

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Performance Progress Report

2. Award Or Grant Number

16-50-M09014

4. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)

10-07-2010

1. Recipient Name

Puget Sound Center for Teaching, Learning and Technology - Idaho

6. Designated Entity On Behalf Of:

State of Idaho

3. Street Address

19020 33rd Avenue West, Suite 210,

8. Final Report?

Yes

No

9. Report Frequency

Quarterly

Semi Annual

Annual

Final

5. City, State, Zip Code

Lynwood, WA 98036-4754

7. Project / Grant Period
Start Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)

11-01-2009

7a. End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)

10-30-2014

8. Reporting Period End Date:
(MM/DD/YYYY)

06-30-2010

9a. If Other, please describe:

N/A

10. Broadband Mapping

10a. Provider Table

Number of Providers Identified	Number of Providers Contacted	Number of Agreements Reached for Data Sharing	Number of Partial Data Sets Received	Number of Complete Data Sets	Number of Data Sets Verified
57	57	38	47	0	11

10b. Are you submitting the required PROVIDER DATA by using the Excel spreadsheet provided by the SBDD grants office? Yes No

10c. Have you encountered challenges with any providers that indicate they may refuse to participate in this project? Yes No

10d. If so, describe the discussions to date with each of these providers and the current status

Three companies in Idaho have refused to participate. They are:

Cactus International Inc.
Cequel Communications LLC
Stat Network Solutions

Cactus provides both landline (DSL) and fixed wireless broadband in a number of small towns near the University of Idaho. Cequel (dba Suddenlink) is a cable provider in several parts of Idaho. Stat Networks provides both wired and wireless service in Northern Idaho. All three reported that they do not have the time required to compile the data required for this program and declined to provider service maps or any other information that would help us more precisely identify network boundaries.

There are other providers who have not responded to repeated attempts at contact, but we cannot say at this time that they are officially refusing to participate. We are beginning our second round of data collection and will be reaching out to them again - so they may choose to provide data in this new round.

As with the other LinkAMERICA states, we did not receive high quality Middle Mile data from Idaho providers in the first round. While almost all of the providers supplied Max Advertised Speed (at least at the MSA/RSA level as a minimum) many did not supply any Typical Speed or Subscriber Weighted Nominal speed information.

Every provider had at least one "gap" in their response in Q1, so we are listing all providers as having technical "incomplete" datasets. As mention in the Wyoming report as well, we are unsure of the definition of "verified" datasets. We are showing 11 providers who responded to our requests in Q2 to verify their own submitted data via check maps and other provider verification tools - but our broader consumer verification processes (and other processes such as drive testing) will not begin until our first interactive maps are launched. We do not believe any dataset will ever be 100% verifiable though - so we are hoping for more guidance from NTIA on how to classify provider's data as "verified".

10e. If you are collecting data through other means (e.g. data extraction, extrapolation, etc), please describe your progress to date and the relevant activities to be undertaken in the future

As with the other LinkAMERICA states, we are using third party data to both verify coverage for existing providers and to fill in gaps where provider data submissions were incomplete. We are also launching drive testing efforts later this year and are collecting consumer speed test information via the LinkIDAHO web site. Finally, we are commencing consumer surveys in Q3 and will be seeking information on consumer connectivity via those surveys through the remainder of this year.

10f. Please describe the verification activities you plan to implement

LinkAMERICA follows similar data verification procedures in all four of its states. In Q2 those procedures consisted primarily of three separate processes.

- 1) .pdf check maps showing specific coverage footprints were prepared for each provider who submitted data in Q1. These maps were shared through a secure server and showed only the census blocks and street segments we derived from the data provided. Providers were asked to verify this data.
- 2) Processes were run within the data to check for "islands" and "donut holes". These are anomalies where a block is listed as covered by the provider but no adjacent or nearby blocks are reported by the same provider. Or, conversely, all but a single block in a large area are covered. We flag these suspect blocks and then investigate with providers. We are using the second data collection process to investigate and correct many of these potential errors.
- 3) We use processes to compare third party data against data reported by providers and flag anomalies. We then investigate those issues with providers.

With the launch of our online state maps, we will be adding additional consumer verification methods and will continue to expand our surveys and drive-testing as the program goes forward.

10g. Have you initiated verification activities? Yes No

10h. If yes, please describe the status of your activities

See above - the first three activities have already begun and we are using the second data collection process to resolve anomalies identified in the first dataset. We expect verification to be an ongoing and expanding effort as the program matures. In fact, given the collection of new data every six months, we do not believe data can ever be fully verified. We believe a form of confidence scoring is the best way to represent data and have implemented a basic confidence alert system in the beta maps to be released this summer.

10i. If verification activities have not been initiated please provide a projected time line for beginning and completing such activities

N/A

Staffing

10j. How many jobs have been created or retained as a result of this project?

SBDD funding has resulted in 1.7 total FTE. All new/retained FTEs shown here are at the EdLab Group (Prime Recipient) and CostQuest Associates (Sub-Recipient).

10k. Is the project currently fully staffed? Yes No

10l. If no, please explain how any lack of staffing may impact the project's time line and when the project will be fully staffed

N/A

10m. When fully staffed, how many full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs do you expect to create or retain as a result of this project?

N/A

10n. Staffing Table

Job Title	FTE %	Date of Hire
Sub Recipient CEO - Supervisory Role	5	11/01/2009
Sub Recipient Project Director	18	11/01/2009
Sub Recipient Project Manager	22	11/01/2009
Sub Recipient GIS Director	15	11/01/2009
Sub Recipient Internal System Support/Architecture	5	11/01/2009
Sub Recipient Provider Relations Manager	15	11/01/2009
Prime Recipient Executive Director	15	11/01/2009
Prime Recipient Operations Manager	15	11/01/2009
Prime Recipient Contracts Coordinator	25	11/01/2009
Prime Recipient Project Manager	35	11/01/2009

Add Row Remove Row

Sub Contracts

10o. Subcontracts Table

Name of Subcontractor	Purpose of Subcontract	RFP Issued (Y/N)	Contract Executed (Y/N)	Start Date	End Date	Federal Funds	In-Kind Funds
Cost Quest Associates Inc./ LinkAMERICA Alliance	Project Management/ GIS Programming & Planning Services	N	Y	11/01/2009	10/31/2011	\$1,251,845	\$265,265

Add Row Remove Row

Funding

10p. How much Federal funding has been expended as of the end of the last quarter? \$331,851 10q. How much Remains? \$1,007,922

10r. How much matching funds have been expended as of the end of last quarter? \$128,705 10s. How much Remains? \$240,737

10t. Budget Worksheet

Mapping Budget Element	Federal Funds Granted	Proposed In-Kind	Total Budget	Federal Funds Expended	Matching Funds Expended	Total Funds Expended
Personal Salaries	\$49,544	\$221,173	\$2,707,171	\$8,911	\$1,667	\$10,577
Personnel Fringe Benefits	\$12,385	\$5,556	\$17,941	\$1,871	\$0	\$1,871
Travel	\$3,420	\$0	\$3,420	\$1,128	\$0	\$1,128
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Materials / Supplies	\$800	\$0	\$800	\$54	\$0	\$54
Subcontracts Total	\$1,251,845	\$0	\$1,251,845	\$317,644	\$0	\$317,644
Subcontract #1	\$1,251,845	\$0	\$1,251,845	\$317,644	\$0	\$317,644
Subcontract #2	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #3	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #4	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #5	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$0	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$0	\$125,000	\$125,000
Total Direct Costs	\$1,317,994	\$351,729	\$1,669,723	\$329,608	\$126,667	\$456,275
Total Indirect Costs	\$21,779	\$17,713	\$39,492	\$2,243	\$2,039	\$4,282
Total Costs	\$1,339,773	\$369,442	\$1,709,215	\$331,851	\$128,705	\$460,557
% Of Total	78	22	100	72	28	100

Hardware / Software

10u. Has the project team purchased the software / hardware described in the application? Yes No

10v. If yes, please list

Very little hardware/software was specified in the application - outside of approximately \$2500 for PCs and equipment that was included in the sub-recipient budget for various positions. The sub recipient is providing all GIS, mapping, and web server hardware/software on a contract basis in Years 1-2. Content will be transitioned to the state of Idaho at the end of Year 2 or Year 5 depending upon the outcome of the recent Supplemental Application for Data Collection.

10w. Please note any software / hardware that has yet to be purchased and explain why it has not been purchased

Software and hardware were not specified in the original application or budget outside of the limited budget for personnel PCs and related software mentioned above. Hardware and software are provided on a hosted/service basis.

10x. Has the project team purchased or used any data sets? Yes No

10y. If yes, please list

American Roamer, Media Prints, and ExchangeInfo

10z. Are there any additional project milestones or information that has not been included? Yes No

10aa. If yes, please list

The beta interactive map for the LinkIDAHO website was released to state personnel for review in July 2010. Public release is scheduled for August, 2010.

10bb. Please describe any challenge or obstacle that you have encountered and detail the mitigation strategies the project team is employing
As with the other LinkAMERICA states, data normalization and initial verification steps took longer than expected. Additional GIS programming resources were applied by LinkAMERICA. Several additional issues were uncovered in the data as the beta maps were developed, which required more extensive database work and data re-processing. Again, we applied additional programming resources to address this issue. As a result, the sub-budget for GIS Programming services is diminishing more rapidly than expected. However, we are monitoring the budget closely and expect the extra work at the beginning of the project will result in time savings in the later/final months.

10cc. Please provide any other information that you think would be useful to NTIA as it assesses your Broadband Mapping Project

This note relates to a problem that is common to all LinkAMERICA states: In many cases providers have reported coverage that has already been challenged by the limited audiences reviewing the first beta maps (i.e. state personnel and advisory boards). Providers are adamant the areas are covered, and the reviewers are adamant they have tried to get broadband in those areas and cannot. The potential number of these types of anomalies is unknown at this point. However, with the public launch of the web maps, we expect a very high volume of similar reports based on individual consumers' experience at specific locations. It may be a case where the two parties disagree and we will need to verify who is correct. Or disputes may occur based on the fact that unserved areas in small census blocks are being shown as served. In any case, we do not intend to override a provider's coverage report based solely on consumer data. If we can use other more reliable methods to verify coverage, we will consider overriding provider data. But the potential number of disputes may be too large for every report to be individually pursued/verified. We will know more about the scope of this issue as the maps are released to the public in Q3.

11. Broadband Planning

11a. Please describe progress made against all goals, objectives, and milestones detailed in the approved Project Plan. Be sure to include a description of each major activity / milestone that you plan to complete and your current status

Following a process with common activities across all LinkAMERICA states, the Planning Team completed 26 in-depth interviews with key Idahoan leaders representing major sectors (government, telecom providers, business, education, health care, public safety, community support organizations). As with the other states, a comprehensive report of the interview findings was written and posted to the LinkIDAHO website. The report outlines Idaho's readiness for broadband development, inventories available resources specific to the state, and explains how those resources may be leveraged in the Idaho broadband planning process. Prior to the report's publication the Planning Team conducted two focused debrief sessions with interviewees to ensure the accuracy of the report finding. With this data in hand, the Team also worked closely with state officials to identify the boundaries of local planning regions for further field activities. An Idaho Advisory Team was also created and is comprised of high-level leaders from around the state. They will advise on the launch of the regional planning process throughout the state.

11b. Please describe any challenge or obstacle that you have encountered and detail the mitigation strategies the project team is employing
The Planning process ran into no significant obstacles in Q2. On the contrary, the support from the PSC, interviewees, and other state contacts/stakeholders has been superb.

11c. Does the Project Team anticipate any changes to the project plan for Broadband Planning? Yes No

11d. If yes, please describe these anticipated changes. Please note that NTIA will need to approve changes to the Project Plan before they can be implemented

N/A

Funding

11e. How much Federal funding has been expended as of the end of the last quarter? \$114,643 11f. How much Remains? \$377,940

11g. How much matching funds have been expended as of the end of last quarter? \$3,702 11h. How much Remains? \$84,947

11i. Planning Worksheet

Planning Budget Element	Federal Funds Granted	Proposed In-Kind	Total Budget	Federal Funds Expended	Matching Funds Expended	Total Funds Expended
Personal Salaries	\$94,834	\$66,316	\$161,150	\$12,068	\$0	\$12,068
Personnel Fringe Benefits	\$23,708	\$0	\$23,708	\$2,534	\$0	\$2,534
Travel	\$2,500	\$0	\$2,500	\$0	\$0	\$0
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Materials / Supplies	\$400	\$0	\$400	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontracts Total	\$343,683	\$0	\$343,683	\$95,968	\$0	\$95,968
Subcontract #1	\$343,683	\$0	\$343,683	\$95,968	\$0	\$95,968
Subcontract #2	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #3	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #4	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #5	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Direct Costs	\$465,125	\$66,316	\$531,441	\$110,570	\$0	\$110,570
Total Indirect Costs	\$27,458	\$22,333	\$49,790	\$4,073	\$3,702	\$7,775
Total Costs	\$492,583	\$88,649	\$581,231	\$114,643	\$3,702	\$118,345
% Of Total	85	15	100	97	3	100

Additional Planning Information

11j. Are there any additional project milestones or information that has not been included?

No further information.

11k. Please describe any challenge or obstacle that you have encountered and detail the mitigation strategies the Project Team is employing

We have experienced no significant obstacles in Idaho and have terrific support from the state GIO's office, the recently assembled Advisory Board, and several other key stakeholders throughout the state.

11l. Please provide any other information that you think would be useful to NTIA as it assesses your Broadband Mapping Project

Karen A. Peterson is the certifying official.

425-977-4750

kpeterson@psctl.org

Report submitted on 8/2/2010 to Anne Neville via email

12. Certification: I certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that this report is correct and complete for performance of activities for the purpose set forth in the award documents.

12a. Typed or Printed Name and Title of Authorized Certifying Official

Karen Peterson

12c. Telephone
(area code, number, and extension)

425-977-4750

CEO/Executive Director

12d. Email Address

kpeterson@psctl.org

12b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official

Submitted Electronically

12e. Date Report Submitted
(Month, Day, Year)

10-07-2010

Performance Progress Report
OMB Approval Number: 0660-0034
Expiration Date: 08/31/2010