.
- Coordinate with MDE to promote responsible device usage among K-12 and postsecondary students and adult learners.
- Monitor the progress of Device Distress Score on annual basis in alignment with data sources.

### Roles

- **MIHI** will develop and secure relationships with internal and external agencies to promote device distribution throughout more significantly distressed regions in accordance with the Device Distress Score. MIHI will develop and coordinate the outreach and in-reach strategies and capitalize on existing programs to utilize funding efficiently. MIHI will elevate the importance of devices to education with its partners throughout MDE. MIHI will monitor the Device Distress Score accordingly.
- **Regional Digital Coordinators** will promote device outreach strategies to Community Digital Navigators and regional businesses.
- **Community Digital Navigators** will disseminate information to community members regarding device access and resources.

Table 13: Goals and Planned Activities

## Host Sites

MIHI will continue to work with host sites to scale programs that are successful in smaller areas to statewide efforts. Contingent on the information included in the Digital Equity Capacity Grant NOFO, MIHI is planning to develop a subprogram that will support the Digital Navigator Network by providing funding to Digital Coordinator host sites. Host sites will provide a location for the Digital Navigator Network to operate and provide resources from. MIHI has identified a list of potential host sites for the Digital Navigators Network; however, the final list and involvement of the host sites will be determined following a LEO procurement process through a Request for Proposal (RFP).

### Potential host sites include:

- |   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Michigan Works! Associations                     | 6. Councils of Government           |
| 2. Library Systems                                  | 7. United Way Organizations         |
| 3. Local Community Colleges, Colleges, Universities | 8. Philanthropic Entities           |
| 4. Intermediate School Districts                    | 9. Healthcare Systems               |
| 5. Tribal Nations                                   | 10. Non-profit Entities             |
|   | 11. Other Host Sites, as Identified |



## Host Sites Roles and Responsibilities

- Oversee the daily activities of the Regional Digital Coordinator.
- Provide Regional Digital Coordinator a daily workspace (remote or otherwise).
- Maintain communication with MIHI about obstacles, barriers, and successes observed by Regional Digital Coordinator in the field.
- Manage financial aspects of the appropriated State Digital Equity Capacity Grant funding including payroll, equipment purchases, travel costs, and administrative costs.
- Compile all necessary programmatic and financial reporting on time in the cadence as determined by MIHI (monthly, quarterly, biannually, annually or as otherwise determined).
- Attend monthly cohort meetings (virtual or otherwise) as scheduled.
- Communicate with MIHI regarding staffing changes affecting the Regional Digital Navigator Network.
- Collaborate with MIHI throughout the hiring process for Regional Digital Coordinator.
- Collaborate and implement programs, assessments, or initiatives as directed by MIHI Digital Inclusion Program Manager.
- Maintain compliance with federal, state, and local regulations as applicable for the State Digital Equity Capacity Grant.

## MIHI DE Indicator Score Impact/Interaction with Outcomes

| Indicator Score                        | Outcomes  |                      |                 |                             |                                      |
|--|---|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
|  | Economic and workforce development goals, plans, and outcomes | Educational outcomes | Health outcomes | Civic and social engagement | Delivery of other essential services |
| Affordability Score                    | ✓   | ✓                    | ✓               | ✓                           | ✓                                    |
| Digital Government Accessibility Score | ✓   | ✓                    | ✓               | ✓                           | ✓                                    |
| Digital Participation Score            | ✓   | ✓                    | ✓               | ✓                           | ✓                                    |
| Digital Security Score                 | ✓   | ✓                    | ✓               | ✓                           | ✓                                    |
| Device Distress Score                  | ✓   | ✓                    | ✓               | ✓                           | ✓                                    |

Table 14: MIHI DE Indicator Scores Impact/Interaction with Outcomes

## 5.2 Timeline

| Activities   | 2023 |    |    |    | 2024 |    |    |    | 2025 |    |    |    | 2026 |    |    |    | 2027 | 2028 | 2029 | 2030 |
|--|------|----|----|----|------|----|----|----|------|----|----|----|------|----|----|----|------|------|------|------|
|  | Q1   | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1   | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1   | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1   | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |      |      |      |      |
| <b>Initial Stakeholder Outreach</b>  |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Phase 1 of community meetings  | ■    | ■  |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Phase 2 of community meetings  |      |    | ■  |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Partnership Roundtable Meetings  | ■    | ■  | ■  | ■  | ■    | ■  | ■  |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Develop and submit DE Plan   | ■    | ■  | ■  | ■  |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| <b>Planning Activities</b>   |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Apply for the State Digital Equity Capacity Grant  |      |    |    |    |      | ■  | ■  |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Finalize existing asset inventory  |      |    |    |    | ■    | ■  |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Convene workgroups among state agencies and external partners  |      |    |    |    |      | ■  | ■  | ■  |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Allocate BEAD funding to nondeployment subprograms   |      |    |    |    |      | ■  | ■  | ■  |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| <b>Implementation Activities</b>   |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Coordinate between State Digital Equity Capacity Grant and BEAD Digital Equity programs  |      |    |    |    |      | ■  | ■  |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Issue RFP for Digital Navigator Host sites   |      |    |    |    |      | ■  |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Hire Regional Digital Coordinators and Community Digital Navigators  |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    | ■  | ■  |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Finalize digital skills platform contract  |      |    |    |    |      |    |    | ■  |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Distribute BEAD funds in multiple rounds for non-infrastructure-related programs   |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    | ■    | ■  | ■  | ■  |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Project deployments for non-infrastructure-related programs  |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    | ■  | ■  | ■    | ■  | ■  | ■  | ■    | ■    | ■    |      |
| <b>Coordination and Outreach</b>   |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Establish an employer-led collaborative with LEO to meet BEAD program subgrantees workforce needs. At least 60% of subgrantees should participate. |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    | ■  |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Partner with MDE on awareness campaigns for parents and students on topics like at-home internet connection, affordability, and access             |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    | ■  | ■  |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Collaborate with MDE on digital skills competencies in K-12  |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    | ■  | ■  | ■    | ■  |    |    |      |      |      |      |

| Activities  | 2023 |    |    |    | 2024 |    |    |    | 2025 |    |    |    | 2026 |    |    |    | 2027 | 2028 | 2029 | 2030 |
|---|------|----|----|----|------|----|----|----|------|----|----|----|------|----|----|----|------|------|------|------|
|   | Q1   | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1   | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1   | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1   | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |      |      |      |      |
| Coordinate with MDHHS on health outcomes from pre- and post-deployment of broadband projects in targeted areas  |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Partner with MDHHS to promote and improve MIBridges portal for benefits such as SNAP, FAP, Medicare, and Medicaid   |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Partner with MDHHS to promote relevant programs to MIBridges users, including ACP   |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Partner with State Library of Michigan for free access to digital skills learning platforms   |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Work with MDOS to educate Michiganders about digital tools and inclusive initiatives, including voter rights and online Secretary of State vehicle services |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Work with MDOS to educate Michiganders on protecting online activities  |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Publish annual progress report card   |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| <b>Indicator Score Monitoring</b>   |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Calculate Indicator Scores  |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Develop tracking mechanism for Indicator Score progress   |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Design outreach and in-reach campaigns for relevant Indicator Scores  |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Monitor Affordability Score every two years   |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Monitor Digital Government Accessibility Score every two years  |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Monitor Digital Participation score every two years   |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Monitor Digital Security score every two years  |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Monitor Device Distress score every two years   |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |
| Monitor continuous quality improvement mechanisms   |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |      |      |      |

Table 15: Timeline

# 6. Public Comment

As part of the Digital Equity Plan Act requirements, pursuant to Section 60304(c)(3) (D)(i) of the Infrastructure Act, MIHI published the draft Digital Equity Plan for public comment on the [LEO website](#). The 35-day public comment period ran from July 11, 2023, through August 15, 2023. Throughout this time, interested parties were able to provide feedback and suggestions by submitting questions and comments electronically through the website. In addition to posting the draft plan on the LEO website, MIHI organized 10 additional MICEF stops throughout Michigan. At these events, MIHI presented the draft plan and allowed attendees to give feedback either online or in person. A total of 41 public comments were received, of which 11 included attachments. As seen in Figure 8, a majority of the comments focused on the Implementation and Current State of Digital Equity sections. Comments regarding the Implementation section largely focused on the BEAD subgrantee process and costs related to broadband expansion. The comments on the Current State of Digital Equity centralized around the gaps in broadband service across areas in Michigan, particularly in rural areas.




Figure 8: Public Comment Focus Areas

In addition to general suggestions and ideas, key themes from the public comment included organizations expressing interest in taking part in planning efforts, individuals and organizations inquiring about broadband infrastructure development and affordability, and direct feedback on key digital equity-related considerations, such as measurable objectives, Digital Navigators, digital skills workforce development, and covered populations. MIHI responded to every comment received as of September 1, 2023. Organizations seeking a greater role in planning efforts were directed toward participation in ongoing stakeholder engagement through the Partnership Roundtables. Organizations seeking inclusion of existing digital equity plans and inclusion of additional digital equity assets for covered populations were directed to the [Michigan Statewide Digital Inclusion survey](#) to be included in Appendix A-2 of the final Digital Equity Plan. Individuals and organizations seeking broadband infrastructure access and affordability were directed toward the appropriate resources, such as the BEAD program Five-Year Action Plan. Finally, public comments on key digital equity-related considerations and general edits were considered and integrated into the final Digital Equity Plan, where appropriate. MIHI would like to thank all of the commenters for their input regarding the Michigan Digital Equity Plan.

# 7. Conclusion

Michigan’s journey to digital equity is a challenging but achievable goal that promises a strong and more connected future. The state recognizes that broadband infrastructure and resources are crucial for economic and workforce development, healthcare, education, transportation, and more. Michigan’s Digital Equity Plan aims at closing the digital divide by 2030 and ensuring universal access and adoption of high-speed internet services. With its integrated and comprehensive approach that involves state agencies, public and private stakeholders, and community members, Michigan is well-positioned to achieve its objectives and become an accessible and inclusive state.

Michigan’s Digital Equity Plan sets out key goals, strategies, and measurable objectives to ensure that every resident in the state has access to affordable high-speed internet services. This includes developing and supporting new plans and programs to expand broadband coverage statewide, facilitating digital skills training for all Michiganders, and removing barriers to increased digital adoption, such as device access and computer training. Through collaboration and a success-focused approach, Michigan is paving the way for a more connected future and an inclusive state that offers boundless opportunities for every Michigander.



# Appendix

## A-1 Appendix 1

### A-1.1 Digital Participation Score Definitions

- Use email (PEEMAIL)
- Text or instant message (PETEXTIM)
- Use social networks (PESOCIAL)
- Play video games online (PEGAMING)
- Participate in video or voice calls or conferencing over the internet (PECONFER)
- Stream or download videos (PEVIDEO)
- Stream or download music, radio programs, or podcasts (PEAUDIO)
- Post or upload blog posts, original videos, or other content (PEPUBLISH)
- Telecommute or work while away from usual workplace (PETELEWK)
- Search or apply for a job (PEJOBSCH)
- Participate in online classes or job training (PEEDTRAI)
- Access government services, such as registering to vote or renew driver's license (PEEGOVTS)
- Request services provided by other people (PEUSESVC)
- Offer own services for sale (PEESVCS)
- Make online purchases, travel reservations, or other consumer services (PEECOMME)
- Sell goods (PEEGOODS)
- Use financial services, such as banking, investing, paying bills online, or sending money to other people (PEFINANC)
- Communicate with a digital assistant (PEVOICEA)
- Interact with household equipment or appliances connected to the internet (PEHOMIOT)
- Access health records or health insurance records (HEMEDREC)
- Communicate with a doctor or other health professional (HEMEDDOC)
- Research health information online (HEMEDINF)
- Use an electronic health monitoring service (HEMEDMON)

## A-2 Appendix 2

### A-2.1 Digital Inclusion Assets by Covered Population

#### Introduction

Michigan’s digital inclusion asset inventory identifies existing resources available to promote digital availability and adoption and has been used to identify any asset gaps that may exist.

Leveraging existing assets is a key strategy for both the Digital Equity and BEAD programs. This is why MIHI developed a [Digital Inclusion Resource Map](#) in September 2022. The map serves as a tool for:

- 1 Collecting information regarding existing assets from the communities.
- 2 Understanding the current digital inclusion programs, offerings, and resources available in communities across Michigan.
- 3 Promoting these new and existing programs to communities.

The map was developed based on responses received to the Michigan Statewide Digital Inclusion survey developed by MIHI and distributed to key stakeholders and the public throughout the state. MIHI used several channels to engage stakeholders and encourage participation in the survey, including socializing it at community meetings as part of the MI Connected Future tour, Partnership Roundtables, and in the MIHI newsletter. Additionally, the survey is easily accessible and prominently displayed on the [MIHI website](#). By targeting stakeholders, such as nonprofit organizations, for-profit organizations, government agencies, colleges, universities, trade schools, public libraries, and K-12 schools, the survey seeks to determine the current state of digital equity and inclusion programs and identify key organizations involved in these efforts. Based on these insights, the Digital Inclusion Resource Map is continuously updated, providing an ongoing and up-to-date inventory of digital inclusion assets in Michigan.

#### Methodology and Purpose

The purpose of this appendix is to provide NTIA with a high-level summary of digital inclusion efforts that were undertaken in Michigan, including the diverse set of organizations and stakeholders involved in promoting digital inclusion throughout the state. By identifying key players and networks, NTIA can gain a deeper understanding of the scope and scale of digital inclusion initiatives across the state and the impact that these efforts are having on the covered populations they serve.

Table A-1 summarizes assets (including nonprofit organizations, for-profit organizations, government agencies, colleges, universities, trade schools, public libraries, and K-12 schools or school districts) that support digital equity and were submitted as part of the Michigan Statewide Digital Inclusion survey in 2023. Each organization was aligned to the covered populations it best serves based on the organization’s mission, values, and services provided. Some organizations included in Table A-1 may serve multiple covered populations, but to simplify our approach in the Organizations by Covered Population section below, they were classified under a single covered population. Following Table A-1, a description of each of these organizations is included, categorized by the category of covered population each organization serves the most.

## Digital Inclusion Resource Map by Covered Populations

| Select Digital Inclusion Assets    | Covered Populations |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 |       |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------|
|                                    | Covered households  | Aging individuals | Incarcerated individuals | Veterans | Individuals with disabilities | Individuals with a language barrier | Racial/Ethnic minorities | Rural community | Youth |
| Detroit Blight Busters Inc.        | ✓                   |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 | ✓     |
| Edgewood Village Nonprofit Housing | ✓                   | ✓                 |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 | ✓     |
| The Avalon Village Inc.            | ✓                   |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 | ✓     |
| SAY Detroit Play Center            | ✓                   |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 | ✓     |
| NPower Inc.                        | ✓                   |                   |                          | ✓        | ✓                             |                                     | ✓                        |                 |       |
| Digitunity                         | ✓                   | ✓                 | ✓                        | ✓        | ✓                             | ✓                                   | ✓                        | ✓               | ✓     |
| Traverse Area District Library     | ✓                   | ✓                 |                          | ✓        | ✓                             | ✓                                   | ✓                        | ✓               | ✓     |
| Petoskey District Library          |                     | ✓                 |                          | ✓        | ✓                             | ✓                                   | ✓                        | ✓               | ✓     |
| Merit Network                      |                     | ✓                 |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 | ✓     |
| Gladwin County District Library    | ✓                   | ✓                 |                          | ✓        | ✓                             | ✓                                   | ✓                        | ✓               | ✓     |

| Select Digital Inclusion Assets                               | Covered Populations |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 |       |
|---|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------|
|   | Covered households  | Aging individuals | Incarcerated individuals | Veterans | Individuals with disabilities | Individuals with a language barrier | Racial/Ethnic minorities | Rural community | Youth |
| Public Media Network  | ✓                   |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 | ✓     |
| Benzie Shores District Library                                | ✓                   | ✓                 |                          | ✓        | ✓                             | ✓                                   | ✓                        | ✓               | ✓     |
| Glen Oaks Community College                                   | ✓                   | ✓                 |                          | ✓        | ✓                             | ✓                                   | ✓                        | ✓               | ✓     |
| Central County Senior Center                                  |                     | ✓                 |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 |       |
| St. Patrick Senior Center                                     |                     | ✓                 |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 |       |
| Engage @ Eastern Michigan University—Digital Connecting Corps |                     | ✓                 |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 |       |
| Grand Traverse County Commission on Aging                     |                     | ✓                 |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 |       |
| Buchanan Area Senior Center                                   |                     | ✓                 |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 |       |
| Greater Niles Senior Center Inc.                              |                     | ✓                 |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 |       |
| River Valley Senior Center                                    |                     | ✓                 |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 |       |
| Senior Citizens Center  |                     | ✓                 |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 |       |
| ABC Computers   |                     | ✓                 |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 | ✓     |
| Detroit Rescue Mission Ministries Education Complex           | ✓                   |                   | ✓                        |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 | ✓     |

| Select Digital Inclusion Assets                      | Covered Populations |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 |       |
|--|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------|
|  | Covered households  | Aging individuals | Incarcerated individuals | Veterans | Individuals with disabilities | Individuals with a language barrier | Racial/Ethnic minorities | Rural community | Youth |
| Emmanuel House                                       | ✓                   |                   |                          | ✓        |                               |                                     |                          |                 |       |
| Michigan Department of Military and Veterans Affairs |                     |                   |                          | ✓        |                               |                                     |                          |                 |       |
| Closing the Digital Gap                              | ✓                   | ✓                 |                          | ✓        | ✓                             | ✓                                   | ✓                        |                 | ✓     |
| Ann Arbor Center for Independent Living              |                     |                   |                          |          | ✓                             |                                     |                          |                 |       |
| Chance For Life Satellite Center Location            |                     |                   | ✓                        |          | ✓                             |                                     |                          |                 |       |
| Washtenaw Literacy                                   |                     |                   |                          |          |                               | ✓                                   | ✓                        |                 | ✓     |
| Livingston County Literacy Coalition                 |                     |                   |                          |          |                               | ✓                                   | ✓                        |                 |       |
| American Indian Health and Family Services           |                     |                   |                          |          |                               | ✓                                   | ✓                        |                 | ✓     |
| Alkebu-lan Village                                   |                     |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     | ✓                        |                 | ✓     |
| Detroit Urban League                                 | ✓                   | ✓                 |                          |          |                               |                                     | ✓                        |                 | ✓     |
| Dream of Detroit                                     | ✓                   |                   | ✓                        |          |                               |                                     | ✓                        |                 | ✓     |
| Interfaith Center for Racial Justice                 |                     |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     | ✓                        |                 |       |
| Latin Americans United for Progress                  |                     |                   |                          |          |                               | ✓                                   | ✓                        |                 |       |
| Latin Americans for Social and Economic Development  |                     | ✓                 |                          |          |                               | ✓                                   | ✓                        |                 |       |
| The Detroit Association of Black Organizations       |                     |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     | ✓                        |                 |       |
| Association of Chinese Americans Community Center    |                     | ✓                 |                          |          |                               | ✓                                   | ✓                        |                 | ✓     |
| Homage to Black Excellence                           | ✓                   |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     | ✓                        |                 |       |

| Select Digital Inclusion Assets          | Covered Populations |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 |       |
|--|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------|
|  | Covered households  | Aging individuals | Incarcerated individuals | Veterans | Individuals with disabilities | Individuals with a language barrier | Racial/Ethnic minorities | Rural community | Youth |
| Pure Broadband                           |                     |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          | ✓               |       |
| Lee Township                             |                     |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          | ✓               |       |
| London Township                          |                     |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          | ✓               |       |
| Center for Change Northern Michigan      |                     |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          | ✓               |       |
| Boys and Girls Club                      |                     |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     | ✓                        |                 | ✓     |
| Center for Success                       |                     |                   |                          |          |                               | ✓                                   | ✓                        |                 | ✓     |
| Church of the Messiah/<br>BLVD Harambee  |                     |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 | ✓     |
| Detroit Hispanic Development Corporation | ✓                   |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 | ✓     |
| Detroit PAL                              |                     |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 | ✓     |
| Downtown Boxing Gym Youth Program        |                     |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 | ✓     |
| Life Remodeled                           | ✓                   |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 | ✓     |
| New City Kids: Grand Rapids              | ✓                   |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 | ✓     |
| New Level Sports Ministries              |                     |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 | ✓     |
| Baxter Community Center                  | ✓                   |                   |                          |          |                               |                                     |                          |                 | ✓     |

Table A-1: Select Digital Inclusion Assets by Covered Population

## A-2.2 Organizations by Covered Population

### Individuals living in households with incomes at or below 150% of the poverty line

- 1. Detroit Blight Busters Inc.:** Detroit Blight Busters' mission is to stabilize, revitalize, and rebuild the city of Detroit by demolishing, renovating, and boarding up blighted homes for community use, and building community partnerships and events to help low-to-middle-income families.
- 2. Edgewood Village Nonprofit Housing Corporation:** Edgewood Village empowers low to very-low-income households by providing them with access to affordable housing, educational opportunities, assistance, health and wellness, and community programming.
- 3. The Avalon Village Inc.:** Avalon Village's mission is to create a safe, nurturing, uplifting, and healing space within the City of Highland Park, Michigan by converting vacant and blighted land into a valuable urban resource and providing basic living components for a quality, comfortable, and prosperous life. In addition, the company provides basic services to the community to enhance traditional municipal or government services that have been reduced, eliminated, or have become unaffordable.
- 4. SAY Detroit Play Center:** SAY Play helps students from low-income families overcome literacy inequality while improving themselves and their communities. It has also become a motivational learning center for Detroit youth with academics as its core.
- 5. NPower Inc.:** NPower creates pathways to economic prosperity by launching digital careers for military veterans and young adults from underserved communities. Their mission is to move people from poverty to the middle class by creating access and pathways to careers in technology fields.
- 6. Digitunity:** Digitunity is a national organization working to eliminate technological gaps among individuals by providing computers and related equipment to those in need since 1984. Their mission is to ensure that everyone has access to technology through a network of stakeholders and solutions. They focus on the device component of digital equity from the supply chain to community distribution.
- 7. Traverse Area District Library:** Traverse Area District Library is a network of six community libraries throughout Grand Traverse County. The network of libraries provides publicly accessible computers, free Wi-Fi, and circulating laptops for use.
- 8. Petoskey District Library:** Petoskey District Library contracts services with the four surrounding townships of Bear Creek, Little Traverse, Resort, and Springvale. It also provides digital literacy training for residents such as courses on software, applications, one-to-one technology assistance, and an Apple users group.
- 9. Merit Network:** The Merit Network's mission is to connect organizations and build community. It provides network, security, and community services to member organizations that help make society a better place to learn, discover, work, and live.

- 10. Gladwin County District Library:** The Gladwin County District Library promotes knowledge, understanding, and wisdom to combat ignorance and indifference by making the best possible resources, personnel, and facilities requisite for modern library service available for every child and adult. They also provide courses for basic computer and smartphone skills for seniors.
- 11. Public Media Network:** Public Media Network is a local nonprofit media organization that builds power with people through media to amplify creative expression, community dialogue, and cultural understanding. Public Media Network provides free training on media skills and programs targeted for youth.
- 12. Benzie Shores District Library:** The Benzie Shores District Library serves the City of Frankfort, Blaine Township, Crystal Lake Township, the Village of Elberta, Gilmore Township, and a portion of Lake Township with a mission to provide educational, informational, intellectual, and recreational library resources to communities and visitors. They also provide computer workstations, wireless internet access, hot spot and Chromebook lending, and one-on-one technology assistance.
- 13. Glen Oaks Community College:** Glen Oaks Community College is a public community college in Centreville, Michigan, with a mission to transform lives and advance communities. They provide programs in computers and information technology.

## Individuals 60 years of age or older

- 1. Central County Senior Center** The Central County Senior Center has a clear objective of meeting the documented needs of senior citizens aged 60 and above. It aims to provide solutions to their problems and offer enjoyable activities for those who reside in their homes.
- 2. St. Patrick Senior Center:** Detroit's largest health, wellness, and activities center for people over the age of 55. The center provides a variety of services including nutritious meals, dozens of health & wellness programs, an on-site clinic, and transportation to medical appointments.
- 3. Engage @ Eastern Michigan University—Digital Connecting Corps:** The Digital Connecting Corps, a collaboration between Eastern Michigan University (EMU) Engage @ EMU and University of Michigan (UM) Ginsberg Center, seeks to design and implement an intergenerational and sustainable digital support program for older adults living in Washtenaw County. The goal is to leverage the resources of both institutions' student capital to serve as tech coaches for the older adult community at older adult centers.
- 4. Grand Traverse County Commission on Aging:** Grand Traverse County Commission on Aging provides services to Grand Traverse County residents aged 60 and over to enable them to remain living at home. This includes personal care, medication management, foot care, housecleaning, laundry, outdoor services, and personal emergency response systems.

5. **Buchanan Area Senior Center:** Buchanan Area Senior Center is a community focal point on aging, where older adults gather for services, programs, and activities that reflect their experiences and skills. The center responds to their diverse needs and interests.
6. **Greater Niles Senior Center Inc.:** Greater Niles Senior Center, located in Berrien County, Michigan, provides a broad range of services and programs for seniors in the Niles area. Its mission is to offer a variety of activities to keep seniors engaged and active.
7. **River Valley Senior Center:** River Valley Senior Center is a senior center located in Harbert, Michigan. Its mission is to offer residents of the area aged 60 years and older a range of educational, recreational, social, transportation, and referral services.
8. **Senior Citizens Center:** Senior Citizens Center is a senior citizen center located in Benton Harbor, Michigan. The mission of the service center is to provide safe, friendly, and positive social, educational, and recreational services to enhance the independence and well-being of the 60+ citizens of its community.
9. **ABC Computers:** ABC Computers offers a range of computer-related services, including the sale of computer equipment, computer servicing (inclusive of laptops), on-site service, data recovery, and educational services, for both high school students and senior citizens. It also offers consulting services.

## **Incarcerated Individuals**

1. **Detroit Rescue Mission Ministries Education Complex:** The Detroit Rescue Mission Ministries is a faith-based, nonprofit organization that has devoted a wealth of resources to meet the basic needs of humanity while motivating individuals to rebuild their lives, one life at a time. DRMM has spent over 100 years of continued service providing food, shelter, and services to intervene where homelessness and substance addiction occur.

## **Veterans**

1. **Emmanuel House:** Emmanuel House is a nonprofit organization that provides daily programs and services to over 70 homeless veterans. It offers homeless veterans an opportunity to take steps toward employment, creates a self-help environment, establishes a safe and drug-free residential setting, provides economic management training services, and facilitates structured interactions for the entire family.
2. **Michigan Department of Military and Veterans Affairs:** The DMVA synchronizes strategic, legislative, and fiscal initiatives to build and sustain military readiness; cares and advocates for veterans; and cultivates purposeful partnerships. Its vision is for Michigan to be the premier state for advancing military readiness and serving veterans and their families.
3. **Closing the Digital Gap:** Closing the Digital Gap provides computer training, computer ownership, and internet access to small nonprofit organizations and individuals in Michigan who may be unemployed, underemployed, low-income, single parents, disabled, veterans, immigrants, at-risk youth, or seniors.

## Individuals living with one or more disabilities

- 1. Ann Arbor Center for Independent Living:** The center is a nonprofit disability advocacy and service agency that assists people with disabilities and their families in living full and productive lives. Its mission is to empower the lives of people with disabilities and advocate for a more inclusive community for all.
- 2. Chance For Life Satellite Center Location:** The center's vision is to transform minds, change hearts, and create safe communities by giving returning citizens and people with disabilities an opportunity to develop themselves in a positive manner despite adverse conditions. CFL focuses on fueling workforce development and strengthening family bonds.

## Individuals with barriers to the English language (including English-language learners and those with low literacy)<sup>55\*</sup>

- 1. Washtenaw Literacy:** Washtenaw Literacy provides literacy support, free of charge, to adults through a network of trained tutors. It is the organization's vision to eliminate illiteracy in Washtenaw County. The organization also offers free English as a second language (ESL) tutoring for adults. Tutoring is open to adults who live, work, or volunteer in Washtenaw County.
- 2. Livingston County Literacy Coalition:** Livingston County Literacy Coalition provides resources for individuals who wish to improve their skills in reading, writing, basic math, or English as a second language. The organization also provides digital literacy drop-in events to provide technical support and assistance.

## Members of racial and ethnic minority groups

- 1. American Indian Health and Family Services:** The American Indian Health and Family Services is a nonprofit health and community wellness center whose mission is to empower and enhance the physical, spiritual, emotional, and mental well-being of American Indian/Alaska Native individuals, families, and other underserved populations in Southeast Michigan through culturally grounded health and family services.
- 2. Alkebu-lan Village:** The original purpose of the organization was to provide affordable martial arts training for African American youth. Over the years the organization has expanded to include youth and adult sports and fitness, leadership training, visual and performing arts, homework assistance and tutoring, youth entrepreneurship training, and community service.
- 3. Detroit Urban League:** The Urban League of Detroit & Southeastern Michigan is committed to being a provider of choice for its clients, an employer of choice for its co-workers, and the investment of choice for its stakeholders and philanthropic entities. Its mission is to enable African Americans and other persons of color to achieve their fullest potential.

---

55. The resources included within this section are organizations that completed a survey to be included within the Digital Inclusion Resource Map. MIHI recognizes there are additional organizations that have not completed the survey, such as those within the CALM Directory that was shared through public comment. However, the CALM Directory is not a publicly available document.

- 4. Dream of Detroit:** Dream facilitates the growth of a thriving Muslim community rooted in Detroit's Black Muslim history while attracting a young, multiracial future. It also remains committed to the broader neighborhood, meeting the concerns and building the capacity and connectedness of all residents, no matter their background.
- 5. Interfaith Center for Racial Justice:** The Interfaith Center for Racial Justice has been working for over 50 years to build bridges of understanding among people of different cultures and faith traditions. The center addresses issues that impact inclusion and recognizes that social and racial justice are key elements that impact inclusion in its communities.
- 6. Latin Americans United for Progress:** The organization focuses on empowering Latinos to participate in creating a better community for all through advocacy, education, and celebration.
- 7. Latin Americans for Social and Economic Development:** The organization's focus is to promote the social, economic, and educational development of the residents of South Detroit by providing advocacy services and programs that create opportunities for the diverse community to better their educational level, employment opportunities, health, and well-being.
- 8. The Detroit Association of Black Organizations (DABO):** The association has been a champion for greater unity and opportunities in Detroit's African American community. Through an expansive network of over 130 organizations, DABO strives to create meaningful resources aimed at improving quality-of-life initiatives around the city. It has uplifted, unified, and empowered Detroit's African American community through various programs, initiatives, and events.
- 9. Association of Chinese Americans Community Center:** The center plays a leading role in enriching the lives of Asian Pacific Americans in the metro Detroit region. The organization is one of several entities that serve the Chinese and Asian Pacific American communities, providing year-round programs that include social services, educational classes, preventive healthcare, and cultural events. Programs focus currently on wellness for seniors and underserved Asians, education excellence and culture awareness for youths, and social and education services for adults.
- 10. Homage to Black Excellence:** Homage to Black Excellence aims to create more inclusive, diverse, and economically equitable experiences for African American Dearborn and metro Detroit residents. The H2BE Media Digital Literary Training program aims to foster collaboration and partnerships to enhance digital skills, cultivate confidence, and promote internet literacy and offers training in e-commerce, social media, and Google search.

## Individuals residing in rural areas

- 1. Pure Broadband:** Pure Broadband is an internet service provider focusing on serving rural communities for over 10 years. Pure provides rural internet, home automation, IT support, and personalized installations.
- 2. Lee Township:** Lee Township is a government agency trying to get reliable, affordable internet in a rural community. The township partners with county and local service providers to ensure residents have access to affordable and reliable broadband services.
- 3. London Township:** London Township is a local township agency with a population of 3,000 with the goal of getting reliable internet in its rural community.
- 4. Center for Change Northern Michigan:** The Center for Change Northern Michigan's mission is to educate, inspire, and empower neighbors for collective progressive advocacy in Michigan's First Congressional District.

## Youth

- 1. Boys and Girls Club:** The club is a nonprofit youth development organization that seeks to create hope and opportunity and foster civic engagement by inspiring and enabling all young people, especially those that need the most, to realize their full potential as productive, responsible, and caring citizens. The club focuses on three core areas to meet diverse needs and interests of members—academic success, good character and citizenship, and healthy lifestyles.
- 2. Center for Success:** The mission of the Center for Success is to unite literacy and community to empower students in the journey of education. The center offers mentoring, bringing together students and community partners during one-on-one, small group, and whole class sessions to allow students to participate in various opportunities.
- 3. Church of the Messiah/BLVD Harambee:** BLVD Harambee is a nonprofit organization helping foster life skills and connect resources for the holistic development of young people in the neighborhood. The church's primary focus is young people; the congregation is 60% African American males under 30.
- 4. Detroit Hispanic Development Corporation:** DHDC is an organization that focuses on youth and families, particularly those at high risk within the Hispanic communities. DHDC provides a range of community services including adult continuing education, conversational Spanish classes, parenting classes, and after-school and summer programs for youth. DHDC's mission is to make a difference by creating life-changing opportunities for youth and their families. Their vision is to create a stable and safe community where youth and families have quality opportunities for self-empowerment, education, and personal wealth.

- 5. Detroit PAL:** Detroit PAL helps youth find their greatness through athletic, academic, and leadership development programs. The Detroit PAL department of Youth Enrichment provides supplemental services for youth and their families to help influence student-athletes to be school and life ready. It focuses on literacy and academic enrichment, leadership development, college readiness, mentoring, workforce development, partnerships, and collaboration.
- 6. Downtown Boxing Gym Youth Program:** DBG is a leading, free, out-of-school-time program centered on student achievement and success. DBG has been providing free academic and athletic programs to students with continuing mentorship and support up to the age of 25.
- 7. Life Remodeled:** Life Remodeled repurposes properties into one-stop hubs of opportunity for entire families to thrive. The organization fills buildings with the best and brightest nonprofit organizations that are providing youth programs, workforce development, and human services to tens of thousands of students and community members each year.
- 8. New City Kids:** Grand Rapids: New City Kids offers after-school programming for local low-income youth. Children and teens get a chance to explore music and academics in a creative and fun environment.
- 9. New Level Sport Ministries:** New Level Sport Ministries is a nonprofit youth support service committed to developing purpose-driven individuals who will be highly effective in all aspects of life. It is a student-athlete support service for ages 1-18 with a mission to maximize and balance the intellectual, spiritual, mental, and physical elements of all participating student-athletes.
- 10. Baxter Community Center:** The Baxter Community Center's Child Development Center serves infants through preschoolers and provides a Wholistic Health Center that offers dental and mental health services through partnerships with local clinics and dedicated volunteers. It also has a marketplace that provides fresh produce to those in need of food assistance.

## A-2.3 Digital Inclusion Plans

### Existing County Plans

Connected Nation's "Connected Community" program has partnered with 10 counties across Michigan to conduct an assessment regarding the current status of broadband and to establish a broadband planning process. Through surveys of local residents, businesses, and organizations, the program aims to understand the existing resources and capabilities in place to support the access, adoption, and use of broadband technology in homes and businesses. Data obtained from this assessment is used to develop an appropriate action plan to improve the broadband ecosystem effectively, addressing the current and future broadband needs of these counties. The program's aim is to enhance the accessibility, affordability, and availability of broadband technology in the counties, leading to social and economic development.

Additional information by county is included below. It's important to note that as more households and communities participate in the Connected Community program, these figures are likely to change.

**Cheboygan County:** Data from Cheboygan County represents survey responses collected between September 28, 2020, and January 29, 2021. Altogether, 1,126 Cheboygan County households responded to the survey; some responded more than one time. Data from all Connected communities represent survey responses collected between January 1, 2017, and January 29, 2021.

**Eaton County:** Data from Eaton County represents survey responses collected between September and November 2021. During this time, 1,322 Eaton County households responded to the survey, with some households responding more than once. Data from all Connected communities represent survey responses collected between January 1, 2017, and November 30, 2021. Eaton County also released the Executive Summary of their Technology Action Plan in January 2022. Eaton County's Executive Summary document can be accessed using the following link: [Eaton-County\\_Executive-Summary\\_01272022.pdf](#) (connectednation.org).

**Huron County:** Data from Huron County represents survey responses collected between December 2020 and April 2021. During this time, 682 Huron County households responded to the survey, with some households responding more than one time. Data from all Connected communities represents survey responses collected between January 1, 2017, and April 30, 2021.

**Lake County:** Data from Lake County represents survey responses collected between September 2020 and February 2021. During this time, 464 Lake County households responded to the survey, with some households responding more than one time. Data from all Connected communities represents survey responses collected between January 1, 2017, and February 28, 2021.

**Lapeer County:** Data from Lapeer County represents survey responses collected between October 9, 2020, and January 1, 2021. Altogether, 1,845 Lapeer County households responded to the survey. Data from all Connected communities represents survey responses collected between January 1, 2017, and January 29, 2021.

**Midland County:** Data from Midland County represents survey responses collected between October 26, 2020, and January 26, 2021. Altogether, 1,438 Midland County households responded to the survey. Data from all Connected communities represents survey responses collected between January 1, 2017, and January 29, 2021.

**Newaygo County:** Data from Newaygo County represents survey responses collected between April 2017 and September 2018. During this time, 929 Newaygo County households responded to the survey, with some households responding more than one time. Data from all Connected communities represents survey responses collected between January 1, 2017, and February 28, 2021.

**Oceana County:** Data from Oceana County represents 481 households that responded to the survey in 2017 and 537 households that responded in 2021, with some households responding more than one time. Data from all Connected communities represents survey responses collected between January 1, 2017, and May 31, 2021.

**Sanilac County:** Data from Sanilac County represents survey responses collected between October 2020 and February 2021. During this time, 676 Sanilac County households responded to the survey, with some households responding more than one time. Data from all Connected communities represents survey responses collected between January 1, 2017, and February 28, 2021.

**Tuscola County:** Data from Tuscola County represents survey responses collected between February 2021 and April 2021. During this time, 663 Tuscola County households responded to the survey, with some households responding more than one time. Data from all Connected communities represents survey responses collected between January 1, 2017, and April 30, 2021.

Additionally, Merit Networks' "Michigan Moonshot" program has partnered with over a dozen counties across the state of Michigan to conduct an assessment regarding the current status of broadband and to establish a broadband planning process. Through surveys of local residents and businesses, the program provides a statistically significant assessment of the current state of connectivity in the area, the internet use experience of connected residents, and the barriers preventing unconnected residents from participating in the digital community. The current state assessment is provided to the community along with educational programming and ongoing support for community-driven broadband solutions.

**Benzie County:** Data from Benzie County represents survey responses collected between November 12, 2021, and March 18, 2022. Altogether, 1,995 Benzie County households responded to the survey; some responded more than one time.

**Berrien County:** Data from Berrien County represents survey responses collected between January 18, 2021, and March 31, 2021. Altogether, 2,944 Berrien County households responded to the survey; some responded more than one time.

**Calhoun County:** Data from Calhoun County represents survey responses collected between July 12, 2021, and January 8, 2022. Altogether, 2,240 Calhoun County households responded to the survey; some responded more than one time.

**EasternUP Connect (Chippewa, Luce, Mackinac Counties):** Data from Chippewa, Luce, and Mackinac Counties represents survey responses collected between July 11, 2022, and December 22, 2022. Altogether, 2,698 households in Chippewa, Luce, or Mackinac Counties responded to the survey; some responded more than one time.

**Livingston County:** Data from Livingston County represents survey responses collected between October 6, 2021, and February 25, 2022. Altogether, 6,112 Livingston County households responded to the survey; some responded more than one time.

**Ottawa County:** Data from Ottawa County represents survey responses collected between May 14, 2021, and January 31, 2022. Altogether, 3,940 Ottawa County households responded to the survey; some responded more than one time.

**Washtenaw County:** Data from Washtenaw County represents survey responses collected between February 4, 2023, and March 19, 2023. Altogether, 7,190 Washtenaw County households responded to the survey; some responded more than one time.

The following county studies are still in development as part of the “Michigan Moonshot” Program and have not yet been published by Merit:

**Ingham County:** Data from Ingham County represents survey responses collected between March 14, 2022, and October 17, 2022. Altogether, 5,906 Ingham County households responded to the survey; some responded more than one time.

**Kent County:** Data from Kent County represents survey responses collected starting on October 6, 2022. Altogether, 10,838 Kent County households responded to the survey; some responded more than one time.

**Lapeer County:** Data from Lapeer County represents survey responses collected between August 21, 2022, and March 7, 2023. Altogether, 3,550 Lapeer County households responded to the survey; some responded more than one time.

**Saginaw Township:** Data from Saginaw Township represents survey responses collected between August 18, 2021, and October 12, 2022. Altogether, 1,818 Saginaw Township households responded to the survey; some responded more than one time.

MIHI recognizes and commends the work that counties, townships, and municipalities have put in to develop digital equity plans. MIHI acknowledges that communities know their unique needs and challenges best, and to that end has adopted a community-based approach as part of this plan that seeks to provide resources and tools to communities, instead of enforcing a statewide one-size-fits-all solution. Therefore, as mentioned in the later sections of this plan, the role of Digital Navigators will be used to support communities in the implementation of their digital equity plans and provide support to communities that have not had the opportunity or resources needed to fully articulate and determine what digital equity looks like within their community.

MIHI recognizes that Tribal communities may be developing or already have digital equity plans in place. While MIHI is not aware of any Tribal digital equity plans that have been shared to date, MIHI remains fully committed to providing assistance and resources, as needed and requested, to support Tribal communities in the development and implementation of their digital equity plans.

## A-3 Appendix 3

### A-3.1 Public Comments and Responses

#### 1. Digitunity: michigan-digital-equity-plan-commen\_638276008018952251

Thank you for taking the time to review and provide feedback on MIHI's Digital Equity Plan. We will respond to each category of comments.

#### Four Overarching Points

MIHI agrees with your overarching points related to device ownership. Having access to large-screen devices, utilizing an ecosystem approach, making sure that the device ecosystem is sustainable, and ensuring that devices are reliable and suit the needs of recipients are all required to ensure that Michiganders will be connected with the devices that they need. Thank you for elevating device ownership as part of your comment.

#### Implementation

We agree with you that we should “Aim high.” To contextualize our quote, “One internet-enabled device per household,” we have the phrase “at least” in front of the quote to note that every household is different. We will work toward making sure that every household has the number of devices it needs to suit its needs.

We concur that the supply is critical. Thank you for working to pass the Computers for Veterans and Students Act in December 2022, which was included in the H.R.2617—Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023. We agree that success will require getting many invested organizations to work toward a sustainable device ecosystem. Thank you for offering your help as a resource on this!

Thank you for sharing your recent report on Digital Navigators. We know that Digital Navigators will be tasked with many important roles, and we want to ensure that they will be able to have access to devices for those in need. Regarding the regenerative process, we concur. We are working to implement a specific life cycle strategy for our device ecosystem so that stakeholders are aware of the possible ways that devices can be recycled, repaired, or refurbished for future use.

#### Five Considerations

The five considerations that you share at the end of the piece focus on many internal conversations we have had as an office. Libraries took on a lot of responsibility during the pandemic. We have been working within the State Library of Michigan to discuss how their experience with digital equity programs and devices could be improved and the role that libraries may fill in the future. We also know that people want to get access to devices in their community from trusted community partners and will work to build those deployment systems.

Workforce development is imperative in ensuring that we solve the digital divide. We have been working to increase the talent pipeline, but we have not focused as much on increasing the workforce of individuals working on refurbishing computers. This gives us some insight into how we could alter dynamics in the future.

Regarding evaluation, we are working to more clearly refine the key performance indicators based on feedback from other public commenters.

We are aware that Digital Navigators will not be the ultimate help desk technicians. The goal for Digital Navigators is to connect people to the resources they need. This may mean that we lean on community organizations that know their communities best to provide technical support or we create people who connect to regional Digital Navigators that will be responsible for helping individuals with tech support for their devices.

**2. Calm Directory: calm--directory\_638267455029265506.pdf**

Thank you for taking the time to read MIHI's Digital Equity Plan and sharing a valuable resource. We will make every effort to connect with the organizations you provided for continued digital equity and language access needs.

**3. Quello Center: comments-of-the-quello-center-at-michigan-state-un\_638277118849388973.pdf**

The Michigan High Speed Internet Office (MIHI) thanks the Quello Center at Michigan State University and Professors Bauer and Hampton for their very thoughtful and thorough comment on the Michigan Digital Equity Plan. MIHI appreciates and recognizes the lens through which the plan was analyzed and enjoys the conversation particularly regarding the concept of multiple digital divides. MIHI also appreciates the holistic approach to the integration of BEAD and DEA activities.

Responses to the comment follow the same structure as the comment submission.

**Digital Equity Defined**

The thought involved in this conversation is certainly apparent and MIHI thanks the Quello Center for such a thoughtful argument! The definition on page six is intended to serve as the vision for digital equity in Michigan, rather than a formal definition of what digital equity is. With digital equity taking many forms throughout the state and the nation, MIHI aims to concisely share what realized digital equity will look like for Michiganders to help clarify what MIHI means when we say "digital equity." Our intent is to build upon the statutory definition to share what "full capacity" means in the context of Michigan.

## Concept of Digital Divides

The fluid nature of digital equity will pose problems, advances, and gaps in existing knowledge that we have yet to fathom. As such, MIHI aims to support capacity-building efforts for individuals and communities to enhance their knowledge as the various digital divides evolve. MIHI agrees with the Quello Center regarding the notion of multi-dimensional digital divides and understands that the barriers keeping Michiganders from fully participating in society and the economy are different for each person. This manifests itself in multiple divides unique to each person. Given the unique nature of the digital divide for the individual, MIHI's intent is that the Digital Navigator program will support the removal of barriers for the multitude of divides faced by the individual.

## KPIs

MIHI received multiple comments surrounding the proposed key performance indicators. MIHI is considering the feedback holistically and is working to adjust the KPIs while being mindful of the multiple comments. MIHI aims to more clearly discuss the KPI methodology and measurement for the final draft.

## Miscellaneous

MIHI thanks the Quello Center for the attention to detail on specific aspects of the plan! Many of the points raised are similar to other commenters as well as reflective of conversations internally. In the final version, MIHI will be clarifying many of the points raised by the Quello Center and providing further context for the reader.

MIHI would like to extend significant thanks to the Quello Center and Professors Bauer and Hampton for their public comment submission!

### 4. **Compudopt: compudopt-michigan-bead-comments-august-15-2023\_638277023190302911.pdf**

Thank you very much for submitting a public comment. We appreciate all the positive feedback that you shared and the alignment that you noted between our Digital Equity Plan and the important work that you do at Compudopt. The work that you do with covered populations to ensure that people in need receive devices is imperative to ensure that we can abolish the digital divide. We also appreciate the ways in which you note the alignment based upon the specific sections of our Digital Equity Plan. Thank you as you continue striving forward on your mission to provide equal access and education to under-resourced youth and their communities. We need everyone involved to help dismantle the digital divide and are glad that you are committed to helping Michigan as well as the rest of the nation close the digital divide.

## 5. Merit

MIHI thanks Merit Network for their thoughtful and insightful public comment on the Michigan Digital Equity Plan. Many of the changes suggested are similar to feedback MIHI has heard from others. MIHI aims to clarify the language of the plan, particularly around the Digital Navigator role and implementation plan. Certain platforms and programs are highlighted throughout the Merit Network public comment. MIHI did not name specific programs so as to maintain the philosophy that communities know communities best. MIHI will support communities in selecting the programs that work best for their needs.

Much of the content in the public comment highlights the infrastructure needs of the state, which MIHI addresses in the BEAD Five-Year Action Plan as per required by the NITA. Further information can be found in the Initial Proposal, which will be released later this year by MIHI. MIHI understands and agrees with Merit Network about the important role of affordability of service, particularly for middle- and low-income households. Affordability of service will be addressed pending further guidance from the NTIA and will be outlined in the Initial Proposal.

MIHI thanks Merit for elevating the work of the Merit Moonshot program and the work that has been done to support digital inclusion efforts in over 12 counties. MIHI will update the Digital Equity Plan to reflect the work of the aforementioned program.

## 6. Education Superhighway: michigan-comments-for-de-plan\_638277113217426428.pdf

Thank you for your detailed comments. MIHI has partnered with EducationSuperHighway for ACP-related endeavors and an ACP campaign that resulted in Michigan more than doubling traffic to getACP.org. MIHI is committed to collaborating with partners, communities, and stakeholders that align with the goals and strategies outlined in the Digital Equity Plan. We understand and acknowledge that digital equity is a space that many organizations have been working in for decades. MIHI has convened a wide range of partners in several ways: Connecting Michigan Task Force (CMIT), MI Connected Future (MICF) Partnership Roundtable monthly meetings, and Enabling Partners. While each group has a different purpose, the overall goal is to leverage partnerships to decrease the digital divide and create a more digitally equitable state. The impact of these efforts can be seen in the Digital Equity Plan. Ways to include ACP as a part of existing committees or as a separate committee can be explored. Having a framework much like what ESH has provided will be critical to determining the direction and desired outcomes of the cohort.

## 7. Nicole Fickes: mihi-digital-equity-plan-draft---public-comment---\_638277155401978320

Thank you for sharing your comments on our Digital Equity Plan. Your thoughts on the negative sides of digital connectivity are important to consider and are often absent from conversations that focus more on opportunities with digital equity. We take a listen first, then plan approach to working with community organizations and think that working with community organizations to help address their specific concerns and negative impacts of the internet can be done through education, building curriculum, and harnessing the power of our Digital Navigators.

## Workforce

We agree that digital connectivity can help improve the workforce. We are currently working to ensure that Michigan has the talent to build and maintain the networks that not only give people an occupation and purpose but also allow people to work from home and find new jobs online.

We agree that education is the foundation for success. We are partnering with offices within Labor and Economic Opportunity (LEO) like Employment and Training and Workforce Development, as well as those outside LEO like the Michigan Department of Education, to make sure that we can not only build infrastructure and keep it maintained but also work on future curriculum development. You can see that we also work with MiSTEM, as noted on pages 8 and 14 of our Digital Equity Plan.

## Health Outcomes

You bring up some excellent points about health outcomes and how individuals always seek to improve themselves but often lack access to specific resources. While this is a laudable endeavor, it lies outside the scope of our Digital Equity Plan. Collaboration is imperative and we will seek to ensure that we are improving health outcomes by increasing broadband access for all. We may also provide Digital Navigators with the resources to connect to local professionals who may better suit their needs related to healthcare.

### **8. Broadband Institute Foundation: Dr. Ron Suarez. public-comments-for-mihi\_638276980593670867.pdf**

Thank you for your public comment to MIHI.

MIHI agrees with you that it is important for our office to identify the community stakeholders from those three groups. Our Digital Equity Plan includes several groups supporting the Hispanic community, including Latin Americans United for Progress, Latin Americans for Social and Economic Development, and Detroit Hispanic Development Corporation. We have nine different groups for individuals 65+ on our Digital Equity Plan. For individuals with disabilities, we have the organizations Ann Arbor Center for Independent Living, Chance for Life Satellite Center Location, and Closing the Digital Gap. You can find these specific groups starting on page 75 of the Digital Equity Plan.

MIHI's workforce development strategies are currently being constructed by collaborating with the Department of Labor and Economic Opportunity's Workforce Development and Employment and Training divisions. We are also partnering with the Michigan Works! Association to support pipelines and training programs so that residents can enhance and advance their skills in the areas with identified labor shortages. MIHI recognizes and understands the complex nature of barriers that keep individuals out of the workforce and will utilize strategies supporting the needs of the individual to remove said barriers. This means we will continue listening to people within the community about how to best understand their needs and create a pathway forward that addresses shared concerns.

Regarding your query about Web3, the technologies and tools, if utilized properly, could be used to push for more equitable experiences online. We also applaud everyone who is striving to make digital connectivity and access on the web more equitable. With that in mind, and with the nascent nature of this technology, we have chosen not to currently reflect Web3 in our Digital Equity Plan. If there are any major shifts or changes, we may revisit this topic at a later date.

Regarding your query on coworking, while visiting 41 stops on our MI Connected Future Tour, several people brought up the idea of coworking and how it can lead to people to learn new things about their spaces as well as engage with others in a physical space. The conversation never evolved into a discussion about promoting the circular economy in local communities. People have discussed the use of libraries and their services as a community center, but have not reflected upon them as stepping stones to create coworking spaces for communities.

MIHI will outline the scoring criteria for all potential BEAD grants in the Initial Proposal. It is expressly stated in the BEAD statute that municipalities are eligible entities for BEAD funding, provided they follow existing state laws associated with municipal broadband networks. MIHI encourages you to review and comment on the Initial Proposal when it is published.

Thanks for your question about online forums. We have had a series of Partnership Roundtables from February to July of this year. Each discussion has focused on topics where we listen to community feedback to best move forward to improve infrastructure and digital equity in our state. They have included important topics like workforce development, digital skills, community anchor institutions, barriers to deploying internet, and how funding should be spent. You can view that information [here](#).

#### **9. SEMCOG: semcog-comments-on-digital-equity-plan---memo\_638276304275118667**

Thank you for your thoughtful and detailed comments. We value the continued support of SEMCOG and the efforts to collaborate on the important work of closing the digital divide. Our alignment of purpose and policies around digital equity is also valued. Additionally, creating more digital opportunities for covered populations that are affordable, available, and accessible is a priority as noted in the Digital Equity Plan.

#### **Affordability**

Exploring creative and sustainable funding models for internet connectivity is key to meeting the needs of covered populations in Michigan. Our goal of 95% adoption includes the consideration of affordable and reliable broadband services. MIHI has partnered with EducationSuperHighway to increase awareness and enrollment of the FCC's Affordable Connectivity Program. Long-term solutions to affordability challenges have been a point of discussion for MIHI very early on. The MIHI team has been able to converse and share ideas with other state broadband leaders, internal and external partners, and the NTIA with the goal of identifying opportunities to sustain the funding. Additional information can be found in the BEAD Five-year Action Plan and the Initial Proposal.

## **Workforce**

MIHI has also partnered with internal agencies and external partners on workforce development, including the Michigan Works! Association, community colleges, adult education providers, and regional/statewide trade skills programs. Additionally, MIHI has identified multiple curriculums with a focus on broadband-related jobs that have been in use by workforce programs. With the emergence of the BIL, there is a focus on developing talent within the state and to create more opportunities for transplants to have broadband-related careers. Contributing to the state's economy in a positive way, via job development throughout the state, will encourage Michiganders to live in the state for years to come.

## **Statewide Digital Navigator Program**

In reference to your feedback on the Statewide Digital Navigator Program, MIHI is aware of other regional structures that may be used as a framework. During the final 10 stops of the MI Connected Future Tour, the Michigan Association of Regions, or regional planning organizations, was mentioned as an alternative framework instead of the State of Michigan Prosperity Regions. SEMCOG's public comment aligns with what we've heard during the final stops of the MI Connected Future Tour. The feedback regarding the Statewide Digital Navigator Program and the use of the Prosperity Regions raised concerns, as the framework prevented some organizations from being eligible for similar programs.

## **10. Visions of Digital Equity by Benton Institute**

Thank you for taking the time to submit your public comment. We agree that leading with equity is imperative to ensure that all voices are heard throughout Michigan and appreciate your sharing Benton's 10 Principles for Digital Equity Visions.

In addition, we would also like to share a bit of how we structured our outreach and data gathering for the Digital Equity Plan. At MIHI, we lead with the mentality of "listen first, plan second." We used this mantra on the road when we traveled to 41 stops throughout the state on our MI Connected Future Tour to listen and collect data from Michiganders. This information was integral in constructing and refining our Digital Equity Plan. We also know that not everyone could attend our listening sessions in person. To be as equitable as possible, we created a "Community Meetings in a Box" that had the same materials for individuals who wanted to host their own meetings in their local communities. For interested parties, we shipped materials including paperwork on how to facilitate a meeting in a box and provided return shipping labels.

We also wanted to hear from community anchor institutions, local community organizations, ISPs, organizations representing covered populations, workforce development groups, and many others. Our office developed Partnership Roundtables that continue to focus on specific topics. They have run from February to July of this year and will continue monthly.

Each discussion has focused on topics where we listen to community feedback to best move forward to improve infrastructure and digital equity in our state. Topics have included workforce development, digital skills, community anchor institutions, barriers to deploying internet, and how funding should be spent. You can view that information [here](#).

#### **11. Comcast Comment: FINAL DRAFT CLEAN\_Comcast Comments on MI Draft Digital Equity Plan\_8.14.2023 (002).docx**

MIHI thanks Comcast for providing a robust and thorough public comment on the draft Digital Equity Plan! MIHI thanks Comcast for the thoughtfulness of the comment. MIHI agrees with many of the points raised in the public comment, particularly surrounding the importance of adoption barrier removal as a crucial aspect of closing the digital divide.

MIHI appreciates the elevation of the adoption barriers, and particularly appreciates learning that Comcast is continuing to invest in both infrastructure and barrier removal. MIHI is excited to see that Comcast is implementing a digital navigator program and is eager to assist with alignment of existing Comcast efforts and proposed MIHI digital equity efforts. Thank you for your comment and your engagement with digital equity initiatives throughout Michigan!

#### **12. Bill Foskett**

“Not only should you be investing in underserved/unserved areas, you should be holding existing communications companies to practices that do not gouge the customer when requesting service in areas that they claim to service. I currently have no broadband service at my home address even though Comcast/Xfinity services the South Haven area including home addresses within 1/4 mile from my house. Xfinity wants to charge me ~\$6000 construction fee up front before providing service (see attachment). In this environment where there is so much grant money available there should be absolutely no reason to charge a customer a construction fee.):

##### **Response:**

Hello,

My name is Daniel Hayes and I work for the Michigan High-Speed Internet Office. Thank you for sharing your comment with us.

We have heard from many individuals while on our MI Connected Future Tour that they have been asked to pay for line extensions to get internet to their homes. We know that this is not equitable and we are working hard to change this as an office. We are excited about the ROBIN and BEAD funds; they will provide a lot of grant money to serve everyone. It should be noted, however, that it will take time for this to happen. There are federal guidelines on how we structure our BEAD capacity grant. Additionally, BEAD infrastructure will not begin construction until late Q3 2025. ROBIN funds will be spent throughout the state, but construction may not be completed in all areas until the end of 2026. ROBIN infrastructure buildouts will only cover areas that receive grant awards.

Lastly, we appreciate your question and think it is essential that every Michigander has access to high-speed internet. Your question is helpful in ensuring that we achieve our mission of having 100% availability of high-speed internet throughout the state. However, your comment is not directly related to MIHI's Digital Equity Plan. For that reason, your comment will not be included in the final copy of our Digital Equity Plan.

### **13. Michigan Cable Telecommunications Association**

MIHI thanks the Michigan Cable Telecommunications Association for providing an insightful public comment on the Michigan Digital Equity plan. MIHI thanks MCTA for their engagement with MIHI on both the BEAD Five-Year Action Plan and the Digital Equity Plan.

MIHI understands and recognizes the importance of an affordable broadband connection at home for middle- and low-income households. MIHI plans to address middle-class affordability options as per requirements from the NTIA as part of the BEAD Initial Proposal. MCTA highlights the Affordable Connectivity Program as an outlet for Michiganders to obtain a subsidy on their internet service plans each month. While MIHI agrees with MCTA about the importance of the ACP on temporary relief, the program has limited funding and is projected to run out of funding by 2024. MIHI aims to find a longer-term solution for middle-class affordability. Many of the other points raised are directly related to the BEAD program, and as such, MIHI encourages MCTA to continue to engage as the Initial Proposal is developed per the BEAD program.

MIHI thanks the MCTA for their comment and engagement for the BEAD and Digital Equity programs.

### **14. MCF Public Comment about cybersecurity**

"I have good access but lack the knowledge I need to make the most of it. What would help is patient, slower explanation of the terms and operation of the system. I want to feel safe and secure using all these devices, but I fear we could be crippled as a nation, in a "NY minute," by cybercrime."

#### **Response:**

Thank you for sharing your public comment. MIHI knows that having high-speed access to the internet is imperative but that if you do not have the tools you need in order to succeed, you will not be as safe or productive as you could be. Our Digital Equity Plan has a key performance indicator called the "Digital Security Score." This score calculates the percentage of people who refrain or do not use the internet at all due to cybersecurity concerns. We will work to decrease these percentages by using Digital Navigators and creating programs and curriculums that will ensure people feel safer using the internet.

## 15. Kerry Stout

“At my home the only internet available is a hotspot on my cell phone, which is quite slow. Because of the many trees, satellite signal isn’t good. Casair came out two years ago and said I had a line of sight to their tower in Big Rapids, but they don’t have capacity to add customers at this time. One half mile from my house Great Lakes Energy ran fiber pole to pole to provide high speed internet to the homes there. I live in Consumers Energy’s area, so nothing available here.”

### **Response:**

Hello, Kerry.

My name is Daniel Hayes and I work for the Michigan High-Speed Internet Office. Thank you for sharing your comment on the lack of availability for high-speed internet at your address in Big Rapids.

MIHI wants to make sure that every Michigander receives high-speed internet service and that all residences will be included on future infrastructure buildouts. We also want to assure you that our Broadband, Equity, Access, and Deployment (BEAD) funding, of which our state was awarded \$1.559 billion, has a federal mandate that we provide service to three types of locations in order of priority before the federal funds are used for any other type of infrastructure construction. These locations are:

1. Unserved: residences with internet below 25Mbps/3Mbps.
2. Underserved: locations with internet between 25Mbps/3Mbps and 100Mbps/20Mbps.
3. Community Anchor Institutions: Community centers and businesses.

What this means is that you and your fellow residents in Big Rapids will receive high-speed internet. One important consideration is that your address must be correctly listed as unserved on the [FCC National Broadband Map](#). I checked on your address on the website and you are currently listed as unserved so there is nothing that currently needs to be done.

Lastly, we appreciate your comment and think it is essential that every Michigander has access to high-speed internet. Your question is helpful in ensuring that we achieve our mission of having 100% availability of high-speed internet throughout the state. However, your comment is not directly related to MIHI’s Digital Equity Plan. For that reason, your comment will not be included in the final copy of our Digital Equity Plan.

If you have any questions or comments, please let me know.

## 16. Randal Keeler

“My wife and I live in a rural area of Gratiot county. She is a school teacher and almost daily works at home grading, lesson plans and communicating with students/parents. It has been extremely difficult to do so because of the lack of high speed internet for our county. We have tried multiple companies but have hit a dead end road due to infrastructure. Any future plans to see that there is a solution would benefit both teachers and students alike. Thank you for taking public comments. Please feel free to contact me for any questions or input!”

**Response:**

Hello, Randall.

My name is Daniel Hayes and I work for the Michigan High-Speed Internet Office. Thank you for sharing your comment on the lack of availability for high-speed internet in Gratiot County.

MIHI wants to make sure that every Michigander receives high-speed internet service and that all residences will be included on future infrastructure buildouts. We have been working to ensure that, as you say, there is a solution that will benefit not just teachers and students but all Michiganders. We also want to assure you that our Broadband, Equity, Access, and Deployment (BEAD) funding, of which our state was awarded \$1.559 billion, has a federal mandate that we provide service to three types of locations in order of priority before the federal funds are used for any other types of infrastructure construction. These locations are:

1. Unserved: residences with internet below 25Mbps/3Mbps.
2. Underserved: locations with internet between 25Mbps/3Mbps and 100Mbps/20Mbps.
3. Community Anchor Institutions: Community centers and businesses.

What this means is that you and your fellow residents in Gratiot County will receive high-speed internet. One important consideration is that your address must be correctly listed as unserved on the FCC National Broadband Map. I am happy to check on this for you if you provide me with your address. [You can also check yourself using this link.](#)

Lastly, we appreciate your comment and think it is essential that every Michigander has access to high-speed internet. Your question is helpful in ensuring that we achieve our mission of having 100% availability of high-speed internet throughout the state. However, your comment is not directly related to MIHI's Digital Equity Plan. For that reason, your comment will not be included in the final copy of our Digital Equity Plan.

If you have any questions or comments, please let me know.

**17. Kathleen Naegele, Taymouth Township**

“Taymouth Township still has several dead zones without internet. It proved to be very frustrating during the pandemic when teachers and students did not have service. I am the director of the local library and I provide hotspots to the public. I currently have four, and they are always checked out. I wish I could afford more, but we have a very small budget.”

**Response:**

Hello, Kathleen.

My name is Daniel Hayes and I work for the Michigan High-Speed Internet Office. Thank you for sharing your comment about the lack of internet service availability in Taymouth Township and the difficulty of providing hot spots for everyone who needs one.

MIHI wants to make sure that every Michigander receives high-speed internet service and that all residences will be included on future infrastructure buildouts. We also want to assure you that our Broadband, Equity, Access, and Deployment (BEAD) funding, of which our state was awarded \$1.559 billion, has a federal mandate that we provide service to three types of locations in order of priority before the federal funds are used for any other types of infrastructure construction. These locations are:

1. Unserved: residences with internet below 25Mbps/3Mbps.
2. Underserved: locations with internet between 25Mbps/3Mbps and 100Mbps/20Mbps.
3. Community Anchor Institutions: Community centers and businesses.

What this means is that you and your fellow residents in Taymouth Township will receive high-speed internet and that we will work to eliminate internet dead zones.

MIHI also cares deeply about ensuring that people have the resources that they need in order to be successful in navigating the internet. We want to thank you for your work as a librarian in helping to close the digital divide and providing service for your patrons.

Lastly, we appreciate your comment and think it is essential that every Michigander has access to high-speed internet. Your question is helpful in ensuring that we achieve our mission of having 100% availability of high-speed internet throughout the state. However, your comment is not directly related to MIHI's Digital Equity Plan. For that reason, your comment will not be included in the final copy of our Digital Equity Plan.

If you have any questions or comments, please let me know.

Warm regards,  
Daniel Hayes

## **18. Clare County Broadband Network Group**

“We are just concerned at a local level as to the eventual broadband builds that occur, may miss a large part of the smaller population numbers such as our county. Building infrastructure is on thing but the massive cost that still waits in the shadows is the end mile hook up. We fear that local governments will continue to be represented to the public as being ultimately responsible for making that end mile build happen no matter what. The cost of doing business as local governments does not allow us to cash match large grant sums of money being offered up. If the end mile build stalls we won't be any better connected in the end than we are now. Thank you, J. Becker Clare County Broadband Network Group”

### **Response:**

Hello, J. Becker.

My name is Daniel Hayes and I work for the Michigan High-Speed Internet Office. Thank you for sharing your comment regarding your concern related to the last-mile connection costs and issues with funding at the local government level.

MIHI wants to make sure that every Michigander receives high-speed internet service and that all residences will be included on future infrastructure buildouts. We also want to assure you that our Broadband, Equity, Access, and Deployment (BEAD) funding, of which our state was awarded \$1.559 billion, has a federal mandate that we provide service to three types of locations in order of priority before the federal funds are used for any other types of infrastructure construction. These locations are:

1. Unserved: residences with internet below 25Mbps/3Mbps.
2. Underserved: locations with internet between 25Mbps/3Mbps and 100Mbps/20Mbps.
3. Community Anchor Institutions: Community centers and businesses.

What this means is that you and your fellow residents in Clare County will receive high-speed internet. We will make sure that the last-mile connections will be put in place.

Lastly, we appreciate your comment and think it is essential that every Michigander has access to high-speed internet. Your question is helpful in ensuring that we achieve our mission of having 100% availability of high-speed internet throughout the state. However, your comment is not directly related to MIHI's Digital Equity Plan. For that reason, your comment will not be included in the final copy of our Digital Equity Plan.

If you have any questions or comments, please let me know.

Warm regards,  
Daniel Hayes

## **19. Bruce Township (Ward Pulfrey)**

“After the preliminary ROBIN grant awards in and around Tri-County Electric Cooperative’s 13 county service territory, I am very pessimistic on BEAD and believe that on our current course Michigan will continue to repeat the broadband sins of the past.

HomeWorks, having not seen a nickel from the State of Michigan for broadband... ever...continues to see private equity and large telecom receive awards in and around its service territory because of matching funds, which I might point out have been procured from decades of previous government subsidies and empty promises (this is the whole reason HomeWorks Connect and electric cooperatives across the state are in the broadband business in the first place). That being said, I would strongly recommend that local not-for-profit cooperative providers receive BEAD award priority within any scoring rubric and that these same organizations are allowed first right of refusal for all performance bonds awarded from private equity and big telecoms failures to execute.

Cooperative’s delivered on this promise in the 1930s with electricity in rural areas and have proved to be one of the only hopes for reliable, resilient and affordable broadband in rural Michigan to date.

I simply ask that MIHI considers my position and the history of rural service and telecom awards in Michigan.”

**Response:**

Hello, Ward.

My name is Daniel Hayes and I work for the Michigan High-Speed Internet Office. Thank you for sharing your comment with us on your frustrations with the ROBIN grant awards as well as your concerns on the upcoming BEAD funding.

MIHI wants to make sure that every Michigander receives high-speed internet service and that all residences will be included on future infrastructure buildouts. We also want to assure you that our Broadband, Equity, Access, and Deployment (BEAD) funding, of which our state was awarded \$1.559 billion, has a federal mandate that we provide service to three types of locations in order of priority before the federal funds are used for any other types of infrastructure construction. These locations are:

1. Unserved: residences with internet below 25Mbps/3Mbps.
2. Underserved: locations with internet between 25Mbps/3Mbps and 100Mbps/20Mbps.
3. Community Anchor Institutions: Community centers and businesses.

Although the scoring criteria for BEAD has not yet been defined, we are in the process of determining the best way to ensure that funds are deployed equitably. Thank you for sharing your perspective on local not-for-profit cooperative providers receiving a priority for BEAD funds. We will take this into consideration.

Lastly, we appreciate your comment and think it is essential that every Michigander has access to high-speed internet. Your question is helpful in ensuring that we achieve our mission of having 100% availability of high-speed internet throughout the state. However, your comment is not directly related to MIHI's Digital Equity Plan. For that reason, your comment will not be included in the final copy of our Digital Equity Plan.

If you have any questions or comments, please let me know.

Warm regards,

Daniel Hayes

**20. William Fazer**

"Last year I was told my home would be part of the new fiber system to be installed by Highline. I was asked to talk to my neighbors about signing up. I did that. This spring Highline installed fiber on the road leading to my home but stopped 1/4 mile away. When I asked when the fiber would be installed to me & my neighbors I was told funding was not provided by MIHI for our area. Obviously my neighbors and I are very disappointed that we were not included. When I attended the Town Forum in Escanaba I was told "you will need to wait until the next round of funding.

I am requesting MIHI include the residents of Veesser Lane in Spading Township for fiber installation by Highline in 2023.

**Response:**

Hello, William.

My name is Daniel Hayes and I work for the Michigan High-Speed Internet Office. Thank you for sharing your comment with us regarding your lack of internet service at your residence.

MIHI wants to make sure that you receive internet service and that your address will be included on future infrastructure buildouts. I checked on your address on the FCC map and you are currently listed as not having high-speed internet service. This is the first step in ensuring that you will receive high-speed internet in the future.

I would also like to share a bit about the programs our office administers. We currently oversee three programs: the Realizing Opportunity with Broadband Infrastructure Networks (ROBIN); Broadband, Equity, Access, and Deployment (BEAD); and the Digital Equity Act. None of these programs has officially awarded money to build out internet infrastructure as of yet. This means that any money ISPs, like Highline, received has not been from programs that our office administers.

ROBIN funds are still awaiting final approval as of this email, and there are no recipients in the Upper Peninsula. The competition for this grant was intense with over 150 applications asking for over \$1.3 billion of funding from the \$238 million that was available. BEAD funds will be used to ensure that your home is served with high-speed internet. We are still waiting to hear more guidance from the federal government and perform due diligence; this will take time. These funds will not be dispersed to build internet infrastructure until at least Q3 2025. Having said that, your home will be included in the buildout and you will receive high-speed internet; we have a federal mandate to ensure that this happens.

Lastly, we appreciate your question and think it is essential that every Michigander has access to high-speed internet. Your question is helpful in ensuring that we achieve our mission of having 100% availability of high-speed internet throughout the state. However, your comment is not directly related to MIHI's Digital Equity Plan. For that reason, your comment will not be included in the final copy of our Digital Equity Plan.

If you have any questions or comments, please let me know.

Warm regards,

Daniel Hayes

## 21. Detroit Digital Justice Coalition: Detroit Community Technology Project

“August 15, 2023

Michigan High-speed Internet Office,

My name is Katie Hearn and I serve as the Director of the Detroit Community Technology Project (DCTP) and represent the Detroit Digital Justice Coalition, or DDJC, which has served as the blueprint for the hundreds of similar coalitions that have taken root across the U.S. over the last five years. Our organizing principles of access, participation, healthy communities, and common ownership have been adopted and adapted globally. Additionally, our popular education curriculum for Digital Stewardship first piloted in Detroit over a decade ago has directly informed similar organizing models for healing the Digital Divide, including the Digital Navigators model featuring prominently in the drafted plan.

At many points, the drafted plan mentions the importance of creative engagement with covered communities, partnership with organizations already providing solutions in the field, and the explicit focus of equitable removal of barriers to participation or employment for folks like our all-women Digital Stewards team serving Southwest Detroit with both digital literacy trainings and affordable Internet provision.

First, we are in full agreement that “collaboration with organizations and agencies that are comprised of, or represent covered populations are also imperative to the success of the DEA and BEAD alignment and implementation.” Though it is stated that MIHI continues to collaborate with and learn from organizations who serve covered populations, there is no mention of how or for how long.

Articulating how such collaborations are conducted, and whether community collaborators are expected to participate or consult for free and without attribution may be important details that impact planning and budgeting. Along these lines, there is great emphasis throughout the plan on inter-agency collaboration. Of course, this type of coordination is vital, but it should not take the place of testing and innovating via further engagement with practitioners on the ground.

Be it through community engagement, consultation contracts, or the endowment mentioned in the plan, specificity regarding equitable engagement, get specific on how Michiganders won't be edged out by Californian transplants.

Next, while I understand that funding timelines may make this difficult, navigators should be in place as soon as possible to meet adoption goals, particularly if the focus for the navigators is in areas hardest hit by the decades-running Digital Divide. From our experience in training Digital Stewards, the navigator role is the baseline. Consider training and professional development needs for the navigators, and whether you are planning to employ a corps large enough to effectively steward a multi-prong role across many constituents without burnout.

(could not submit phone number using form)”

**Response:**

Thank you for taking the time to review and provide feedback on MIHI's Digital Equity Plan. As part of the MIConnectedFuture tour, one of the key aspects was the Partnership Roundtable discussions, during which obstacles and barriers of broadband deployment and adoption were discussed and participants were asked to share their thoughts and ideas regarding digital equity, focusing on device access, digital skills and proficiency, affordability, relevance/awareness, and inclusivity. The Partnership Roundtables will continue throughout the implementation phase of the plan and MCTA is encouraged to continue participation in these discussions. We appreciate your feedback and will take your comment into consideration as we finalize our plan.

MIHI is committed to creating a comprehensive and equitable plan that serves the needs of all its residents, and we value your input as we work toward achieving this goal.

**22. NPower**

"Thank you for sharing your most recent draft of the State of Michigan's Highspeed Internet Office Digital Plan. On behalf of NPower it is my privilege to offer our public comment and support of this comprehensive plan for impact.

"The greatness of a state lies not only in the businesses it attracts or the revenue it generates but, more importantly, in the quality of life it provides its citizens. It's clear to see that Michigan's philosophy prioritizes the well-being of its residents. This understanding is at the heart of our appreciation for the digital action plan in Michigan.

Digital equity, where individuals and communities possess the information technology capacity necessary for comprehensive participation in society, extends beyond affordable and reliable broadband. It encompasses access to internet-connected devices, the digital literacy skills to use them effectively, and access to quality technical support. It is not a luxury but a vital necessity.

A glaring gap exists where some members of our society are deprived of broadband access, a foundational pillar of digital equity. At NPower, we are focused on transforming this digital divide into a talent tide in our region. The plan's commitment to expanding high-speed broadband infrastructure to unserved and underserved areas, and to increasing digital skills aligns perfectly with our mission and core values. As an active player in this sector, NPower is poised to assist in implementing various facets of this comprehensive action plan.

The Digital Action Plan is more than building infrastructure; it's about creating an infrastructure with equity at its core. It's about creating opportunities for individuals to gain the necessary skills for a future that is increasingly powered by technology. It's about transforming lives by providing careers in technology, and equipping individuals with the resources needed to seize opportunities in the tech sector.

With regards to the Barriers and Assets section of the document, NPower Michigan should be included to partnership asset in the region. Our partnership with Human IT, fuel the talent for a community helpdesk for citizens in Metro Detroit, along with commitment to providing no cost workforce training in the tech sector and job placement, among the priority populations mentioned in the plan.

The Digital Equity Plan represents a significant stride towards achieving digital equity. It promises a future where access to quality, reliable internet is a birthright, not a privilege. This journey towards becoming a more digitally equitable state is not a distant dream but a reality unfolding. With anticipation, we look forward to the profound impact this will have on the lives of Michiganders and the wider community, propelling us all into a more connected and inclusive future.”

Moreover, we stand as a willing and able partner, ready to help foster connectivity, equity and opportunity in creating a better Michigan for all.

In partnership,

Jose”

**Response:**

Thank you for taking the time to review and provide feedback on MIHI’s Digital Equity Plan. We encourage you to complete the survey to add your organization to the Digital Inclusion Resource Map. Please complete the survey by Wednesday, September 6, to be included in the final Digital Equity Plan.

MIHI is committed to creating a comprehensive and equitable plan that serves the needs of all its residents, and we value your input as we work toward achieving this goal.

**23. Michigan Department of Education**

“On page 9 of the draft plan, the MIHI “aims to incorporate digital skills standards and competencies into K-12 education settings”. The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) would welcome MIHI’s support of the department’s ongoing efforts to seamlessly integrate digital skills curriculum across K-12 instruction, especially at the K-8 level. MDE’s Michigan Integrated Technology Competencies for Students (MiTeCS) is a set of competencies first developed by the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE). Michigan schools have used the MiTeCS as a guide for integration of digital skills and technology literacy for students across K-8. The Regional Educational Media Center Association of Michigan (REMC) also provide resources to support K-12 educators and students in integration of digital literacy and technological skills instruction. Educators can receive micro credentialing through REMC.org in Design and Computational Thinking for Computer Science, Digital Literacy and Citizenship, and Using Open Educational Resources for Teaching and Learning. Content for students includes 21Things4Students, “an online resource to help students improve their technology proficiency as they prepare for success in the real world. Teachers value 21Things4Students because it’s experiential, relevant, applicable and adaptable.”

MDE applauds the work of the MIHI and welcomes the opportunity to continue collaborative activities that improve educational outcomes for all students.”

**Response:**

Thank you for taking the time to review and provide feedback on MIHI’s Digital Equity Plan. We have incorporated the description provided by the Michigan Department of Education into the updated plan.

MIHI is committed to creating a comprehensive and equitable plan that serves the needs of all its residents, and we value your input as we work towards achieving this goal.

**24. Wende Randall**

“Regarding the Goals and Strategies: I would like to see partnership with community-based non-profits added for the digital skills development portion of this strategy.

“Improve educational attainment including removing barriers for credentialed workers and in postsecondary achievement”

“Collaborate and partner with Michigan Department of Education to elevate online learning opportunities and additional pathways to digital skills development for adults””

**Response:**

Thank you for taking the time to review and provide feedback on MIHI’s Digital Equity Plan. MIHI is seeking clarification from our federal partners regarding the option to place additional focus on building partnerships and collaborations with various stakeholders to implement digital inclusion activities at the local level effectively, including community-based nonprofits. The Digital Navigators outlined in the plan would serve to facilitate partnerships with community-based nonprofits. We appreciate your feedback and will take your comment into consideration as we finalize our plan. MIHI is committed to creating a comprehensive and equitable plan that serves the needs of all its residents, and we value your input as we work toward achieving this goal.

**25. Anonymous Public Comment**

“I am commenting with the hope of drawing attention to the serious of amount of resources and collaboration necessary to bridge the digital divide for incarcerated individuals. While I see they are noted as a “covered population,” I did not see anything about plans to work with MDOC or local jails on what any solutions might look like or when they would be implemented. For many reasons, this is a group that poses a lot of logistical considerations when we talk about internet access. This is also a group with a lot of opportunity to benefit - and better serving incarcerated individuals can translate to less recidivism and therefore decreased public service spending long-term, safer communities, stronger families, etc. As more public services convert to digital platforms for interaction, we CANNOT leave this population behind. Thank you for consideration.”

**Response:**

Thank you for taking the time to review and provide feedback on MIHI's Digital Equity Plan. The Digital Equity Plan identified asset gaps for several covered populations, including incarcerated individuals, and MIHI is committed to addressing the digital asset gaps that impact this population while prioritizing removing the obstacles and barriers related to digital equity. We encourage you to complete the survey to add additional resources supporting incarcerated individuals to the Digital Inclusion Resource Map. Please complete the survey by Wednesday, September 6, to be included in the final Digital Equity Plan.

MIHI is committed to creating a comprehensive and equitable plan that serves the needs of all its residents, and we value your input as we work toward achieving this goal.

**26. AT&T Michigan (Jason Bigelow)**

"A few points of concerns regarding the building of the infrastructure. The 1st would be reasonable permitting fees across the state. The 2nd would be attachment charges for existing aerial pole leads, runs by pole owners. Adherence the National Electric Safety Codes. 3rd Owners being responsible for creating and keeping accurate and usable records of what infrastructure they build and are responsible to maintain. In the interest of public safety and low impact to creating blight in public ROWs, it is my believe all 3 of these items are necessary to ensure public safety, eliminate or lower a negative impact to property values and create an environment in which if we have a disaster restoral of services will be quick, if necessary, at all. I realize that this office may not have authority over the public service commission, but any influence or pressure that could be brought to bear on the MPSC, as they could and should play an important role in making sure that the 1,559,362,479 and 29 cents :) worth of broadband allocation gets built safely and can provide reliable service for generations to come."

**Response:**

Thank you for taking the time to review and provide feedback on MIHI's Digital Equity Plan. The BEAD Five-Year Action Plan includes plans to address barriers relating to permitting, pole attachments, safety, and the reliability of infrastructure. We appreciate your feedback and will take your comment into consideration as we finalize our plan. MIHI is committed to creating a comprehensive and equitable plan that serves the needs of all its residents, and we value your input as we work toward achieving this goal.

## 27. Shirley Thomas

“In order for this program to be seen as an investment it must be protected as all valid investments are. Cyber-security should be a class in schools. Knowing how many deadly webpages are on the internet should increase cyber security spending. In order to protect our future (the children) we must make the internet safer regardless of what devices they use.

Most schools and families do as much as they can to safeguard children. It’s time that internet companies afford that software in their accounts even for those receiving discounted services. Cyber security is not for the faint in internet skills.”

### **Response:**

Thank you for taking the time to review and provide feedback on MIHI’s Digital Equity Plan. MIHI is planning to partner with the Michigan Department of Education to promote digital skills competencies among K-12 students. Cybersecurity is emphasized as an important component of the digital skills competency curriculum. We appreciate your feedback and will take your comment into consideration as we finalize our plan.

MIHI is committed to creating a comprehensive and equitable plan that serves the needs of all its residents, and we value your input as we work toward achieving this goal.

## 28. Christina Potts

“I believe the way the affordable connectivity program was so quite when it first started was wrong.”

### **Response:**

Thank you for taking the time to review and provide feedback on MIHI’s Digital Equity Plan. One of MIHI’s planned activities in the Five-Year Action Plan is to support smaller ISPs, advocacy organizations, and other similar stakeholders with technical assistance to provide low-cost service (including ACP) through information and application support. For more information on MIHI’s plans for low-cost service, please reference the BEAD Five-Year Action Plan. We appreciate your feedback and will take your comment into consideration as we finalize our plan.

MIHI is committed to creating a comprehensive and equitable plan that serves the needs of all its residents, and we value your input as we work toward achieving this goal.

## 29. Jim Busch

“For future BEAD applications would recommend that the organization submitting the BEAD application receive a letter of engagement from the local government. This letter would serve a two fold purpose.

1. Would provide notification to the local government that a grant application is being submitted for an area within their boundaries.
2. Would help create engagement between the local government and the organization requesting the BEAD grant.”

**Response:**

Thank you for taking the time to review and provide feedback on MIHI's Digital Equity Plan. The subgrantee selection process for broadband infrastructure projects through the BEAD program has not been initiated at this time. We urge you to submit a public comment on the BEAD Initial Proposal Volumes I and II once published. We appreciate your feedback.

MIHI is committed to creating a comprehensive and equitable plan that serves the needs of all community members, and we value your input as we work toward achieving this goal.

**30. Anonymous Public Comment**

"Would the grant process consider having special criteria for small business when applying for the grant?"

**Response:**

Thank you for taking the time to review and provide feedback on MIHI's Digital Equity Plan. The criteria for the Digital Equity Capacity Building Grant Program and Digital Equity Competitive Grant Program is currently in development. As the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) releases additional information and guidance on the programs, we will work on developing the criteria along with other considerations required. We appreciate your feedback and will take your comment into consideration as we finalize our plan. MIHI is committed to creating a comprehensive and equitable plan that serves the needs of all its residents, and we value your input as we work toward achieving this goal.

**31. Dennis Hock**

"I am not sure if this isn't already being looked into but I feel that having just one Community College teaching basic Fiber Installation may not be enough. In order to make it easier for potential students to attend I think several community colleges should be engaged.

I also believe we should be doing more right now have a program that addresses the high school student as choosing a career in this broadband field. These will offer good jobs with a long term stability. First we should endeavor to make sure the school systems are aware of and received some training that will allow them to impart this to the student. An alternative would be to have representatives come in from MIHI and some ISPs to do a sort of career day.

A big shock for me was learning that FBA in doing testing with the school systems in NC is finding a large disinterest by the students in pursuing this career. As I was told they want to have their Tik Tok and such but show little interest in what makes it work. That is very sad.

Finally being 70 and having spent 36 years in telecom I still easily understand the nuances of Passive Optical Network and Single Fiber Working which allows the building of very fast and modern broadband. But as a consumer user I don't know how to properly manipulate say EXcel except for the very basics. So I would foresee that there should be classes offered at little or nothing to encourage seniors to attend and learn about what the internet can do better for them. This could take the form of roving training that go from anchor institute to anchor inssttinue so that attendeds would n't have to travel very far. Conversley they could be had at our local community colleges such as SC4.

I am looking forward to learning more and becoming even more comfortable with the technology.”

**Response:**

Thank you for taking the time to review and provide feedback on MIHI's Digital Equity Plan. MIHI is currently working toward expanding the broadband skilled trades workforce through partnerships with industry leaders and community colleges. MIHI is planning to partner with the Michigan Department of Education to promote digital skills competencies among K-12 students. Additionally, a key goal of Michigan's plan to bridge the digital divide is to ensure all individuals, including aging individuals, have the resources needed to utilize the internet in a productive and impactful manner. We appreciate your feedback and will take your comment into consideration as we finalize our plan. MIHI is committed to creating a comprehensive and equitable plan that serves the needs of all its residents, and we value your input as we work toward achieving this goal.

**32. Michele Howard**

“Please consider libraries as a main partner for staff and grants to teach digit tools as digital navigators. Libraries have been teach the public important digital and non-digital skills for a century. Libraries are trusted and proven public resources for information.”

**Response:**

Thank you for taking the time to review and provide feedback on MIHI's Digital Equity Plan. MIHI has existing partnerships with the statewide library network and plans to expand upon the relationship as part of our digital equity implementation plan. We encourage you to complete the survey to add the Traverse Area District Library to the Digital Inclusion Resource Map. Please complete the survey by Wednesday, September 6, to be included in the final Digital Equity Plan. We appreciate your feedback and will take your comment into consideration as we finalize our plan. MIHI is committed to creating a comprehensive and equitable plan that serves the needs of all its residents, and we value your input as we work toward achieving this goal.

### 33. Mark Shelden

“It is obvious that this plan is well thought out. However, I’m concerned that it doesn’t adequately address the problem and the potential for access to high speed broadband internet to residents in apartment buildings. Adoption among that population is particularly low and a plan to address that is going to be necessary to attain the 95% statewide adoption goal.”

#### **Response:**

Thank you for taking the time to review and provide feedback on MIHI’s Digital Equity Plan. To ensure that every resident in Michigan has access to a reliable, affordable, high-speed broadband connection, the state is proposing to consider last-mile broadband deployment projects that will provide access to every unit within BEAD-eligible multi-dwelling units (MDUs) and will not consider last-mile broadband deployment projects that only provide access to the broadband serviceable locations (BSLs). For more detailed information on the proposed plans to address these areas, please refer to the BEAD Initial Proposal Volume I once available for public comment.

MIHI is committed to creating a comprehensive and equitable plan that serves the needs of all its residents, and we value your input as we work toward achieving this goal.

### 34. Ronald Evans

“The plan should more explicitly define the how and when for providing access to high speed broadband across the state since it was identified as the number one need. The Time Line on page 69 should better define the stages of the high speed broadband infrastructure placement.”

#### **Response:**

Thank you for taking the time to review and provide feedback on MIHI’s Digital Equity Plan. The timeline has been revised to include more detail about the timing of key activities from the Implementation Strategy. For information on the timeline of broadband deployment, please refer to the BEAD Five-Year Action Plan.

MIHI is committed to creating a comprehensive and equitable plan that serves the needs of all community members, and we value your input as we work toward achieving this goal.

### **35. Petoskey District Library**

“The Petoskey District Library has been providing digital literacy to our residents for many years. We currently provide classes on software and applications as well as an Apple users group. We also provide one-on-one, walk-in training for usage of individual devices. Our library is well situated to house or be a digital navigator since we are already providing those services. The Petoskey District Library is a trusted source for the community and is well situated to partner with the MIHI initiative. Please consider utilizing the already community centered public libraries as a hub for your initiative.”

Thank you for taking the time to review and provide feedback on MIHI’s Digital Equity Plan. We encourage you to complete the survey to add the Petoskey Digital Library to the Digital Inclusion Resource Map. Please complete the survey by Wednesday, September 6th to be included in the final Digital Equity Plan.

MIHI is committed to creating a comprehensive and equitable plan that serves the needs of all its residents, and we value your input as we work toward achieving this goal.”

### **36. Northland Library Cooperative (Linda Adams)**

“Public libraries in Michigan have been providing digital literacy education, one-on-one technical support, and device support for over 20 years to Michigan residents. As an anchor institution in every part of Michigan, we are the trusted educators on all areas of digital literacy. We help people when they walk through the door and need help with a device or are frustrated by a technology issue. We offer classes on how to use a computer, a cellular phone, how to search the internet, cybersecurity, and how to use a variety of software applications. We offer private spaces and the hardware for telehealth calls, for working remotely, and for doing online training for future workforce development. These services are offered to all as a means to equitable access and skills. Libraries serve the underrepresented, under-invested and underserved people in our communities. Librarians, as part of the Michigan Department of Education, are and have been the digital navigators in Michigan. We are the established resource. People trust us.

In northern Michigan, the Northland Library Cooperative has partnered with Great Lake Energy in the current ROBIN Grant program. That grant proposal has been reviewed and is in the comment phase. It includes two pilot projects with the Kalkaska and Otsego libraries. The money will be used to expand digital literacy education to new users of broadband services.

As the Digital Equity Plan is implemented, place the Digital Navigators in public libraries. They can build on our infrastructure, experience, and the trust of Michigan residents.”

**Response:**

Thank you for taking the time to review and provide feedback on MIHI’s Digital Equity Plan. MIHI has existing partnerships with the statewide library network and plans to expand upon the relationship as part of our digital equity implementation plan. We appreciate your feedback and will take your comment into consideration as we finalize our plan. MIHI is committed to creating a comprehensive and equitable plan that serves the needs of all its residents, and we value your input as we work toward achieving this goal.

**37. Amy DeHaan**

“You’ve omitted Prosperity Region 2 in your Digital Equity Profile.”

**Response:**

Thank you for taking the time to review and provide feedback on MIHI’s Digital Equity Plan. We have updated the plan to include Prosperity Region Two. MIHI is committed to creating a comprehensive and equitable plan that serves the needs of all its residents, and we value your input as we work toward achieving this goal.

**38. Bob Suess**

“The plan states: “The ability to reside anywhere in the state and not worry about access to high quality and reliable internet service.”

What about those areas where residents don’t want or need access to internet service?

One of the most attractive aspects of ‘Pure Michigan’ is those undeveloped areas unspoiled by modern civilization and technology where people go to escape from society and to be at one with nature. Many citizens have intentionally invested in remote cabin/camps/sites in order to get away from it all. At these cabins/camps there are no public utilities - no electricity, no water, no sewers, no telephones, etc. - and citizens have purchased these remote rustic sites not despite, but because, there are no utilities. Now these citizens/residents are being forced to accept the installation of fiber optics for internet service in their pristine environments when there is no want or need for it. Why are taxpayer dollars being wasted and why is big government imposing its will on individual citizens who have consciously invested their hard-earned dollars in remote rustic sites in order to unplug from modern society and enjoy the quiet solitude of nature?”

**Response:**

Thank you for taking the time to review and provide feedback on MIHI’s Digital Equity Plan. We appreciate your feedback and will take your comment into consideration as we finalize our plan. MIHI is committed to creating a comprehensive and equitable plan that serves the needs of all its residents, and we value your input as we work toward achieving this goal.

### **39. HomeWorks Tri-County Electric Cooperative (Christopher O’Neill)**

“After the preliminary ROBIN grant awards in and around Tri-County Electric Cooperative’s 13 county service territory, I am very pessimistic on BEAD and believe that on our current course Michigan will continue to repeat the broadband sins of the past.

HomeWorks, having not seen a nickel from the State of Michigan for broadband... ever...continues to see private equity and large telecom receive awards in and around its service territory because of matching funds, which I might point out have been procured from decades of previous government subsidies and empty promises (this is the whole reason HomeWorks Connect and electric cooperatives across the state are in the broadband business in the first place). That being said, I would strongly recommend that local not-for-profit cooperative providers receive BEAD award priority within any scoring rubric and that these same organizations are allowed first right of refusal for all performance bonds awarded from private equity and big telecoms failures to execute.

Cooperative’s delivered on this promise in the 1930s with electricity in rural areas and have proved to be one of the only hopes for reliable, resilient and affordable broadband in rural Michigan to date.

I simply ask that MIHI considers my position and the history of rural service and telecom awards in Michigan.”

#### **Response:**

Thank you for taking the time to review and provide feedback on MIHI’s Digital Equity Plan. The BEAD program includes plans to address barriers related to the reliability of infrastructure. For more information on BEAD, please refer to the [Five-Year Action Plan](#).

MIHI is committed to creating a comprehensive and equitable plan that serves the needs of all its residents, and we value your input as we work toward achieving this goal.

### **40. Teresa (Tracy) Muscat Lareau**

“Would you please include Prosperity Region Two in the document. There is no detailed information for this Region and we know that we are a rural community that is deeply underserved in areas of it and I want to ensure that it is represented and covered. See pages 47 - 48.”

#### **Response:**

Thank you for taking the time to review and provide feedback on MIHI’s Digital Equity Plan. We have updated the plan to include Prosperity Region Two. MIHI is committed to creating a comprehensive and equitable plan that serves the needs of all its residents, and we value your input as we work toward achieving this goal.

## 41. Christopher Abbott

“I commend the Michigan High-Speed Internet Office (MIHI) for its proactive efforts to bridge the digital divide across our state. As we contemplate potential solutions, it’s crucial that we strive not only to provide high-speed internet access but also to shape an inclusive tech ecosystem.

Despite considerable strides toward diversifying the tech workforce, we continue to witness a pronounced underrepresentation of minority-owned tech enterprises. Our Black, Hispanic, and Native American communities, who constitute a significant share of our population, are disproportionately absent in tech leadership roles. This underrepresentation represents a missed opportunity to incorporate diverse perspectives that could foster innovation and advance equity in our tech landscape.

In our quest to alleviate our state’s broadband challenges, we should learn from successful models implemented nationwide. Time and again, local and regional Internet Service Providers (ISPs) have outshone their larger counterparts in service quality, availability, and affordability. These smaller ISPs, often spearheaded by community members themselves, are frequently the sole service providers in numerous remote areas. Their profound understanding of local needs and challenges uniquely qualifies them to devise targeted solutions for their communities.

As such, I strongly advocate for MIHI to dedicate a substantial portion of the available funding towards nurturing the growth of local and regional ISPs. This approach would not only help surmount the immediate broadband accessibility barriers but also present a unique opportunity to propel minority ownership and leadership in these emergent service providers.

Establishing smaller, community-oriented ISPs requires minimal initial investment, particularly in regions where the dark fiber infrastructure is already laid but underexploited. The benefits of this approach extend beyond enhanced internet access; these ISPs can act as catalysts for both technological advancement and social equity. They can generate local employment opportunities, offer well-paying jobs, and equip our underserved and marginalized communities with transferable skill sets, thereby fostering economic empowerment.

By seizing this dual opportunity, we can ensure that our tech industry mirrors the diversity of the communities it serves and paves the way for a more equitable digital future. Therefore, let us make a concerted effort to support the growth of local ISPs, boost minority representation in tech leadership, and create meaningful economic opportunities for all Michiganders.”

### **Response:**

Thank you for taking the time to review and provide feedback on MIHI’s Digital Equity Plan. We appreciate your feedback and will take your comment into consideration as we finalize our plan. MIHI is committed to creating a comprehensive and equitable plan that serves the needs of all its residents, and we value your input as we work toward achieving this goal.

## A-4 Appendix 4

### A-4.1 MIHI Tribal Consultation Invitation, Agenda, and Participation List



STATE OF MICHIGAN

GRETCHEN  
GOVERNOR

WHITMER DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY LANSING

SUSAN CORBIN DIRECTOR

May 2, 2023

[Address Line 1]

[Address Line 2]

Dear [Name]:

On behalf of the Michigan High-Speed Internet Office (MIHI), I am announcing a Tribal Consultation regarding the Broadband Equity, Access, and Deployment Act (BEAD) and the Digital Equity Act (DEA), both programs established by the infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, Public Law 117-58 (IIJA).

The BEAD program is designed to expand high-speed internet access by funding planning, infrastructure deployment, and adoption programs. The DEA program targets digital equity and inclusion and aims to ensure that all people and communities have the skills, technology, and capacity needed to reap the full benefits of the digital economy.

As you are likely aware, Michigan is projected to be allocated more than \$1.6 billion in funding through BEAD and DEA. MIHI has been identified as the agency responsible for developing the Five-Year Action Plan (for BEAD) and the Digital Equity Plan (for DEA) that Michigan will submit to the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) to secure these funds, and I am committed to ensuring that your input informs both of these plans.

At the direction of Governor Whitmer and Lieutenant Governor Gilchrist, MIHI's work focuses on the pursuit of digital equity as defined through two key goals:

- Ensure that high-speed internet access is available to every home, business, institution, and community within Michigan
- Ensure that 95% of households in Michigan adopt a permanent home internet connection. I am inviting you and/or a Tribal representative(s) with your delegation of authority to participate in a Tribal Consultation to provide your advice and insights as MIHI staff are working through critical issues related to BEAD and DEA.

As you may know, MIHI staff will be attending the United Tribes of Michigan meeting on June 1st to provide a short presentation regarding BEAD and DEA and, should you wish to meet in person following that presentation to share your thoughts with MIHI or to pose questions, we are happy to schedule time with you either on that date or on June 2nd.

In addition, I respectfully invite your participation in a Tribal Consultation session:

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Date</b>                        | June 15, 2023   |
| <b>Time</b>                        | 10:00 am EDT - 12:30 pm EDT                             |
| <b>Virtual Meeting Link</b>        | <a href="http://bitly.ws/DQy7">http://bitly.ws/DQy7</a> |
| <b>Call In Meeting Information</b> | +1 248-509-0316<br>Conference ID: 706 079 775#          |

In the event you would prefer to attend in person, as we would be honored to host you at the MIHI offices in the Department of Labor and Economic Opportunity’s Landmark Office Building in Lansing.

If the above options are not convenient for you and you would like to meet with MIHI on another date, please contact us so that we may find a mutually convenient time as soon as possible.

Written comments can be submitted to <mailto:LEO-MIHighSpeedInternet@michigan.gov> by June 16, 2023, at 5:00 pm Eastern Daylight Time.


- What are key considerations regarding digital equity for Tribal nations?
- How should MIHI work with Tribal nations to identify unserved areas, underserved areas, and Community Anchor Institutions for inclusion among areas and institutions eligible for funding to expand high-speed internet deployment?
- What broadband deployment and/or digital equity projects within Tribal nations should MIHI be aware of, and how should MIHI seek opportunities to coordinate with these projects? Do you have your own build-out and/or digital equity plan and, if so, would you be willing to share it/them?
- As MIHI moves forward toward preparing the Five-Year Action Plan and Digital Equity Plan in the coming weeks, how should we collaborate with Tribal nations on those plans?

Additional information about the BEAD and DEA grant programs created by the IJA can be found at <https://broadbandusa.ntia.doc.gov>. Additional information about MIHI can be found at <https://www.michigan.gov/leo/bureaus-agencies/mihi>.

If you have any questions regarding MIHI, the development of BEAD or DEA plans in Michigan, or these consultation sessions, you may contact Eric Frederick, (517) 230-8510 or [FrederickE1@michigan.gov](mailto:FrederickE1@michigan.gov). I look forward to our consultation and government-to-government engagements with Tribal leaders who are working to close the digital divide. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Susan Corbin, Director



Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Opportunity

The Tribal Consultation Meeting took place on Thursday, June 15, 2023. The meeting agenda was as follows:

- Introduction to MIHI
- Introduction to BEAD Act
- Consultation (Discussion)

Additionally, the tribes that participated include the following:

- Bay Mills Indian Community
- Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians
- Keweenaw Bay Indian Community
- Match-e-be-nash-she-wish Band of Potawatomi Indians
- Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan
- Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians

## A-5 Appendix 5

### A-5.1 Tribal Consultation Notes

**Event: Michigan High-Speed Internet Office Tribal Consultation**

**Date: June 15, 2023**

**10am-12:30pm**

**Location: Microsoft Teams**

\* Note that several MIHI staff and NTIA staff will participate in the Consultation from the Landmark Office Building (105 West Allegan Street in Lansing). However, as of June 14, no Tribal representatives have indicated that they will attend in person.

**Staff attending:**

- Susan Corbin, Director of LEO (virtual)
- Poppy Sias-Hernandez, LEO Tribal Liaison (virtual)
- Eric Frederick, MIHI (Landmark Building)
- Allie Herkenroder, MIHI (Landmark Building)
- Jessica Randall, MIHI (Landmark Building)—will moderate the meeting
- Daniel Hayes, MIHI (virtual)—attending to take notes
- Jessica Robinson, MIHI (virtual)—attending to take notes
- Ben Fineman, NTIA Federal Program Officer for Michigan (Landmark Building)
- Theron Rutyna, NTIA Midwest Tribal Federal Program Officer (Landmark Building)

**Tribal Attendees:**

- Larry Jacques—Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians
- Adam Garrison—Gun Lake Tribe
- Brandon—Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan
- Brianna Gunka—Bay Mills Indian Community
- Eric Sprague—COO, Gun Lake Tribe
- Jacob Brown—Bay Mills Indian Community
- Jake Smith—IT director, Gun Lake Tribe
- George McClellan—IT director for Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians
- John Potesky—attorney for Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians
- Dave Zasadnyj—Keweenaw Bay Indian Community

***Purpose/Goal: Open government-to-government dialogue to encourage productive partnership around implementation of the Broadband Equity, Access, and Deployment Act (BEAD Act) and the Digital Equity Act (DEA Act), and, by doing so, fulfill the Tribal Consultation requirements contained within the BEAD Act and DEA Act***

***Run of show: Note: It is our goal that this be a fluid discussion that responds to the priorities raised and topics opened by the Tribal representatives. It is possible that the questions listed below could be addressed in a different order, that one or more may not be directly discussed at all, and/or that Tribal representatives may have additional topics they wish to raise.***

- 9:55: JESSICA RANDALL opens the virtual meeting room.
- 10:01: JESSICA thanks everyone who has joined the meeting and invites a Tribal representative to offer an invocation.
- Invocation.
- JESSICA thanks the invocator and turns to DIRECTOR CORBIN for welcoming comments.
- DIRECTOR CORBIN offers brief (no more than 2 minutes) welcome that acknowledges the importance of the Consultation to the Department of Labor and Economic Opportunity and her appreciation for the Tribal representatives' willingness to join this discussion, as well as hope that this is only the first of an ongoing government-to-government dialogue regarding the BEAD Act and DEA. DIRECTOR CORBIN invites POPPY SIAS-HERNANDEZ to offer comments next.
- POPPY offers brief (no more than 2 minutes) welcome that expresses excitement about the Consultation and echoes Director Corbin's hopes regarding the potential for ongoing dialogue. POPPY invites ERIC FREDERICK to offer comments next.
- ERIC provides a brief (no more than 2 minutes) welcome that echoes the seriousness and excitement with which MIHI has prepared for the Consultation. His comments also place the Consultation in context of MIHI's work:
  - We have recently completed a series of "listening session" style meetings in 31 communities around the state, as part of the MI Connected Future planning process.
  - We firmly believe in "listening first" and that people know their own communities best—which is to say, we believe that these Tribal representatives know their own Tribes' needs best and we hope to learn in this Consultation and in future conversations how we can partner together to respond to those needs.

- ERIC invites BEN FINEMAN to introduce himself next.
- BEN offers a brief introduction that explains his role at NTIA and invites THERON RUTYNA to introduce himself.
- THERON does so, then invites JESSICA to introduce herself.
- JESSICA does, then turns to ALLIE HERKENRODER.
- ALLIE introduces herself and her team members (DANIEL HAYES and JESSICA ROBINSON).
- JESSICA invites Tribal representatives to introduce themselves and identify which Tribe they are representing.
- JESSICA makes a brief (no more than 5 minutes) presentation that provides background information on the BEAD Act and DEA Act, then opens discussion that she will moderate for the remainder of the meeting. The following questions have been provided in advance to Tribal representatives:
- **What are key considerations regarding digital equity for Tribal nations?**
  - **Larry:** What is the timeline? Will the Tribes have a period to edit and make comments before the public comment period?
    - **Jess Randall:** Yes, and this conversation will be incorporated into the plan. MIHI will do its best to show it to Tribes first but cannot guarantee.
    - **Eric:** We want to make sure that we get a draft plan in front of you and everyone else who wants to comment as well. Today we really want to listen to what should be in that plan. The BEAD Action Plan lays out something in a very hierarchical plan that will drive the policy and implementation of the plan. What else can we do to make sure that this part of the BEAD program is successful? We're in the middle of that and we're getting ready to draft the plan, but we want your feedback now to draft the plan. Specifically, the vision, goals, objectives, and strategies will benefit from Tribal input.
    - **Larry:** So, we are going to see the comments at the same time as the general public. Is that correct?
    - **Jess Randall:** As soon as the plan is ready, we will circulate it to you. We hear that you will want to see it first and we will do our best. But, timelines are quite tight.

- **Jess Randall:** What else should we elevate as a part of the collaboration efforts?
  - **Larry:** MIHI has done a great job in sharing timelines; is there something that folks can take back to the leadership of their Tribes to show updates on critical path? Charts or something?
  - **Jess:** We're going to initiate the public comment period on July 10. Drafts will therefore be available no later than that date. We are planning to submit our plan August 23, 2023, and will fill in additional dates to share with Tribes.
  - **Jake Smith:** I think when it comes to the reasons that we have applied for or have not applied for funding in the past, a lot of it comes down to two things: 1. Do we have the rights or are we forced into collaboration? and 2. How many strings are attached to the funding? In the past, things were unclear and open-ended. A lot of it comes down to, if we're going to engage with you guys, previous to the Middle Mile Program that was done, do we have the authority to make these decisions in the future?
    - **Jess:** Can you speak to your concerns so that we can understand.
    - **Jake:** We're looking hundreds of years down the road and how we behave with this resource. How do we best steward our land? How do we make sure that these communities are built up and function over time? We could have plans that are public vs. non-public. Thus, there needs to be a little "we make the decisions" and a little less "fewer strings attached." I can't sit on a call and divulge the next 100 years of our planning. What kind of strings are attached to the dollars determines if we are able to engage or not? But, we're not going to communicate the specifics with you. We're going to tell you that we cannot engage though.
    - **Eric:** BEAD is going to be different than funds in the past. Requirements of participation include a wide variety. A new infrastructure model will meet everyone's needs. Flip side, certain requirements are not flexible. Where we do have flexibility, we want to take full advantage of so that everyone can participate.
  - **Brianna:** Will private industry be able to apply for BEAD programs?
    - **Eric:** Yes. They will be able to. BEAD tell us that they are one of the entities that is required to participate.
  - **Larry:** To follow up, I'm thinking about the impact of these dollars and the economic impact. We'd like to see these funds contained within our region to have the most impact. So, if our money is spent in the Upper Peninsula, for example, we'd like to see the construction. If an ISP like, say, Charter comes in here and those dollars are sucked out to wherever their headquarters are. When the Tribes do a project, we end up running it and funds get retained locally. I think that's something important for MIHI to consider when creating networks. How do we make sure that the money stays in Michigan?

If you go about making those subgrants, can you do something about the retention of that economic impact? I think that the Tribes have something to offer. I think that we can also do something with cross regions—we have a seven-county service area. We don't have to utilize the match. I think that would be a benefit to the state. I think that's useful to consider when developing the subgrantee process.

- **Jake:** I'd like to second everything Larry said. We've worked a lot with Jill Dunham. We're working with 123Net. The other problems were that there was no Tribal land in the area we were considering. We're kind of trying to consider that. If people are trying to claim it, that can create issues. For certain sections, those are not theirs. A lot of the strings attached to the federal dollars get passed on to you and then on to us. The problem is if we're already removed from the conversation when it comes to how we're doing with the local governments, I'd prefer us to not be removed in the future. Whether we're deciding on to engage or not engage, it's kind of demoralizing. If somehow those dollars go into amounts where we have control. I guess some of it's that we want to engage, but some have been basic understanding of local understanding of land ownership. It's something that I'm still trying to undo.

- **How should MIHI work with Tribal nations to identify unserved areas, underserved areas, and Community Anchor Institutions for inclusion among areas and institutions eligible for funding to expand high-speed internet deployment?**

- **Jake:** Increased collaboration and trying to figure out where we're underserved. I am not 100% sure outside of marking challenges on the FCC map and working with our local representation. Are we doing the right things now?
- **Eric:** The methods you've outlined are correct, including continued engagement with MIHI. The FCC broadband maps is the first step. MIHI will be running their own state challenge process in Q1 next year, will publish as a state map when complete and open a challenge period. The map will be challenged and updated multiple times before release of a final map. The FCC map challenge maps will then go to MIHI, who will conduct their own challenge process in Q1 of next year to deliver their final unserved, underserved, served.
  - **Jake:** Based on what I understand the local maps are not moved to you it seems. Is that correct?
  - **Eric:** That's correct. I imagine that Allegan County may have submitted maps to the FCC, but we do not have access to who submitted challenges.
  - **Jake:** With that mapping, I assume you're able to pull from the BIA website to see who has what land from which Tribe.
  - **Eric:** Yes, we have access to that information. The State Challenge Process will allow us to know when BEAD funding is not accurate.

- **Larry:** I posted something in the chat about the Tribal Consultation talking about land ownership, I'd like to know which ones qualify for the NEAR definition. MIHI to pull this up and verify. These are the counties close to them.
- **Jess: I'd like to focus on the CAIs. CAIs matter because we are required to provide a higher level of service to CAIs. We have the ability to add certain groups of institutions and classify them as CAIs. Are there any CAIs that you would like to add or thing that we should add that may be specific to you?**
  - **Larry:** Did you treat Tribal health centers as the same as hospitals?
    - **Eric:** We will want to make sure that they are included. If you could share that information with us, that would be helpful.
  - **Larry:** Tribal libraries would also be something that we would like to have. I don't know if Tribal libraries would be something that we want to do aligning work in those regions.
    - **Eric:** There are subcategories for libraries. We would want to make sure that that was part of it as well.
  - **Brianna:** Just to clarify, would certain entities such as Tribal nations be considered CAIs?
    - **Eric:** Yes, they would be.
- **What broadband deployment and/or digital equity projects within Tribal nations should MIHI be aware of, and how should MIHI seek opportunities to coordinate with these projects? Do you have your own buildout and/or digital equity plan and, if so, would you be willing to share it/them?**
  - **Brianna:** Is there an opportunity here to prioritize funding to Tribes or municipalities over private industry? We talked about this a minute ago, communities know what they need. We have a priority for what we need. Could there be a priority for local communities?
    - **Eric:** We want to hear from Tribal communities and local communities. The NOFO requirements stymie that a bit, but communities know their communities best and we want to make sure that we can include that.
  - **Jess: Collaboration could include scoring criteria. Are there other things/ways Tribes would like to see collaboration?**
  - **Brianna:** I don't have any specifics here just getting to the fact that this is a resource that we're putting in the ground. Tribes should own that infrastructure. Things can get complicated when private industry owns that infrastructure. Finding ways to consider that in the scoring.
    - **Eric:** The mechanics of ownership and so on will be included. We will be taking more feedback on that. There may not be suggestions now, but there will be an opportunity to make sure those recommendations are heard in the near future.

- **Larry:** The Tribes have a unique ability to pull down federal funds, If I'm bringing in \$20M from the feds, it seems like that is a huge value to the state of Michigan. A dollar-for-dollar match in points would be nice. For anything that we're bringing in from the outside, having points be awarded for that would be nice. Just a thought.
- **Jess: What else is in this space?**
  - **Brianna:** You piqued my interest a little bit. One of the things that when working with municipalities, we have generally asked if they have existing DE plans or other plans they would be willing to share. Does anyone have something that they would be willing to share?
  - **Jake:** For us, digital literacy is important. The trouble I'm having is getting someone to do this; I don't want to hire someone and then fire them when a grant ends. I'm not asking for vendors, but has anyone had any luck with this? I'm not finding anything for this.
    - **Allie:** We are working on establishing a vehicle for broadband navigators; there is a broadband navigator position to support digital literacy training being explored and Michigan Works! does skills training. Libraries are currently the best resource currently for digital equity.
    - **Jake:** In our case, we're going to engage with the populations we're impacting. We'll meet at the community centers.
- **Larry:** We have a few plans. We have been awarded \$25M for fiber for Reconnect. We are applying for \$4M for Reconnected. We just applied for \$156K for broadband planning for BEAD. This will help define our plans in regard to BEAD. We're going to refine plans more. We also just were awarded \$500,000 that will subsidize broadband bills. We are also part of the EUP collaborative. We have lines being drawn into the future. We have a lot of cross-collaboration in the future for things that have worked for the Tribe and the population. We've done a tremendous amount of groundwork. We can share those things in some level of detail when you're ready to have more conversation about this.
  - **Jess:** It's especially useful to think about where fiber routes and where they would be most useful and how they align with funding opportunities; that's really exciting. I think that you piqued a few ears in the room when you spoke about the \$500,000 toward funding bills. Could you share more?

- **Larry:** Sure. It's \$25 a month if people qualify. We're going to push them to apply for the ACP. Some people may need some assistance when signing up online; their adoption rate is not what it should be. I think we also need to pick back up and more aggressively talk about the ACP for Tribal members off nation. The mechanics are all there. We could give \$25 all in one year or it could go up to five years. If we want to connect those people to Digital Navigators, when we're signing them up for the program it's a good time to connect them to other services. We should be giving them your other programming, our other programming. There should be some coordination there.
- **Jess:** I appreciate you bringing up the ACP thread there. We're engaged in conversations with congressional delegations about why ACP is important. I think that ACP can even better serve Michigan.
- **Larry:** If you're on reservation, you get \$75 (from the ACP). Only 8% of Tribal Members live on Tribal Lands. This means that 92% of people are missing out on funds. If we figure out something we'll share it with the other Tribes.

**What are considerations regarding digital equity for Tribal nations? Are there concerns related to availability of service, affordability of service, digital skills and tech savvy, and devices? What other factors are missing?**

**• As MIHI moves forward toward preparing the Five-Year Action Plan and Digital Equity Plan in the coming weeks, how should we collaborate with Tribal nations on those plans?**

- **Jake:** Can you clarify what you mean by devices?
  - **Allie:** Internet-enabled devices, such as desktop computers, iPads, but more than a smartphone.
  - **Jake:** We don't have any good service when it comes to cell service for that area, or whenever else. You have an elderly resident with Life Alert or something with mobility issues. What does this mean for distribution? Do I have another way of extending cellular distribution via emergency services? There are issues with Wi-Fi calls because there is not the education to turn it on. We need to build something about why distribution is so important.
  - **Eric:** I think that you bring up an incredibly good point. Our piece with BEAD is the connectivity piece: having a permanent connection. We're going to be deploying tens of thousands of miles of coverage, which is going to impact cell service. Wireless is also needed.

- **Larry:** Can you share BEAD requirements for speeds? Cell towers are not covered through BEAD requirements.
  - **Eric/Ben:** Eric explained the BEAD speed requirements and Ben explained the NTIA definition of service, including how cellular could be eligible for BEAD. Eric explained that we want to make sure we are building infrastructure for the future and investing in networks that can handle the needs of the future. Ben shares the prioritization for projects.
  - **Larry:** In a scenario of which everything is fiber to the home, but I also have a cell tower next to a group of islands, would any points be awarded for a cell tower relative to laying submarine cables if you spend BEAD to lay? Will there be positive scoring for subgrantees that save money by not running expensive fiber?
    - **Eric:** I understand what Larry is saying, but can't answer it today as the process is still being developed.
- **Larry:** Tribal health centers are already a benefit to healthcare, and they take in a lot of federal funds. What level of support can there be for medical devices?
  - **Allie:** We understand the importance of digital connectivity and how it supports health outcomes.
  - **Jess:** We've had some conversations with health organizations/companies that are getting devices in people's hands and teaching them how to use them.
  - **Larry:** Tribes will be able to share with MDHHS
    - **Allie:** MIHI works with MDHHS. Broadband is a major social determinant of health.
  - **Larry:** It seems like there could be additional points for considering health outcomes as well.
  - **Jess/Allie:** Good point.
  - **Larry:** You can look up these services on the federal register for Tribes of Michigan.
- **As MIHI moves forward toward preparing the Five-Year Action Plan and Digital Equity Plan in the coming weeks, how should we collaborate with Tribal nations on those plans?**
  - **Jake:** I think we told you everything. Thinking about Q1 next year and talking about Q1 map for challenges, I feel like this isn't exactly perfect. I feel like something where we can check in more often would be beneficial.
  - **Eric:** Yeah. A lot of this is still being defined. We will also need to ingest data from multiple entities. We can send that model through to you. I hear you on making this more of a human interaction. We can build this into a more human process moving forward. We're still defining this process. Establishing this system, if the FCC struggled with it, it will be a struggle for states as well.

- **Jake:** We will likely use KMZ (keyhole markup language) files or GIS files. I think that most Tribes end up using a lot of these files for land use planning. If we are able to share this information with you ahead of time, would that be helpful?
- **Eric:** Yes, having this information ahead of time would make things easier.
- **Jess:** The FCC map as of June 30 will guide how the BEAD funding will be allocated. The Q1 2024 map will help fold in the properties held in trust as we look at which properties we have.
- **Larry:** I appreciate the conversation and consultation today. Tribal consultation at various stages would be helpful, especially ones that include the sharing of background information and data to create a greater understanding of the outcomes. Engagement should be done long term.
  - **Poppy:** I'm really interested in what's next and how we either drill down on what has come to the surface from this conversation or build upon what has been spoken about. A lot of this conversation has been future focused, but I think that there are a lot of things that can be focused on. I just wanted to lift that up. As the Tribal liaison, Jessica has done a great job. I don't want to take away from that. But, if there is ever any way that I can be helpful, I'm just a phone call away. The team at MIHI is amazing, but my work is through an equity lens. I heard so many unique opportunities and challenges being lifted up. I want to encourage folks to follow those. Those challenges, in my experience, are where the experiences live if we want to be working for equity. Thank you so much for including me!
  - **Eric:** I echo all of that. We want to continue drilling down on those issues and everyone's needs. There are a lot of things we don't have flexibility on but where we do we want to make sure that we can meet everyone's needs as we move forward on our proposal.
  - **Theron:** Any time you have feedback, please bring it to us directly. We are happy to meet with you and take any comments forward.
  - **Ben:** Others have said it well. Thank you for everyone's time today. This is not a one-and-done conversation. This has some intentional formality. We want to make sure that everyone is including the Tribes. The MIHI Office has not made this a struggle. As we near the end of the conversation, I hope this conversation continues. The state is now nearing the meat of their plan process—the continuing nature of how this process will be accepted so that the needs of your Tribal Members can be met at the conclusion of this program.
  - **Jess:** Thank you! If you have written comments that you want to share with us as a supplement today, there is an email address on the screen. If you have written comments, that's the place to send them—Eric's contact info as well as my own. As part of the wrap-up, we'll include meeting notes as well as everything else included.

- NO LATER THAN 12:20: JESSICA thanks all Tribal representatives, Director Corbin, Poppy, MIHI staff, and NTIA staff for their participation. JESSICA invites any brief closing comments that DIRECTOR CORBIN, POPPY, ERIC, BEN, or THERON would like to offer. JESSICA invites any closing comments that any Tribal representative would like to offer. JESSICA highlights opportunity for written comments to supplement things shared during the Consultation and invites any attendee to be in touch with any questions or concerns.
- NO LATER THAN 12:30: JESSICA closes the virtual meeting room.

(y) Tribal Lands— The term “Tribal Lands” means (A) any land located within the boundaries of— (i) an Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancheria; or (ii) a former reservation within Oklahoma; (B) any land not located within the boundaries of an Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancheria, the title to which is held— (i) in trust by the United States for the benefit of an Indian Tribe or an individual Indian; (ii) by an Indian Tribe or an individual Indian, subject to restriction against alienation under laws of the United States; or (iii) by a dependent Indian community; (C) any land located within a region established pursuant to section 7(a) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. § 1606(a)); (D) Hawaiian Home Lands, as defined in section 801 of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. § 4221); or (E) those areas or communities designated by the Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior that are near, adjacent, or contiguous to reservations where financial assistance and social service programs are provided to Indians because of their status as Indians; and the term.

6882 Federal Register / Vol. 58, No. 30 / Wednesday, February 17, 1993 / Notices

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

**Bureau of Indian Affairs**

**Near-Reservation Designations**

February 9, 1993.

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** This notice is published in exercise of authority delegated by the Secretary of the Interior to the Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs. Pursuant to 25 CFR 20.1(r), Notice is hereby given of the near-reservation designations for certain Indian tribal entities within the contiguous 48 states recognized as eligible to receive services from the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA).

**DATES:** These near-reservation designations become effective immediately.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David L. Hickman, Chief, Division of Social Services, Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1849 C Street, NW., MS 310 SIB, Washington, DC 20240.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In accordance with title 25—Indians, Chapter 1—BIA, Department of the Interior, subchapter D—Human Services, part 20—Financial Assistance

and Social Services Program (25 CFR part 20) 25 CFR 20.1(r), the Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs designates the following locales as “near-reservation” areas appropriate for the extension of BIA financial assistance and/or social services. 25 CFR part 20—Financial Assistance and Social Services Program regulations have full force and effect when extending BIA financial assistance and/or social services into these designated “near-reservation” locations. In the absence of officially designated “near-reservation” areas, such services are provided only to Indian people who live within reservation boundaries. The tribes identified below are now authorized to extend financial assistance and social services to their eligible tribal members (and their family members who are Indian) who reside outside the boundaries of a federally recognized tribe’s reservation, but within the areas designated below.

The locales listed below are those designated for this purpose.

**Tribe:** Bay Mills Indian Community  
**“Near-reservation” locations:** The counties of Chippewa, Luce and Mackinac in the State of Michigan.

**Tribe:** Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians  
**“Near-reservation” locations:** The counties of Grand Traverse, Charlevoix, Leelanau, Benzie,

Manistee and Antrim in the State of Michigan.

**Tribe:** Hannahville Indian Community  
**“Near-reservation” locations:** The counties of Delta, Menominee and Dickinson in the State of Michigan.

**Tribe:** Keweenaw Bay Indian Community  
**“Near-reservation” locations:** The counties of Baraga, Iron, Houghton, Marquette, Ontonagon, Dickinson, Gogebic and Keweenaw in the State of Michigan.

**Tribe:** Lac Vieux Desert  
**“Near-reservation” locations:** The counties of Gogebic, Ontonogin and Iron in the State of Michigan.

**Tribe:** Saginaw Chippewa  
**“Near-reservation” locations:** The counties of Isabella, Arenac, Osceola, Mecosta, Montcalm, Midland, Gratiot, Gladwin and Midland in the State of Michigan.

**Tribe:** Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Michigan  
**“Near-reservation” locations:** The counties of Chippewa, Mackinac, Luce, Alger, Schoolcraft, Delta and Marquette in the State of Michigan.

**Eddie F. Brown,**  
 Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs.  
 [FR Doc. 93-3663 Filed 2-16-93; 8:45 am]  
 BILLING CODE 4310-02-M

## A-6 Appendix 6

### A-6.1 Organizational Matrix

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name         | Type of<br>Organization                                   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| 123.NET INC.                                 | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but<br>not attended any<br>meetings.  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| 906<br>Technologies<br>LLC                   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but<br>not attended any<br>meetings.  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| AARP   | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| ABC<br>Computers<br>Detroit, LLC             | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   |  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Above Wireless<br>LLC                        | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but<br>not attended any<br>meetings.  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Accenture                                    | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   |  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| ACD.net                                      | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Attended March<br>and April Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                        | ✓  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Ace Telephone<br>Company of<br>Michigan Inc. | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Attended March<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                                  | Type of<br>Organization                                 | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| AcenTek   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but<br>not attended any<br>meetings.  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| ACME  | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Activate<br>Detroit:<br>Economic<br>Development<br>Company<br>Detroit | Economic<br>Development                                 |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Addison<br>Township   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Adtran Inc.   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| aecom   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| AEG/ITC<br>Broadband  | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but<br>not attended any<br>meetings.  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Agile Networks  | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Agri-Valley<br>Communica-<br>tions Inc.                               | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended March<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name       | Type of<br>Organization                                   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Algonguin<br>Lake Commu-<br>nity           | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Allband Com-<br>munications                | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but<br>not attended any<br>meetings.  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Allband Com-<br>munications<br>Cooperative | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Allegan County<br>Government               | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended March<br>and April Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                        | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Alliance for<br>Economic<br>Success        | Economic<br>Development                                   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Allied Media                               | Nonprofit<br>Organization<br>(501c3)                      | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Almont<br>Township                         | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but<br>not attended any<br>meetings.  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Almvoy Inc.                                | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but<br>not attended any<br>meetings.  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Altman Solon                               | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| American Arab<br>Chamber of<br>Commerce    | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but<br>not attended any<br>meetings.  |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name | Type of<br>Organization                          | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|                                      |  |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| American Electric Power (AEP)        | Industry Representative or Association (501c6)   | Attended February, March, and April Partnership Roundtable meetings.                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Anchor Systems                       | Industry Representative or Association (501c6)   | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Aspen Wireless                       | Industry Representative or Association (501c6)   | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Astrea Connect                       | Industry Representative or Association (501c6)   | Attended March Partnership Roundtable meeting.   | ✓  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| AT&T                                 | Industry Representative or Association (501c6)   | Attended April Partnership Roundtable meeting.   | ✓  | ✓                           | ✓                                |  |
| Athens Township                      | County or Municipal Government                   | Attended February and March Partnership Roundtable meetings.                           | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| ATI Networks Inc.                    | Industry Representative or Association (501c6)   | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Atlas Township                       | County or Municipal Government                   | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| AuSable Valley CMHA                  | Organization that Represents Covered Populations | Attended February, March, and April Partnership Roundtable meetings.                   | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                   | Type of<br>Organization                        | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|--|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |  |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Avanzata, LLC  | Other  | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Baldwin Assembly of God                                | Predominantly Black Institution                | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Ballmer Group  | Foundation                                     | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Baraga Telephone Company                               | Industry Representative or Association (501c6) | Attended April Partnership Roundtable meeting.   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Barger Creek Wireless                                  | Industry Representative or Association (501c6) | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Baroda Township  | County or Municipal Government                 | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Barry Community Foundation                             | Foundation                                     | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Barry County Broadband Committee                       | County or Municipal Government                 | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Barry County Chamber & Economic Development Commission | Economic Development                           | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name  | Type of<br>Organization   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|                                       |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Barry County Democratic Party         | Other   | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Barry County Telephone Company        | Industry Representative or Association (501c6)                      | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Bath Township MI Broadband Task Force | County or Municipal Government                                      | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Bay Arenac ISD                        | Local Education Agency  | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Bay City                              | County or Municipal Government                                      | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Bay County                            | County or Municipal Government                                      | Attended February and March Partnership Roundtable meetings.                           | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Bay County Commission                 | County or Municipal Government                                      | Attended February and March Partnership Roundtable meetings.                           | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Bay Mills Community College           | Institutions of Higher Education                                    | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Bay Mills Indian Community,           | Indian Tribe, Alaska Native Entity, or Native Hawaiian Organization | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  | ✓  |
| BCN Telecom, Inc.                     | Industry Representative or Association (501c6)                      | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name  | Type of<br>Organization                                   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Beaver Island Association   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Beaver<br>Island Joint<br>Townships<br>Telecommuni-<br>cations<br>Advisory<br>Committee | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Beaver Island<br>JTAC   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Bellaire Public<br>Library  | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Bellevue<br>Township  | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Benefits Data<br>Trust  | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  | ✓                           |                                  | ✓  |
| Benton Charter<br>Township  | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Benton<br>Institute   | Foundation  |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Benzie Area<br>Chamber of<br>Commerce   | Economic<br>Development                                   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Berrien County  | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended February,<br>March, and April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.          | ✓  | ✓                           |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name       | Type of<br>Organization                                 | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Berrien County<br>Commissioner             | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but<br>not attended any<br>meetings.  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Bethany<br>Christian<br>Services           | Community<br>Anchor<br>Institution                      |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Big Rapids<br>Charter<br>Township          | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Big River<br>Telephone<br>Company LLC      | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but<br>not attended any<br>meetings.  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Bitwise<br>Industries                      | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Black Churches<br>for Digital<br>Equity    | Civil Rights<br>Organization                            |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Black<br>Leadership<br>Advisory<br>Council | Predominantly<br>Black Institution                      | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but<br>not attended any<br>meetings.  |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Blanchard<br>Telephone Co.                 | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but<br>not attended any<br>meetings.  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Bloomington<br>Telephone<br>Company Inc.   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   |  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name         | Type of<br>Organization                                   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Blue Collar ISP                              | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but<br>not attended any<br>meetings.  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Blue Water<br>Development<br>Housing         | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Branch County                                | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Branch County<br>Commissioner                | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Branch County<br>First Precinct<br>Delegates | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Branch District<br>Library                   | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Branch<br>Intermediate<br>School District    | Local Education<br>Agency                                 | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Branch<br>Sheriff's<br>Department            | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Broadband<br>Institute<br>Foundation         | Nonprofit<br>Organization<br>(501c3)                      | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                       | Type of<br>Organization                                   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Bruce Township   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| Buckeye<br>Broadband                                       | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Attended March and<br>April Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                        | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Building Assets<br>to Strengthen<br>Society<br>(BASS Inc.) | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Business<br>Leaders of<br>Michigan                         | Economic<br>Development                                   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Butler<br>Township   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Cadillac Area<br>Chamber of<br>Commerce                    | Economic<br>Development                                   | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Cadillac<br>Wexford Public<br>Library                      | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Calhoun<br>County  | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Calm Directory   | Other   | Submitted a public<br>comment  |  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| Cannon<br>Township   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                     | Type of<br>Organization                                   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Capital Area<br>District<br>Libraries                    | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Career<br>Education<br>Planning<br>District<br>Directors | Workforce<br>Development<br>Organization                  |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Carmel<br>Township                                       | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Carr Telephone<br>Company                                | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Casco<br>Township  | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| CCI Systems  | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Cedar Creek<br>Wireless LLC                              | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Center for<br>Change<br>Northern<br>Michigan<br>Advocacy | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations | Attended March and<br>April Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                        | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Center Upper<br>Peninsula<br>Planning and<br>Development | Economic<br>Development                                   | Attended March<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                                 | Type of<br>Organization                                | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|--|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |  |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Central Michigan University  | Institutions of Higher Education (if not listed above) | Attended March Partnership Roundtable meeting.   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Central Upper Peninsula Planning and Development Regional Commission | Economic Development                                   | Attended February and March Partnership Roundtable meetings.                           | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Chaldean Community Foundation  | Foundation   | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Charlotte Public Schools   | Local Education Agency                                 | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Charlevoix County  | County or Municipal Government                         |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Charter Communications (Spectrum)                                    | Industry Representative or Association (501c6)         | Attended February and March Partnership Roundtable meetings.                           | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Charter Township of Hampton  | County or Municipal Government                         | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Charter Township of Union  | County or Municipal Government                         | Attended February and March Partnership Roundtable meetings.                           | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Charter Township of Vienna   | County or Municipal Government                         | Attended February Partnership Roundtable meeting.                                      | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Cheboygan County   | County or Municipal Government                         | Attended February Partnership Roundtable meeting.                                      | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name      | Type of<br>Organization                                 | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Cherry Capital<br>Connection<br>LLC       | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Chikaming<br>Township                     | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| China<br>Township                         | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Chippewa<br>River District<br>Library     | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Chocolay<br>Township                      | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but<br>not attended any<br>meetings.  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| CHR Solutions                             | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Church of the<br>Messiah/BLVD<br>Harambee | Predominantly<br>Black Institution                      | Attended March<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| City of Alpena                            | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| City of<br>Birmingham                     | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| City of Cadillac                          | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    |  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| City of Detroit                           | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| City of<br>Detroit Digital<br>Inclusion   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name | Type of<br>Organization              | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|                                      |                                      |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| City of Eaton Rapids                 | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| City of Flint                        | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| City of Hart                         | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| City of<br>Litchfield                | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| City of<br>Marquette                 | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| City of<br>Negaunee                  | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| City of Norway                       | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| City of<br>Portland                  | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| City of<br>Roseville                 | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| City of<br>St. Johns                 | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| City of Sterling<br>Heights          | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name       | Type of<br>Organization                                   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Clare County                               | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Clare County<br>Broadband<br>Network Group | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Clare County<br>EMHSD                      | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Clay Township                              | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Climate Realty<br>Project                  | Nonprofit<br>Organization<br>(501c3)                      | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Climax<br>Telephone<br>Company             | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but<br>not attended any<br>meetings.  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Clinton Count<br>Board of<br>Commissioners | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Clinton County                             | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Closing The<br>Digital Gap                 | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations | Attended March and<br>April Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                        | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| CMC Telecom<br>Inc.                        | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| CMSInter.net<br>LLC                        | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                    | Type of<br>Organization                                   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Coalition for<br>a Strong and<br>Prosperous<br>Michigan | Economic<br>Development                                   |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Cogent Com-<br>munications                              | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Coldwater<br>Board of Public<br>Utilities               | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Coldwater<br>Telecommuni-<br>cations Utility            | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Coldwater<br>Township                                   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| COLI Inc.   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Columbia<br>Township<br>Board                           | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Columbus<br>Township                                    | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Comcast   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Attended February,<br>March, and April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.          | ✓  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| Commission on<br>Middle Eastern<br>American<br>Affairs  | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Communica-<br>tions Workers<br>of America               | Workforce<br>Development<br>Organization                  | Attended March and<br>April Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                        | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                               | Type of<br>Organization                                   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Community<br>Action Agency<br>Association                          | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Community<br>Action Alger<br>Marquette                             | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Community<br>Action of<br>Allegan County                           | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Community<br>Advisory<br>Council-D4<br>(Detroit)                   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Community<br>Economic<br>Development<br>Association of<br>Michigan | Economic<br>Development                                   | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Compudopt  | Nonprofit<br>Organization<br>(501c3)                      |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Concord<br>Township  | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Concord Youth<br>Association                                       | Nonprofit<br>Organization<br>(501c3)                      | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Connect 313  | Nonprofit<br>Organization<br>(501c3)                      | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name | Type of<br>Organization                                 | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|                                      |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Connect<br>Detroit                   | Nonprofit<br>Organization<br>(501c3)                    | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Connecting<br>Manistee<br>County     | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Consumer<br>Cellular Inc.            | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Consumers<br>Energy                  | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Convis<br>Township                   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Conway<br>Township                   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Cooperative<br>Network<br>Services   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| COOR ISD                             | Local Education<br>Agency                               | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Core                                 | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                      | Type of<br>Organization   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Corewell Health   | Health or<br>Telehealth<br>Organization<br>(Direct Service<br>and Policy focus) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Council of<br>Michigan<br>Foundations                     | Foundation  | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| County of<br>Gladwin                                      | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government  | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| County of<br>Iosco  | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government  | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| County Road<br>Association of<br>Michigan                 | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government  | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Cradlepoint   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Creek Plastics  | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Crown Castle<br>Fiber LLC                                 | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Crystal<br>Automation<br>Systems Inc.,<br>dba Casair Inc. | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| CS Mott<br>Foundation                                     | Foundation  | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| CWS Global  | Nonprofit<br>Organization<br>(501c3)  |  |  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                 | Type of<br>Organization                                   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| D&P Communi-<br>cations                              | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| DayStarr LLC   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| DCS<br>Technology<br>Design                          | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Attended February and<br>March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Detroit<br>Community<br>Technology<br>Project        | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  | ✓                           |                                  | ✓  |
| Detroit<br>Digital Justice<br>Coalition              | Nonprofit<br>Organization<br>(501c3)                      |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| City of Detroit                                      | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Detroit<br>Regional<br>Chamber                       | Economic<br>Development                                   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Detroit<br>Regional<br>Partnership                   | Economic<br>Development                                   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Detroit JCS  | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Attended February,<br>March, and April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.          | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Develop Iosco,<br>Broadband<br>Advisory<br>Committee | Economic<br>Development                                   | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name      | Type of<br>Organization                                   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Develop Iosco,<br>Inc.                    | Economic<br>Development                                   | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Dewitt District<br>Library                | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Dexter<br>Township                        | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Dickinson Area<br>Community<br>Foundation | Foundation  | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Digitunity                                | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations |  |  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| DMCI<br>Broadband<br>LLC                  | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Dowagiac<br>Union Schools                 | Local Education<br>Agency                                 | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Downriver<br>Community<br>Conference      | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations | Attended March<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| DTE Energy                                | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Duke<br>Broadband                         | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Attended February,<br>March, and April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.          | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Dykema                                    | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                    | Type of<br>Organization                        | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|--|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |  |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Dynamic Environmental Associates Inc.                   | Industry Representative or Association (501c6) | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| East Bay Township                                       | County or Municipal Government                 | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| East Michigan Council of Governments                    | County or Municipal Government                 | Attended April Partnership Roundtable meeting.   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Eastern UP Regional Planning and Development Commission | Economic Development                           | Attended February, March, and April Partnership Roundtable meetings.                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Eastern Upper Peninsula Connect Collaborative           | Economic Development                           | Attended March Partnership Roundtable meeting.   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Eastern Upper Peninsula ISD                             | Local Education Agency                         | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Eaton County  | County or Municipal Government                 |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Eaton County Commissioner #5                            | County or Municipal Government                 | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Eaton County Community Development                      | County or Municipal Government                 | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name   | Type of<br>Organization                                 | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Eaton Rapids   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Eaton RESA   | Local Education<br>Agency                               | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Eclipse Com-<br>munications  | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Economic<br>Development<br>Partnership of<br>Hillsdale   | Economic<br>Development                                 | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Education Su-<br>perHighway  | Nonprofit<br>Organization<br>(501c3)                    |  |  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| EFS Networks   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Egelston<br>Township   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Elk Rapids<br>District Library   | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Elk Rapids<br>Schools  | Local Education<br>Agency                               | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Employment<br>& Training<br>Division,<br>Michigan<br>Department<br>of Labor and<br>Economic<br>Opportunity | Other   |  |  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                      | Type of<br>Organization                          | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|--|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |  |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Evergreen Consulting Services, LLC                        | Industry Representative or Association (501c6)   | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Everstream GLC Holding Company LLC                        | Industry Representative or Association (501c6)   | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Farmers Mutual Telephone Company                          | Industry Representative or Association (501c6)   | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Farmhouse Favorites                                       | Other  | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| FirstNet Built with AT&T                                  | Industry Representative or Association (501c6)   |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Flint Innovative Solutions                                | Organization that Represents Covered Populations |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Forest Township in Missaukee County (Township Supervisor) | County or Municipal Government                   | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Franklin Wright   Naon-Profit Organization   Detroit      | Nonprofit Organization (501c3)                   | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Friends of Parkside                                       | Nonprofit Organization (501c3)                   | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| FirstNet Built with AT&T                                  | Industry Representative or Association (501c6)   | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                       | Type of<br>Organization                                   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Flint Innovative<br>Solutions                              | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations | Attended March and<br>April Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                        | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Frontier Com-<br>munications                               | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Attended March and<br>April Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                        | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Fund MI Future   | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations | Attended an<br>MICF Date   | ✓  | ✓                           |                                  | ✓  |
| Galien<br>Township   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Garfield<br>Charter<br>Township                            | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| General<br>Equipment<br>Maintenance<br>and Language<br>LLC | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| GeoTech  | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Gerald R Ford<br>Job Corps<br>Center                       | Workforce<br>Development<br>Organization                  |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| GivingTuesday  | Nonprofit<br>Organization<br>(501c3)                      | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                      | Type of<br>Organization                                   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Gladwin<br>County<br>Commission                           | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Gladwin<br>County<br>Democratic<br>Party                  | Other   | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Gladwin County<br>Office of<br>Veterans Affairs           | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Global Entre-<br>preneurship<br>Business Lab              | Economic<br>Development                                   | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| GLS Region V<br>Planning and<br>Development<br>Commission | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Gogebic<br>County Board                                   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Google North<br>America Inc.                              | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Grand Rapids<br>Alliance of<br>Cooperative<br>Communities | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but<br>not attended any<br>meetings.  |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Grand Rapids<br>Area Black<br>Businesses                  | Economic<br>Development                                   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Grand Rapids<br>Area Chamber<br>of Commerce               | Economic<br>Development                                   | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Grand Rapids<br>Urban League                              | Predominantly<br>Black Institution                        | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                           | Type of<br>Organization   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Grand Traverse<br>Band of<br>Ottawa and<br>Chippewa<br>Indians | Indian Tribe,<br>Alaska Native<br>Entity, or Native<br>Hawaiian<br>Organization |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Grand Traverse<br>County<br>Board of<br>Commissioners          | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government  | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Grand Traverse<br>County<br>Commission<br>on Aging             | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government  | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Granite Tele-<br>communica-<br>tions LLC                       | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Grass Lake<br>Charter<br>Township                              | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government  | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Gratiot County   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government  | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Great Lakes<br>Energy  | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Great Lakes<br>Energy -<br>Truestream                          | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Great Lakes<br>Islands Alliance                                | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations                       | Attended March<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Greater Gratiot<br>Area  | Economic<br>Development   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Griswald<br>Consulting   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name            | Type of<br>Organization   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Guidehouse                                      | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| GVSU  | Institutions<br>of Higher<br>Education<br>(if not listed<br>above)              | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Hagar<br>Township                               | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government  | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Hannahville<br>Indian<br>Community,<br>Michigan | Indian Tribe,<br>Alaska Native<br>Entity, or Native<br>Hawaiian<br>Organization | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Harbor Beach<br>Community<br>Schools            | Local Education<br>Agency   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Hayes<br>Township                               | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government  | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Healthcare<br>Association of<br>Michigan        | Health or<br>Telehealth<br>Organization<br>(Direct Service<br>and Policy focus) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but<br>not attended any<br>meetings.  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Henry Ford<br>Health                            | Health or<br>Telehealth<br>Organization<br>(Direct Service<br>and Policy focus) | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Hiawatha<br>Communica-<br>tions, Inc.           | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Attended March<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Hidden Lake<br>Wireless Inc.                    | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name   | Type of<br>Organization                                   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Highland Twp<br>Supervisor             | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Highline<br>Internet                   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Attended March<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.<br>Attended an MICF<br>Date       | ✓  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Hillsdale<br>County                    | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Hispanic/<br>Latino<br>Commission      | Hispanic-Serving<br>Institution                           | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Holland Board<br>of Public<br>Works    | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| HomeWorks                              | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)   | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Housing<br>Services of<br>Mid Michigan | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Hudson<br>Webber<br>Foundation         | Foundation  | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Human-I-T                              | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations | Attended February,<br>March, and April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.          | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Huron County                           | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                    | Type of<br>Organization                          | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|--|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |  |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Huron & Sanilac County Economic Development Corporation | Economic Development                             | Attended March Partnership Roundtable meeting. Attended an MICF Date                   | ✓  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Huron County Seniors                                    | Organization that Represents Covered Populations | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Huron ISD   | Local Education Agency                           | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| IBEW 275 and MSC  | Workforce Development Organization               | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| IBEW 352 (Lansing Light & Power)                        | Workforce Development Organization               | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| IBEW 58   | Workforce Development Organization               | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| IBEW Local 1106   | Workforce Development Organization               | Attended April Partnership Roundtable meeting.   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| IBEW Local 17   | Workforce Development Organization               | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| IBEW Local 876  | Workforce Development Organization               | Attended February, March, and April Partnership Roundtable meetings.                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                     | Type of<br>Organization                                 | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Ideal Lawn<br>Care LLC                                   | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Indiana<br>Michigan<br>Power<br>Company Inc.             | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Ingham<br>Intermediate<br>School District                | Local Education<br>Agency                               | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| International<br>Brotherhood<br>of Electrical<br>Workers | Workforce<br>Development<br>Organization                | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Internet<br>Service Inc.                                 | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| InvestUP   | Workforce<br>Development<br>Organization                | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Ionia County<br>Economic<br>Alliance                     | Economic<br>Development                                 | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Ionia Unlimited<br>LLC                                   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Iron County<br>Economic<br>Chamber<br>Alliance           | Economic<br>Development                                 | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Iron River<br>Coop TV and<br>Ant.                        | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name          | Type of<br>Organization                        | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|--|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |  |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| ISP Management Inc.                           | Industry Representative or Association (501c6) | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| ITC Broadband                                 | Industry Representative or Association (501c6) | Attended February Partnership Roundtable meeting.                                      | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Jackson County                                | County or Municipal Government                 | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Jackson County Commission                     | County or Municipal Government                 | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Jackson County Democratic Committee           | Other  | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| JMF Solutions Inc.                            | Industry Representative or Association (501c6) | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| JSI Telecom                                   | Industry Representative or Association (501c6) | Attended April Partnership Roundtable meeting.   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Kalamazoo Regional Educational Service Agency | Local Education Agency                         | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Kaleva Telephone Company                      | Industry Representative or Association (501c6) | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| KALITTA AIR                                   | Industry Representative or Association (501c6) | Attended February Partnership Roundtable meeting.                                      | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                    | Type of<br>Organization   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Kellogg<br>Community<br>College                         | Institutions of<br>Higher Education   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Kellogg<br>Foundation<br>of Michigan                    | Foundation  | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Kent County<br>Government                               | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government  | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Kent County<br>Essential<br>Needs Task<br>Force         | Community<br>Anchor<br>Institution  |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Kent ISD  | Local Education<br>Agency   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Keweenaw<br>Bay Indian<br>Community                     | Indian Tribe,<br>Alaska Native<br>Entity, or Native<br>Hawaiian<br>Organization | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Keweenaw<br>Economic<br>Development<br>Alliance         | Economic<br>Development   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Kingsley<br>Branch Library                              | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Laborers'<br>International<br>Union of North<br>America | Other   |  |  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name   | Type of<br>Organization   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Lac Vieux<br>Desert Band of<br>Lake Superior<br>Chippewa<br>Indians of<br>Michigan | Indian Tribe,<br>Alaska Native<br>Entity, or Native<br>Hawaiian<br>Organization | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Lake Charter<br>Township   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government  | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Lake County  | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government  | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Lake County<br>Historical<br>Museum  | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Lake Superior<br>Community<br>Partnerships<br>(LSCP)                               | Economic<br>Development   |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Lake Superior<br>State<br>University   | Institutions of<br>Higher Education<br>(if not listed<br>above)                 | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| LakeNet  | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Lakeview<br>Estates  | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name   | Type of<br>Organization                        | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|--|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |  |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Lansing Board of Water & Light         | Industry Representative or Association (501c6) | Attended February and March Partnership Roundtable meetings.                           | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Lansing Regional Chamber               | Economic Development                           | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Lapeer County                          | County or Municipal Government                 | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Lapeer County ISD                      | Local Education Agency                         | Attended February Partnership Roundtable meeting.                                      | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Lapper County Board of Commissioners   | County or Municipal Government                 | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Latin Americans United for Progress    | Hispanic-Serving Institution                   | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Lee Township, Allegan County           | County or Municipal Government                 | Attended February Partnership Roundtable meeting.                                      | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Leelanau County                        | County or Municipal Government                 | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Leelanau County Board of Commissioners | Local Education Agency                         | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Leland Public Schools                  | Local Education Agency                         | Attended February Partnership Roundtable meeting.                                      | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Lenawee Intermediate School District   | Local Education Agency                         | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                                 | Type of<br>Organization   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Lennon Telephone Company   | Industry Representative or Association (501c6)                      | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Leroy Township   | County or Municipal Government                                      | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Library of Michigan  | Other   | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Lighthouse.Net   | Industry Representative or Association (501c6)                      | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Lincoln Charter Township   | County or Municipal Government                                      | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Lit Communities Broadband Inc.                                       | Industry Representative or Association (501c6)                      | Attended February and March Partnership Roundtable meetings.                           | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Little River Band of Ottawa Indians                                  | Indian Tribe, Alaska Native Entity, or Native Hawaiian Organization | Attended April Partnership Roundtable meeting.   | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Little Traverse Bay Bands of Odawa Indians                           | Indian Tribe, Alaska Native Entity, or Native Hawaiian Organization | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| LiUNA  | Other   | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| LLEAD—Latino Leaders for the Enhancement of Advocacy and Development | Hispanic-Serving Institution  | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                 | Type of<br>Organization   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Local Access<br>LLC                                  | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Local Initiatives<br>Support<br>Corporation          | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations                       | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Local Union<br>876                                   | Workforce<br>Development<br>Organization  | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| London<br>Township                                   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government  | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Lake Superior<br>Community<br>Partnerships<br>(LSCP) | Economic<br>Development   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| M3 Wireless,<br>Inc.                                 | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Ma'at<br>Community                                   | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| MACC<br>Development                                  | Nonprofit<br>Organization<br>(501c3)  | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Mackinac<br>Straits Health<br>System                 | Health or<br>Telehealth<br>Organization<br>(Direct Service<br>and Policy focus) | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Mackinaw<br>Power                                    | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                                | Type of<br>Organization                                   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Macomb<br>County<br>Commission                                      | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Macomb<br>County Dept<br>of Planning<br>& Economic<br>Development   | Economic<br>Development                                   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Macomb<br>Intermediate<br>School District                           | Local Education<br>Agency                                 | Attended March<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Macon<br>Township   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| MAEDS<br>Michigan<br>Association for<br>Educational<br>Data Systems | Local Education<br>Agency                                 | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Manistee<br>County<br>Commission                                    | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Manistee<br>County Human<br>Services<br>Collaborative<br>Body       | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Make This<br>World<br>Foundation                                    | Foundation  | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Maple Grove<br>Township   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Marathon<br>Township  | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                      | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                            | Type of<br>Organization   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Market Van Buren  | Economic Development  | Attended April Partnership Roundtable meeting.   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Marq6 Broadband   | Industry Representative or Association (501c6)                      | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Marquette County  | County or Municipal Government                                      | Attended March Partnership Roundtable meeting.   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Marquette County Aging Services                                 | Organization that Represents Covered Populations                    | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Marquette Monthly   | Other   | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Marquette-Alger RESA  | Local Education Agency  | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Marysville Public Schools                                       | Local Education Agency  | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Mastodon Township Planning Commission                           | County or Municipal Government                                      |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Match-E-Be-Nash-She-Wish Band of Pottawatomi Indians (Gun Lake) | Indian Tribe, Alaska Native Entity, or Native Hawaiian Organization | Attended February Partnership Roundtable meeting.                                      | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| MBK Benton Harbor   | Predominantly Black Institution                                     | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| MBK Highland Park   | Predominantly Black Institution                                     | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| MBK Lansing   | Predominantly Black Institution                                     | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name        | Type of<br>Organization   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| MBK Southfield                              | Predominantly<br>Black Institution  | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| MBK<br>Washtenaw<br>County                  | Predominantly<br>Black Institution  | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| McKenzie<br>Health System                   | Health or<br>Telehealth<br>Organization<br>(Direct Service<br>and Policy focus) | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Mental Health<br>Association of<br>Michigan | Health or<br>Telehealth<br>Organization<br>(Direct Service<br>and Policy focus) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Mercury<br>Broadband                        | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Attended March<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Meridian<br>Charter<br>Township             | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government  | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Merit Network                               | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Attended February,<br>March, and April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.          | ✓  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| Merritt<br>Township                         | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government  | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| MetaLINK<br>Technologies<br>Inc.            | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Metro Fibernet<br>LLC                       | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                                       | Type of<br>Organization   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Metropolitan<br>Telecommu-<br>nications of<br>Michigan Inc.,<br>dba MetTel | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                             | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| MI Community<br>Action   | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations                           | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| MI Health<br>and Hospital<br>Association                                   | Health or<br>Telehealth<br>Organization<br>(Direct Service<br>and Policy focus)     | Attended February,<br>March, and April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.          | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan<br>AgriBusiness<br>Association                                    | Economic<br>Development   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan<br>Asian Pacific<br>American<br>Affairs<br>Commission             | Asian American<br>and Native<br>American Pacific<br>Islander-serving<br>Institution | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Michigan<br>Association<br>for Computer<br>Users in<br>Learning<br>(MACUL) | Local Education<br>Agency   | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan<br>Association of<br>Counties                                     | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government  | Attended February,<br>March, and April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.          | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan<br>Association of<br>County Drain<br>Commissioners                | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government  | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan<br>Association of<br>Intermediate<br>School<br>Administrators     | Local Education<br>Agency   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name              | Type of<br>Organization                                | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|--|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |  |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Michigan Association of School Libraries          | Local Education Agency                                 | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan Association of Senior Centers            | Organization that Represents Covered Populations       | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Michigan Association of State Universities        | Institutions of Higher Education (if not listed above) | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan Association of United Ways               | Organization that Represents Covered Populations       | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Michigan Building and Construction Trades Council | Workforce Development Organization                     | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan Cable Telecommunications Association     | County or Municipal Government                         |  |  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| Michigan Central Broadband Company LLC            | Industry Representative or Association (501c6)         | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan Chamber of Commerce                      | Economic Development                                   | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan Coalition on Black Civic Participation   | Predominantly Black Institution                        | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Michigan College Access Network                   | Institutions of Higher Education (if not listed above) | Attended February Partnership Roundtable meeting.                                      | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name  | Type of<br>Organization   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Michigan<br>College<br>Alliance   | Institutions of<br>Higher Education<br>(if not listed<br>above) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan<br>Community<br>College<br>Association                             | Institutions of<br>Higher Education<br>(if not listed<br>above) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan<br>Cooperatives<br>Directors<br>Association                        | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations       | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Michigan<br>Department<br>of Agriculture<br>and Rural<br>Development        | Other   | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan<br>Department of<br>Civil Rights                                   | Other   | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan<br>Department of<br>Corrections                                    | Other   | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan<br>Department of<br>Education                                      | Other   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| Michigan<br>Department<br>of Education<br>Office of<br>Special<br>Education | Other   | Attended March<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan<br>Department<br>of Health<br>and Human<br>Services                | Other   | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name   | Type of<br>Organization   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |                           |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Michigan<br>Department<br>of Labor and<br>Economic<br>Opportunity  | Other                     | Attended February,<br>March, and April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.          | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Employment<br>& Training<br>Division,<br>Michigan<br>Department<br>of Labor and<br>Economic<br>Opportunity | Other                     | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan<br>Department<br>of Natural<br>Resources  | Other                     | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan<br>Department<br>of Technology,<br>Management,<br>and Budget                                      | Other                     | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan<br>Department of<br>Transportation  | Other                     | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan<br>Economic<br>Developers<br>Association  | Economic<br>Development   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan<br>Economic<br>Development<br>Corporation   | Economic<br>Development   | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan<br>Education<br>Justice<br>Coalition  | Local Education<br>Agency | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Michigan<br>Educational<br>Technology<br>Leaders   | Local Education<br>Agency | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                   | Type of<br>Organization   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Michigan Electric Cooperative Association              | Industry Representative or Association (501c6)                      | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan Faith in Action                               | Nonprofit Organization (501c3)                                      | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Michigan Farm Bureau                                   | Economic Development  | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan Farmers Union                                 | Organization that Represents Covered Populations                    | Attended February, March, and April Partnership Roundtable meetings.                   | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Michigan Health and Hospital Association               | Health or Telehealth Organization (Direct Service and Policy focus) | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan Health Council                                | Health or Telehealth Organization (Direct Service and Policy focus) | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan Health Improvement Alliance                   | Health or Telehealth Organization (Direct Service and Policy focus) | Attended March Partnership Roundtable meeting.   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan Hispanic Chamber of Commerce                  | Hispanic-Serving Institution  | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Michigan Infrastructure and Transportation Association | Industry Representative or Association (501c6)                      | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name    | Type of<br>Organization   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Michigan Infrastructure Council         | Other   | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan Infrastructure Office          | Other   | Attended February and March Partnership Roundtable meetings.                           | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan League for Public Policy       | Nonprofit Organization (501c3)                                      | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan Library Association            | Organization that Represents Covered Populations                    | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Michigan Medicine                       | Health or Telehealth Organization (Direct Service and Policy focus) | Attended February Partnership Roundtable meeting.                                      | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan Municipal Electric Association | Industry Representative or Association (501c6)                      | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan Municipal League               | County or Municipal Government                                      | Attended February and March Partnership Roundtable meetings.                           | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan Primary Care Association       | Health or Telehealth Organization (Direct Service and Policy focus) | Attended April Partnership Roundtable meeting.   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan Public Service Commission      | Other   | Attended February, March, and April Partnership Roundtable meetings.                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan Railroads Association          | Industry Representative or Association (501c6)                      | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name   | Type of<br>Organization   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Michigan<br>Small Business<br>Development<br>Center                                    | Economic<br>Development   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan State<br>University   | Institutions of<br>Higher Education<br>(if not listed<br>above) | Attended February,<br>March, and April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.          | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan State<br>University<br>Center for<br>Community<br>and Economic<br>Development | Institutions of<br>Higher Education<br>(if not listed<br>above) | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan<br>Technological<br>University,<br>Information<br>Technology                  | Institutions of<br>Higher Education<br>(if not listed<br>above) | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan<br>Townships<br>Association   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                            | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan<br>Unemployment<br>Insurance<br>Agency  | Other   | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan<br>Veterans<br>Affairs Agency   | Other   | Attended February,<br>March, and April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.          | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan<br>Veterans<br>Foundation   | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations       | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Michigan<br>Workforce<br>Development<br>Institute                                      | Workforce<br>Development<br>Organization                        | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan<br>Works!<br>Association  | Workforce<br>Development<br>Organization                        | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                               | Type of<br>Organization                        | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|--|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |  |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Michigan Works! Region 7B  | Workforce Development Organization             | Attended April Partnership Roundtable meeting.   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan Works! Region 7B/Ogemaw EDC                               | Workforce Development Organization             | Attended February Partnership Roundtable meeting.                                      | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michigan Works! Southeast  | Other  | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Michigan's Great Lakes Bay Regional Convention and Visitors Bureau | Economic Development                           | Attended April Partnership Roundtable meeting.   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Michwave Technologies, Inc.  | Industry Representative or Association (501c6) | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Middle Michigan Development Corporation                            | Economic Development                           | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Midland Area Transportation Study                                  | County or Municipal Government                 | Attended February Partnership Roundtable meeting.                                      | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Midland Int-Comm   | Industry Representative or Association (501c6) | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Mid-Michigan Library League  | Other  | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Midwest Energy & Communications                                    | Industry Representative or Association (501c6) | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| MIHI   | Other  |  |  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                      | Type of<br>Organization                                 | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Milennium<br>Technology<br>Partners                       | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Mining Journal  | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Midwest<br>Energy &<br>Communica-<br>tions                | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended March and<br>April Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                        | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Millennium  | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| MISDIG<br>(Michigan<br>Utility<br>Notification<br>Center) | Other   | Attended March and<br>April Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                        | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| MITCON LLC  | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Mobilitie<br>Management<br>LLC                            | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Monroe County<br>Farm Bureau                              | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Montcalm<br>Area ISD                                      | Local Education<br>Agency                               |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Moon Lake<br>Riparian<br>Association                      | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Moran Twp<br>High Speed<br>Internet<br>Committee          | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                    | Type of<br>Organization   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| mPower<br>Innovations                                   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| MSU Extension   | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations                       | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Mt. Pleasant<br>Area Chamber<br>of Commerce             | Economic<br>Development   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Munson<br>Healthcare                                    | Health or<br>Telehealth<br>Organization<br>(Direct Service<br>and Policy focus) | Attended February,<br>March, and April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.          | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Muskegon<br>Community<br>College                        | Institutions of<br>Higher Education<br>(if not listed<br>above)                 | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Muskegon<br>County                                      | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government  | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| MyMichigan<br>Health                                    | Health or<br>Telehealth<br>Organization<br>(Direct Service<br>and Policy focus) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Nation Outside  | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations                       | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Negaunee<br>Cable<br>Company                            | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Negaunee<br>High School<br>- Negaunee<br>Public Schools | Local Education<br>Agency   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                      | Type of<br>Organization                                 | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| NetOne Com-<br>munications                                | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Networks<br>Northwest                                     | Economic<br>Development                                 | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Networks<br>Northwest/<br>Northwest<br>Michigan<br>Works! | Economic<br>Development                                 |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| New View<br>Agriculture                                   | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Newaygo<br>Company  | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| NEWCC EII   | Nonprofit<br>Organization<br>(501c3)                    | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Networks<br>Northwest                                     | Economic<br>Development                                 | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Networks<br>Northwest/<br>Northwest<br>Michigan<br>Works! | Economic<br>Development                                 | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| NMU Network   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Nokia   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name               | Type of<br>Organization   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| North Branch<br>County<br>Commissioner             | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                            | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| North End<br>Woodward<br>Community<br>Coalition    | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations       | Attended March<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Northeast<br>Michigan<br>Council of<br>Governments | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                            | Attended February,<br>March, and April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.          | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Northern<br>Broadband                              | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)         | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Northern Lakes<br>Economic<br>Alliance             | Economic<br>Development   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Northern<br>Michigan<br>University                 | Institutions of<br>Higher Education<br>(if not listed<br>above) | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.<br>Attended an<br>MICF Date    | ✓  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Northern Votes                                     | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Northland<br>Library<br>Cooperative                | Local Education<br>Agency                                       |  |  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| Northside TV<br>Corporation                        | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)         | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Northwest<br>Education<br>Services                 | Local Education<br>Agency                                       | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name  | Type of<br>Organization   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Northwest<br>Education<br>Services—<br>METL                                       | Local Education<br>Agency   | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Northwest<br>Michigan<br>Council of<br>Governments<br>(dba Networks<br>Northwest) | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government  | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Norvell<br>Township<br>Government   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government  | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| NOS Commu-<br>nications Inc.  | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but<br>not attended any<br>meetings.  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Nottawaseppi<br>Huron<br>Band of the<br>Potawatomi                                | Indian Tribe,<br>Alaska Native<br>Entity, or Native<br>Hawaiian<br>Organization | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| NPower  | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations                       | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| nTechQuity<br>Community<br>Learning   | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations                       | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Oakfield<br>Township  | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government  | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Oakland 80  | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government  | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name  | Type of<br>Organization   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Oakland<br>County<br>Commission   | Economic<br>Development   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Oakland<br>Forward  | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations       | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Oakland<br>Livingston<br>Human Service<br>Agency  | Nonprofit<br>Organization<br>(501c3)                            | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Oakland<br>University   | Institutions of<br>Higher Education<br>(if not listed<br>above) | Attended February,<br>March, and April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.          | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Oceana County<br>Economic<br>Alliance   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                            | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Oceana County<br>Board of<br>Commissioners  | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                            | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Office of<br>Foundation<br>Liaison  | Foundation  | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Office of<br>Global<br>Michigan   | Other   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Office of Rural<br>Development,<br>Michigan<br>Department<br>of Agriculture<br>and Rural<br>Development | Other   | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name            | Type of<br>Organization                                 | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Office of<br>Senator John<br>Damoose            | Other   |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Office of<br>U.S. Senator<br>Debbie<br>Stabenow | Other   | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Office of U.S.<br>Senator Gary<br>Peters        | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Ogden<br>Telephone<br>Company                   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Oneida<br>Township                              | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Operation<br>ABLE                               | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Osceola<br>County                               | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Ottawa County                                   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Park Township                                   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Pasty.net                                       | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name           | Type of<br>Organization                                 | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Peerless<br>Network of<br>Michigan LLC         | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Peaine<br>Township                             | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Peninsula Fiber<br>Network                     | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended February,<br>March, and April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.          | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Pennies<br>from Heaven<br>Foundation           | Foundation  | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Pentwater<br>Township                          | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Peter White<br>Public Library                  | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Petoskey<br>District Library                   | Other   |  |  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| Petoskey<br>Regional<br>Chamber of<br>Commerce | Economic<br>Development                                 | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Pigeon<br>Chamber of<br>Commerce               | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Pinconning<br>Township                         | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Pipestown<br>Township                          | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name       | Type of<br>Organization                                 | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Plainfield<br>Township                     | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Plante Moran                               | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Pleasant Plains<br>Township                | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Point<br>Broadband<br>Fiber Holding<br>LLC | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Powell<br>Township                         | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Pratt Valley<br>Farms                      | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Presque Isle<br>Electric &<br>Gas Co-op    | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended March<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| PROTEC<br>Michigan                         | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Pure<br>Broadband                          | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Quello Center<br>at MSU                    | Institutions of<br>Higher Education                     | Attended February,<br>March, and April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.          | ✓  |                             | ✓                                |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name   | Type of<br>Organization              | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |                                      |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Quincy<br>Township<br>Branch County  | Local Education<br>Agency            | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Ralph J. Wilson<br>Jr. Foundation  | Foundation                           | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Region 2<br>Planning<br>Commission   | Economic<br>Development              | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Regional<br>Education<br>Media Center<br>(REMC) of<br>Michigan                 | Local Education<br>Agency            | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Regional<br>Education<br>Media Center<br>(REMC) of<br>Michigan/<br>Tuscola ISD | Local Education<br>Agency            | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Representative<br>Greg<br>Alexander's<br>Office                                | Other                                | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Republic<br>Township<br>Supervisor   | Other                                | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Richland<br>Township,<br>Kalamazoo<br>County                                   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Richmond<br>Township<br>Planning<br>Commission<br>(Marquette<br>County)        | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name    | Type of<br>Organization                                 | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Rise                                    | Institutions of<br>Higher Education                     | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| River Rouge<br>City                     | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Rockford<br>Telephone<br>Company Inc.   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Rocky<br>Community<br>Fund              | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Roscommon<br>County                     | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Roscommon<br>Township                   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Rural Gig LLC                           | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Rural<br>Innovation<br>Strategies Inc.  | Economic<br>Development                                 | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Ryter<br>Cooperative<br>Industries      | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Sage Telecom<br>Communica-<br>tions LLC | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                       | Type of<br>Organization   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Saginaw<br>Chippewa<br>Indian Tribe<br>of Michigan         | Indian Tribe,<br>Alaska Native<br>Entity, or Native<br>Hawaiian<br>Organization | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Saginaw<br>County<br>Community<br>Action Center            | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations                       | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Saginaw<br>County<br>Information<br>Technology<br>Director | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government  | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Saginaw<br>Future Inc.                                     | Indian Tribe,<br>Alaska Native<br>Entity, or Native<br>Hawaiian<br>Organization | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Saginaw<br>Housing<br>Commission                           | Indian Tribe,<br>Alaska Native<br>Entity, or Native<br>Hawaiian<br>Organization | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Saginaw ISD  | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Sand Creek<br>Telephone<br>Company                         | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Attended March<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Sands<br>Township  | Foundation  | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Sanilac County<br>Community<br>Foundation                  | Foundation  | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Sault Area<br>Public Schools                               | Local Education<br>Agency   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                | Type of<br>Organization   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Sault EDC   | Economic<br>Development   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Sault Ste.<br>Marie Tribe<br>of Chippewa<br>Indians | Indian Tribe,<br>Alaska Native<br>Entity, or Native<br>Hawaiian<br>Organization | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Savion Energy                                       | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Schoolcraft<br>Memorial<br>Hospital                 | Health or<br>Telehealth<br>Organization<br>(Direct Service<br>and Policy focus) | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Secord<br>Township                                  | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government  | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Seville<br>Township                                 | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government  | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| ShoreWaves<br>LLC                                   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Sidney<br>Township                                  | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government  | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Sister Lakes<br>Cable TV                            | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| SisterFriends<br>Detroit                            | Health or<br>Telehealth<br>Organization<br>(Direct Service<br>and Policy focus) | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name               | Type of<br>Organization   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Small Business<br>Association of<br>Michigan       | Economic<br>Development   | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| SoftPath<br>Technologies<br>LLC                    | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| SonicNet Inc.                                      | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Attended March and<br>April Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                        | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Southcentral<br>Michigan<br>Planning<br>Council    | Economic<br>Development   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Southeast<br>Michigan<br>Council of<br>Governments | Economic<br>Development   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           | ✓                                |  |
| Southwest<br>Economic<br>Solutions                 | Economic<br>Development   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Southwest<br>Michigan<br>Planning<br>Commission    | Economic<br>Development   | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Southwestern<br>Michigan<br>Urban League           | Predominantly<br>Black Institution  | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| Sparrow Eaton<br>Hospital                          | Health or<br>Telehealth<br>Organization<br>(Direct Service<br>and Policy focus) | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Spartan<br>Net Co, dba<br>STELLAR<br>Broadband     | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)                         | Attended March<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name              | Type of<br>Organization                        | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|--|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |  |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Springport Telephone Co.                          | Industry Representative or Association (501c6) | Attended February and March Partnership Roundtable meetings.                           | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| St James Township                                 | County or Municipal Government                 | Attended April Partnership Roundtable meeting.   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| St. Clair County Commission                       | County or Municipal Government                 | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| St. Clair County Metropolitan Planning Commission | Economic Development                           | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| St. Clair RESA                                    | Local Education Agency                         | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| St. Johns Area Chamber of Commerce                | Economic Development                           | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Stanger Farm                                      | Other  | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Stannard Township                                 | County or Municipal Government                 | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| State Historic Preservation Office                | Other  | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| State of Michigan                                 | Other  | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name              | Type of<br>Organization                                 | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| State<br>Representative<br>Angela Witwer          | Other   | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| STELLAR<br>Broadband                              | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended March<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Strategic<br>Alliance<br>Community<br>Development | Economic<br>Development                                 | Attended March and<br>April Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                        | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Strawberry<br>Lake<br>Association                 | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Suburban<br>Library<br>Cooperative                | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Summit Digital                                    | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Sunrise<br>Communica-<br>tions LLC                | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Superior<br>District Library                      | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Surf<br>Broadband                                 | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                           | Type of<br>Organization                                 | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Sylvester<br>Broome<br>Empowerment<br>Village                  | Foundation  | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| SyncWave LLC   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Syntech<br>Development<br>LLC                                  | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Tabernacle<br>AME Church                                       | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Taymouth<br>Township   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    |  |  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| TC3 Telecom<br>Inc.  | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| TDS Telecom  | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| TechQuity<br>Community<br>Learning                             | Nonprofit<br>Organization<br>(501c3)                    | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Telecommuni-<br>cations<br>Association<br>of Michigan<br>(TAM) | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended February,<br>March, and April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.          | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name | Type of<br>Organization                          | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|                                      |  |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| The Chillicothe Telephone Company    | Industry Representative or Association (501c6)   | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| The Disability Network               | Organization that Represents Covered Populations | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| The Disability Network               | Organization that Represents Covered Populations | Attended April Partnership Roundtable meeting.   | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| The Ezekiel Project                  | Organization that Represents Covered Populations | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| The Herald-Palladium Newspaper       | Other  | Attended an MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| The Kresge Foundation                | Foundation                                       | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| The Right Place                      | Economic Development                             | Attended February, March, and April Partnership Roundtable meetings.                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Thumb Electric                       | Industry Representative or Association (501c6)   | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |
| T-Mobile                             | Industry Representative or Association (501c6)   | Has been invited to Partnership Roundtable but not attended any meetings.              |  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                                | Type of<br>Organization                                 | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| T-Mobile<br>Central LLC   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| T-Mobile US   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Torch Wireless  | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Traverse Area<br>District Library                                   | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Traverse City<br>Area Public<br>Schools                             | Local Education<br>Agency                               | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Tri-County<br>Electric<br>Cooperative<br>dba Home-<br>Works Connect | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| Tri-County<br>Regional<br>Planning<br>Commission                    | Economic<br>Development                                 | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| TriMedia<br>Environmental<br>& Engineering                          | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Trout Lake<br>Township  | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                              | Type of<br>Organization   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| United Tribes<br>of Michigan                                      | Indian Tribe,<br>Alaska Native<br>Entity, or Native<br>Hawaiian<br>Organization | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| United Way for<br>Southeastern<br>Michigan                        | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations                       | Attended February and<br>March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  | ✓  |
| University of<br>Michigan   | Institutions of<br>Higher Education<br>(if not listed<br>above)                 | Attended February,<br>March, and April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.          | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| University<br>of Michigan—<br>Flint                               | Institutions of<br>Higher Education<br>(if not listed<br>above)                 | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| University<br>of Michigan<br>Health                               | Health or<br>Telehealth<br>Organization<br>(Direct Service<br>and Policy focus) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| UP Health<br>Care Solutions/<br>Health<br>Information<br>Exchange | Health or<br>Telehealth<br>Organization<br>(Direct Service<br>and Policy focus) | Attended March<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| UP Kids   | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| UP Labor<br>Federation  | Workforce<br>Development<br>Organization  | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Urban League<br>of Detroit and<br>Southeastern<br>Michigan        | Predominantly<br>Black Institution  | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  | ✓  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                       | Type of<br>Organization                                 | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|  |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Urban League<br>of Detroit and<br>Southeastern<br>Michigan | Predominantly<br>Black Institution                      | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Urban Wireless<br>Solutions                                | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| US Cellular  | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| US Signal<br>Company LLC                                   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Vantage Point  | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Vergennes<br>Broadband<br>LLC                              | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Verizon  | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended March<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Victor<br>Township   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Victor<br>Township Hall                                    | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name | Type of<br>Organization                                 | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses)                    | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|                                      |   |   | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Victor Township,<br>Clinton County   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended March and<br>April Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Village of<br>Pentwater              | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended February,<br>March, and April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                             | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Waldron<br>Communica-<br>tion Co.    | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended February,<br>March, and April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.<br>Attended an<br>MICF Date | ✓  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Washington<br>Township               | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Washtenaw<br>Community<br>College    | Institutions of<br>Higher Education                     | Attended an<br>MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Washtenaw<br>County                  | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.                        |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Washtenaw<br>Fiber<br>Properties LLC | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.                        |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Watersmeet<br>Taskforce              | Economic<br>Development                                 | Attended an<br>MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Watersmeet<br>Township               | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended an<br>MICF Date  |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name  | Type of<br>Organization   | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Wayne County<br>Commissioner  | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                            | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Wayne County<br>Community<br>College District                                       | Institutions of<br>Higher Education<br>(if not listed<br>above) | Attended February<br>and March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Wayne Metro<br>Community<br>Action Agency   | Foundation  | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Wayne State<br>University   | Institutions of<br>Higher Education<br>(if not listed<br>above) | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| We The People   | Organization<br>that Represents<br>Covered<br>Populations       | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Webster<br>Broadband<br>Cooperative   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6)         | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Weldon Twp.   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                            | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Wells Township  | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                            | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Western Upper<br>Peninsula<br>Planning and<br>Development<br>Regional<br>Commission | Economic<br>Development   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name          | Type of<br>Organization                                 | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Wheatfield<br>Township                        | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| White Pine<br>Library<br>Cooperative          | Other   |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Wideband<br>Group, LLC                        | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended February and<br>March Partnership<br>Roundtable meetings.                     | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| Williamston<br>Township                       | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended February<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.<br>Attended an<br>MICF Date    | ✓  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| WinnTel                                       | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Wise Township<br>(Clare County)               | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    |  |  |                             |                                  |  |
| WISPA   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended April<br>Partnership<br>Roundtable meeting.                                   | ✓  |                             |                                  |  |
| WMSRDC<br>(West MI<br>Shorliene<br>Community) | Economic<br>Development                                 | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| WNMU - FM                                     | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name                                | Type of<br>Organization                                 | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|   |   |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| WNUC 96.7FM<br>Detroit -<br>Detroit's<br>Community<br>Radio Station | Other   | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Woodstock<br>Township   | County or<br>Municipal<br>Government                    | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| WorldWide<br>Technology   | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| WOW!  | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Wyandotte<br>Cable  | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |
| Wyoming<br>Kentwood<br>Chamber of<br>Commerce                       | Economic<br>Development                                 | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Yates Township<br>Planning<br>Commission                            | Economic<br>Development                                 | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Youth<br>Development<br>Corporation                                 | Nonprofit<br>Organization<br>(501c3)                    | Attended an<br>MICF Date   |  | ✓                           |                                  |  |
| Zayo Group,<br>LLC  | Industry<br>Representative<br>or Association<br>(501c6) | Has been invited<br>to Partnership<br>Roundtable but not<br>attended any meetings.     |  |                             |                                  |  |

| Organization/<br>Stakeholder<br>Name | Type of<br>Organization | Notes (Include any<br>notes or clarifications<br>regarding your<br>previous responses) | Levels of Engagement                           |                             |                                  |  |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|                                      |                         |  | Participated in<br>a Partnership<br>Roundtable | Attended<br>an MICF<br>Date | Submitted<br>a Public<br>Comment | Is Dedicated to<br>Serving One or<br>More Covered<br>Populations |
| Jim Busch                            | Individual Contributor  |  |  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| Kerry Stout                          | Individual Contributor  |  |  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| Michele Howards                      | Individual Contributor  |  |  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| Nicole Fickes                        | Individual Contributor  |  |  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| Randal Keeler                        | Individual Contributor  |  |  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| Ronald Evans                         | Individual Contributor  |  |  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| Shirley Thomas                       | Individual Contributor  |  |  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| Teresa Muscat Lareau                 | Individual Contributor  |  |  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| Wende Randall                        | Individual Contributor  |  |  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| William Fazer                        | Individual Contributor  |  |  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| Bill Fosket                          | Individual Contributor  |  |  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| Bob Suess                            | Individual Contributor  |  |  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| Dennis Hock                          | Individual Contributor  |  |  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| Amy DeHaan                           | Individual Contributor  |  |  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| Christina Potts                      | Individual Contributor  |  |  |                             | ✓                                |  |
| Christopher Abbot                    | Individual Contributor  |  |  |                             | ✓                                |  |



MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF  
**LABOR & ECONOMIC  
OPPORTUNITY**

**MICHIGAN  
HIGH-SPEED  
INTERNET  
OFFICE**