U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE	2. Award Or Grant Number
Performance Progress Report	56-50-M09016
	4. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)
	10-20-2010

1. Recipient Name	6. Designated Entity On Behalf Of:	
Puget Sound Center for Teaching, Learning and Technology	Wyoming	

3. Street Address	8. Final Report?	9. Report Frequency
19020 33rd Avenue West, Suite 210,	○ Yes	◉ Quarterly
	◉ No	○ Semi Annual
5. City, State, Zip Code		○ Annual
Lynwood, WA 98036-4754		○ Final

7. Project / Grant Period Start Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	7a. End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	8. Reporting Period End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	9a. If Other, please describe:
11-01-2009	10-30-2014	09-30-2010	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
37	37	23	30	0	0

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

Only Lariat.net and Customer Telephone Broadband Services Inc. have flatly declined to participate in the state of Wyoming. In both cases they have been reached and clearly stated that they do not wish to expend the time and effort to submit data. We will continue to reach out in each data cycle but do not anticipate a change of heart.

No other Wyoming providers have refused to participate and overall participation is quite high across the state. There were only three providers who submitted data in Round 1 but who were non responsive in Round 2.

Further guidance from NTIA on the proper way to account for providers in this section would be appreciated. It is unclear if we should be reporting "participation" in the program as a whole (a cumulative number of providers who submitted at least once) or only on the data collection round that was completed immediately prior to this report (in this case, Round 2 submitted on October 8).

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 reported for all LinkAMERICA states, the team uses third party data sources and standard engineering analysis (using technology types, middle mile infrastructure points, and well known networking/propagation principles) to augment provider data. These same techniques are used for verification purposes.

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

The LinkAMERICA team uses common verification procedures in each of the four LinkAMERICA states. Our efforts include the following primary activities:

1) PDF check maps and other "check data": This information is generated from provider submissions. Maps and other summarized forms of data are shown to the providers after their initial data has been normalized and formatted per NOFA standards. Providers have the opportunity to visually check the representation and make corrections if necessary.   This process is ongoing with each data Round.

2) Database scripts are run to flag potential errors in large batches of data. For instance, we look for areas where coverage is reported outside of a provider's known Exchange Area boundary, or where a single census block is shown as covered without any other covered blocks within a specific distance. We investigate the anomalies with providers when possible and correct the data based on their feedback.   This process is ongoing with each data Round.

3) Drive testing using multi-frequency/multi-carrier wireless analysis tools. This form of testing will be piloted in Wyoming in 2011 and is incorporated into the project plan for 2012-2014.

4) Consumer Feedback/Verification: In the future, we plan to implement a consumer feedback mechanism that will provide an indication of data accuracy as reported by map users. The feature is being designed and a delivery date has not been set.

10g. Have you initiated verification activities? ◉ Yes ○ No

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

We repeat the above activities with each new round of data collection, and continue to run database scripts and other processes against the data between submittals. Verification is an ongoing process that never truly stops.

As with the other LinkAMERICA states, it should be noted that we show "0" in the box above for "Verified datasets". We do this because we are not certain of the definition of "verified". Data changes constantly and can never be 100% verified without physically visiting every location. We often recieve conflicting reports from providers who say they offer coverage in an area and consumers who swear they are unserved in that same area. Some of this is due to the imprecision of using census blocks for mapping purposes. Unfortunately, investigating each and every instance of this is well beyond the scope and budget of this program. However, we believe our existing validation measures and the future "consumer feedback" system will provide valuable perspective on conflicting data.

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

A method for sharing consumer feedback on a given location/area is currently under development. This will help to further qualify the data submitted by providers. Users will be able to report potential errors through a feedback form, and other users will be able to see when a consumer has questioned the providers reported coverage.

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?

1.7 FTE

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 Grants & 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
CostQuest Associates, Inc.	Project Management/ GIS Programming & Planning Services	N	Y	11/01/2009	10/30/2011	$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? $717,025   10q. How much Remains? $3,436,808

10r. How much matching funds have been expended as of the end of last quarter? $216,547   10s. How much Remains? $821,917

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	$270,095	$200,474	$470,569	$27,735	$8,719	$36,454
Personnel Fringe Benefits	$67,524	$7,682	$75,206	$5,825	$0	$5,825
Travel	$17,920	$0	$17,920	$1,060	$0	$1,060
Equipment	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Materials / Supplies	$4,968	$0	$4,968	$60	$0	$60
Subcontracts Total	$3,667,506	$229,500	$3,897,006	$656,052	$0	$656,052
Subcontract #1	$3,667,506	$229,500	$3,897,006	$656,052	$0	$656,052
Subcontract #2	$0	$0	$0	$16,657	$0	$16,657
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	$507,155	$507,155	$0	$200,000	$200,000
Total Direct Costs	$4,028,013	$944,811	$4,972,824	$707,389	$208,719	$916,108
Total Indirect Costs	$125,820	$93,653	$219,473	$9,636	$7,828	$17,464
Total Costs	$4,153,833	$1,038,464	$5,192,297	$717,025	$216,547	$933,572
% Of Total	80	20	100	77	23	100

Hardware / Software

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

10v. If yes, please list

Yes, the team has purchased the laptop computers and software budgeted for the Project Manager and Provider Relations positions.

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

Additional 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 for the interactive maps 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

After a review period, the LinkAMERICA team was excited to release the first publicly available "beta" version of Wyoming's interactive map in early August. Response has been positive, although the state has chosen not to heavily publicize the map until the Round 2 data has been implemented later this fall.

10bb. Please describe any challenge or obstacle that you have encountered and detail the mitigation strategies the project team is employing

As with all LinkAMERICA states, the largest challenge within the mapping program is the receipt of incomplete or inaccurate datasets - or no response at all - from providers. To address these problems, we have invested in a full time Provider Relations Manager position as well as Provider Relations contractors who reach out to all Wyoming providers on a regular basis.

To help with completeness of data in Round 2, we generated a customized instruction sheet for each Wyoming provider that specifically identified the type of information that was missing from their Round 1 submission and explained the proper way to include that information in Round 2.

The use of street segments also continues to be a challenging issue. Most smaller providers do not have the ability to identify street segments in large census blocks as required in the NOFA. As a result, we do a great deal of geo-processing to convert provider maps into blocks and segments.

Finally, we attempted to collect Maximum Advertised Speed at the Census Block level as requested by NTIA. Unfortunately, several large providers flatly refused to give this information, citing the fact that it is "not listed in the NOFA". Others remain confused about the definition of "Advertised" and seem to be providing a single maximum speed that is literally advertised in the newspaper or on TV for the entire market area - instead of offering a CB by CB analysis of what maximum speeds are possible.

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

N/A

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

The planning team was very busy in Wyoming in Q3. We continue to meet regularly with the Wyoming Broadband Advisory Board, and presented the final version of the interview findings report in July.   Short video segments were developed based upon feedback from the interviews and will be used to educate and query the public as the regional planning process expands. The geographic boundaries of the planning regions were finalized and several meetings occurred to identify an appropriate in-state partner for regional planning team coordination. Partners under consideration in include the Wyoming Business Council, the University of Wyoming, and Community Colleges for Wyoming.

A consumer survey was initiated in July and had received 1033 responses in Wyoming as of the end of September, a phenomenal result for such a rural and sparsely populated state. A separate public safety survey is currently under development with the state Public Safety Commission.

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 Q3.

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? $0   11f. How much Remains? $0

11g. How much matching funds have been expended as of the end of last quarter? $0   11h. How much Remains? $0

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	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Personnel Fringe Benefits	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Travel	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Equipment	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Materials / Supplies	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Subcontracts Total	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Subcontract #1	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
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	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total Indirect Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
% Of Total	0	0	0	0	0	0

Additional Planning Information

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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@psctlt.org
12b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official Submitted Electronically	12e. Date Report Submitted (Month, Day, Year) 10-29-2010