

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**Performance Progress Report**

2. Award Or Grant Number

55-50-M09015

4. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)

10-28-2011

1. Recipient Name

Public Service Commission of Wisconsin

6. Designated Entity On Behalf Of:

State of Wisconsin.

3. Street Address

610 North Whitney Way,

8. Final Report?

Yes

No

9. Report Frequency

Quarterly

Semi Annual

Annual

Final

5. City, State, Zip Code

Madison, WI 53705

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

11-01-2009

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

10-30-2014

7b. Reporting Period End Date:

09-30-2011

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
0	0	0	0	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

The fourth round of data collection for the SBDD program in Wisconsin was completed in mid-September 2011 and submitted to NTIA on October 1st. No further provider data collection efforts occurred in Q3. As mentioned in last quarter's report, the following providers have officially declined to participate in the program:

\*\* Fibernet Communications Co.: Status: Declined - will attempt again in Round 5

\*\* Geneva On-Line Inc.: Status: Declined - will attempt again in Round 5

The providers below have not provided data to date for the SBI program. (When available we submit estimated 3rd party data on behalf on non-participating providers) We will continue to reach out to these providers to encourage participation in future rounds.

- Broadview Networks Holdings, Inc.
- AirRunner Networks LLC
- Air-Speed.Net
- Cannon Telephone Co.
- Kaukauna Utilities
- CIMCO Communications, Inc.
- Rapid Communication LLC
- Wireless Wisconsin
- UP Logon
- Community Antenna System, Inc
- T6 Broadband
- NEXVO LLC
- Granite Broadband, Inc
- Nextera Wireless
- Hiercomm Networks
- Telephone Associates
- Niagara Community TV Co-op.
- CyberZone
- Tri-County Electronics & Internet Service

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

The LinkAMERICA team continues to follow consistent procedures within each of our four state projects. We augment provider and CAI data, when necessary, with coverage and speed information from third party sources. We do not substitute third party information for provider-supplied information, however, unless we can independently verify that the provider information is incorrect. Discrepancies between provider and third party data are investigated to ensure data accuracy.

If providers do not submit data, but we are able to verify infrastructure information through other sources, we use common engineering principles to estimate coverage and speed. We also collect user feedback (discussed below in the verification section) via location-specific feedback mechanisms on the state interactive map.

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

As described in past reports, the LinkAMERICA team uses consistent data verification procedures in each data collection round and across the four states within which we work. We add new verification procedures after they have been developed and tested. In general, we believe verification can be segmented into four categories/activities:

**\*\* Third Party Data Comparison:** As data arrives from providers we compare submissions against several commercial data sources to identify obvious anomalies or areas for further investigation. An example would be the comparison of an ILEC's reported coverage area boundaries with the legal exchange areas shown in the commercial ExchangeInfo data product. Coverage footprints of wireless providers are compared against AmericanRoamer database. This process occurs with each data collection round

**\*\* Provider Validation:** Check maps and other tools are produced at the beginning of each data collection round based upon prior round coverage reports. In the Round 4 collection period LinkAMERICA supplied providers with Check Maps in both GoogleEarth format and PDF format. This flexibility gave Providers that utilized the GoogleEarth format the ability to update coverage boundaries directly within the check map file itself. This process will be continued with each subsequent data collection round

**\*\* Data Format Verification:** Proprietary and NTIA-supplied scripts are run against the data set prior to submission to ensure the data is properly formatted and will be fully received upon submittal. This process occurs with each data collection round.

**\*\* Consumer Feedback/Verification:** The LinkWISCONSIN interactive map contains a user feedback mechanism that identifies the precise coordinates of each point of feedback. In QTR 3 a Consumer Feedback layer was developed for the interactive map that will further enhance the opportunity to collect coverage and speed information from consumers for comparison against provider supplied data.

10g. Have you initiated verification activities?  Yes  No

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

The above activities are performed in each data collection round. In addition, in Q3 2011 a new interactive Consumer Feedback layer was developed with a Beta version being released to the state for testing at the end of August. Browser errors discovered in testing are being corrected and the new layer is expected to go live on the interactive map in QTR 4 2011. This layer will publicly display the results from all user feedback and will incorporate speed testing into the feedback form to help verify provider-reported speeds.

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

Current verification activities will be enhanced over time as follows:

**\*\* Improved user feedback form and display layer:** As describe above, the new layer is being added to the state interactive map to display the location of user feedback points. This additional information will help all users/consumers understand where provider - reported coverage may be questionable. It will also help the mapping team better identify areas for further investigation. The feature will be released for public viewing in Q4 2011.

**\*\* Mobile Wireless Broadband Drive Testing:** This process will use a special device from a vendor to test signal strength and bandwidth/throughput on multiple mobile wireless signals at the same time. This technology will be used in areas where there is a large discrepancy between provider-reported coverage/speed and consumer-reported coverage/speed to determine the actual coverage and speed characteristics - commences in early 2012.

**\*\* Mobile Wireless Crowd Sourced Testing:** This process will use a proprietary smart phone application, provided by an outside vendor, to constantly check signal strength and bandwidth/throughput on users' mobile phones. The application will be available on multiple phone platforms and will be downloadable by consumers in each LinkAMERICA state. It runs in the background on the consumer's phone and does not impact phone performance. Data is sent from the vendor to LinkAMERICA for use in validating provider coverage and speed reports - commences in early 2012.

## Staffing

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

An analysis of actual hours worked in Q3 2011 shows that the project resulted in 0.73 FTE jobs created/retained at the Prime Recipient and Sub Recipient level in that quarter. It should be noted that this figure does not include a substantial personnel contribution by the PSCW in order to meet matching fund requirements. It also does not include positions staffed by vendors involved in the project. The staffing table discrepancy (.73 vs .74) is due to WI's more refined calculation of personnel time which the PPR can't accommodate.

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?

REFER TO 11L FOR A COMPLETE EXPLANATION REGARDING STAFFING FOR QTR 3.

10n. Staffing Table

Job Title	FTE %	Date of Hire
CEO-Supervisor Role	1	11/01/2009
Project Director	7	11/01/2009
Project Manager	18	09/05/2011
GIS Director	19	11/01/2009
Internal System Support/Architecture	10	11/01/2009
Provider Relations Manager	19	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./LinkAMERICA Alliance	Project Management/GIS Programming & Planning Services	Y	Y	11/01/2009	10/30/2011	1,717,684	0
CostQuest Associates Inc./LinkAMERICA Alliance	Project Management/GIS Programming & Planning Services	Y	Y	10/31/2011	10/30/2014	1,917,826	0

Add Row

Remove Row

## Funding

10p. How much Federal funding has been expended as of the end of the last quarter? \$1,403,193

10q. How much Remains? \$3,136,959

10r. How much matching funds have been expended as of the end of last quarter? \$379,736

10s. How much Remains? \$751,666

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	\$417,150	\$472,331	\$889,481	\$0	\$145,677	\$145,677
Personnel Fringe Benefits	\$105,277	\$172,255	\$277,532	\$0	\$56,916	\$56,916
Travel	\$27,500	\$26,388	\$53,888	\$0	\$1,730	\$1,730
Equipment	\$62,418	\$0	\$62,418	\$0	\$0	\$0
Materials / Supplies	\$0	\$6,482	\$6,482	\$0	\$6,482	\$6,482

Mapping Budget Element	Federal Funds Granted	Proposed In-Kind	Total Budget	Federal Funds Expended	Matching Funds Expended	Total Funds Expended
Subcontracts Total	\$3,635,510	\$0	\$3,635,510	\$1,403,193	\$0	\$1,403,193
Subcontract #1	\$1,717,684	\$0	\$1,717,684	\$1,403,193	\$0	\$1,403,193
Subcontract #2	\$1,917,826	\$0	\$1,917,826	\$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	\$292,297	\$382,580	\$674,877	\$0	\$168,931	\$168,931
Total Direct Costs	\$4,540,152	\$1,060,036	\$5,600,188	\$1,403,193	\$379,736	\$1,782,929
Total Indirect Costs	\$0	\$71,366	\$71,366	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Costs	\$4,540,152	\$1,131,402	\$5,671,554	\$1,403,193	\$379,736	\$1,782,929
% Of Total	80	20	100	79	21	100

### Hardware / Software

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

10v. If yes, please list

Laptop computer and software for Sub Recipient Project Manager (WI allocated portion): \$352.78  
Laptop computer and software for Sub Recipient Vendor Relations Manager (WI allocated portion): \$339.48  
Dell Precision T5500 Workstation w/Arclnfo C (WI allocated portion): \$3,458.59\*

\*The Arclnfo software was a necessary purchase to enable CostQuest to run the validation script, on provider data, that NTIA & FCC require for the SBDD program. Purchasing the hardware/software bundle was the most cost effective way to acquire the needed software. Without the hardware the cost for the software alone would have been \$1000 higher. This expense was allocated evenly to each of the four LinkAMERICA states.

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

\*\* Additional hardware and software in the amount of \$30,928 has been allocated for the "Address File" project approved in the Supplemental grant award.

\*\* Additional hardware and software in the amount of \$25,000 for the Mapping project has been approved in Year 5 via the Supplemental grant award. This equipment has not yet been purchased because it will not be needed until the last year of the project as the state assumes responsibility for hosting and management of the provider database and interactive maps.

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

10y. If yes, please list

\*\*American Roamer: Market area boundary and speed data on mobile cellular providers - \$5147  
\*\*Media Prints: Cable franchise boundary database - \$500  
\*\*ExchangeInfo: Legal exchange area boundary database for Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers - \$3805

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

10aa. If yes, please list

\*\*Data Collection Round 4: The fourth round of data (current as of 6/30/2011) was successfully collected and processed for submission to NTIA on October 1.

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

The data collection for Round 4 proved to be especially challenging due to the change to 2010 Census vintage. LinkAMERICA found that many providers were ill equipped to make this transition and needed assistance. The move to the new Census vintage resulted in a significant change in block counts in the LinkAMERICA states and we anticipate the reflection of that change to impact the view of provider coverage on the interactive map. We have communicated extensively with providers throughout the Round 4 collection

period to make them aware of the change and to assist with the data issues associated with it. Additionally, we continue to encounter difficulty in reconciling reported provider speeds with the NTIA speed range parameters. We envision this problem becoming more pronounced as the program requires a more granular reporting of provider speed information.

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

The release of the updated National Broadband Map in September caused confusion for some providers as it came just after the deadline date for submitting updates for the Round 4 data collection. Providers also continue to be frustrated in the lag time between data collection and posting to the NBM and question the value of maps with such dated information. They are concerned that consumers won't be properly informed on their most recent efforts to expand broadband coverage. We encourage NTIA to make map updates a priority after each data submission round, and to be sensitive to the timing of the release of the updates. Additionally, sufficient time and instruction are needed before changes to the format and/or type of data being requested for a collection period, is communicated to the provider community. Asking for changes just prior to a collection period creates frustration for the provider community and makes it more difficult to collect the necessary information. The PSC interactive map has been rolled out for some time and, with the updates recently implemented, the mapping tool is in frequent use. The newer mapping layers have enhanced the functional use of the maps and broadband data.

### 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 following are Year 1-2 Planning activities as described in the original project plan:

**\*\*Key Stakeholder Interviews:** Perform interviews with 20+ influential cross-disciplinary stakeholders within WI to determine most critical barriers to broadband expansion and adoption - Due: June 2010 - Status: Completed 28 interviews within scheduled time frame.

**\*\*Publish Initial Broadband Vision Summary and Videos** - publish draft, review with stakeholders and state, and then finalize summary report of emerging state broadband priorities, including video clips highlighting key facts - Due Date: August 2010 - Status: Completed

**\*\*Wisconsin Household Broadband Survey** - a statistically significant study of household internet usage and attitudes to help direct broadband planning - Due Date: December 2010 - Status: Completed

**\*\*Develop Regional Planning Teams:** Divide the state into appropriate regions and recruit local stakeholders and other in-state partners to draft regionally specific broadband development plans - Due Date: January 2011 - Status: Completed. Nine teams now formed, oriented and currently engaging in regional planning activities.

**\*\*Draft Regional Broadband Investment Plans:** Work with RPTs to identify most productive short-term activities to expand broadband access and adoption in each region. Publish plans for review within regions and by PSCW staff. Due Date: End of Q1 2011. Status: Completed

**\*\*Final Regional Broadband Investment Plans:** Publish final approved plans in each region. All 9 plans have been written, 6 have been finalized, one is scheduled for final review at a public forum scheduled for Nov.8, the remaining two are pending identification of transition partner. Due Date: End of Q3 2011. Status: Pending

**\*\*Transition ownership of regional plans to local teams.** Target Date - End of Q4. Status: Pending

**\*\*Develop up to five prototype engagement and outreach modules for implementation of regional plans in Years 3-5.** Due 10/31/11 - Status: Pending

11b. Please describe any challenge or obstacle that you have encountered and detail the mitigation strategies the project team is employing

The RPT process has been successful and has generated focus on and interest in broadband in the regions. We have experienced no significant challenges or obstacles in the Wisconsin Planning process for Years 1-2 and are currently on schedule with all planned activities/deliverables. With 9 different regions, progress has been varied in these areas. In two regions, we are still focusing on identification of local/regional leadership to take over the transition from planning to implementation.

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

Personal Salaries	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Personnel Fringe Benefits	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

11i. Planning Worksheet						
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?

The LinkWISCONSIN program submitted project plans for Capacity Building and Technical Training activities in Years 3-5 of the SBI Program. The Supplemental Award will provide for the following activities among others:

**\*\*Establish a Wisconsin State Broadband Director position to facilitate and coordinate the activities of the Capacity Training, Monitoring and Evaluation, and the ongoing Regional Planning Process. This full time, in-state staff member will 1) Provide a "statewide awareness clearinghouse" for broadband development activities and funding opportunities 2) Track best practices from within state and coordinate the implementation of those practices within each region 3) Log and communicate policy-related developments to the PSCW, regional teams, and all other stakeholders 4) implement statewide communications strategy to increase program awareness and participation.**

**\*\*Develop statewide investment plan with combined input from all nine regional plans**

**\*\*Build in-state Capacity Training Resources: Partner with other in-state entities to design, build and deploy specialized training resources to: 1) Expand capacity of Wisconsin's small business sector to access, adopt and utilize broadband 2) Improve capacity of Regional Planning Teams to advance current and future targeted broadband investments 3) Strengthen regional leadership capacity to successfully identify and receive broadband-related grant resources 4) Build in-state capacity for the sustainable use and future development of the broadband planning tools developed for Regional Planning Teams 5) Build capacity to access, adopt and utilize monitoring and evaluation tools created for Wisconsin in years 3 through 5.**

**\*\*Develop robust Broadband Monitoring & Evaluation modules to track program achievement**

**\*\*Develop socioeconomic impact model to assess broadband investment opportunities and summarize results in published report.**

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

In two of Wisconsin's our nine regions, although plans were formulated and released for public input, we are still working to identify local/regional leadership organizations in these two areas to head up the transition from planning to implementation. We continue to explore options in these regions and expect progress soon.

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

A change in staffing occurred in Q3 with the Project Manager leaving the program in September. The Provider Relations Manager was promoted to fill the vacancy and steps were taken to backfill that position. There was no impact to the project time-line as the Round 4 data collection period deadline had passed and the staff on hand was able to assist with needed tasks during the time the position was

not staffed. A new Provider Relations Manager has been hired and will start in Q4. As the program has been fully staffed with the exception of this short interim, we do not expect any changes to the FTEs that have been reported to date. The Date of Hire for the Project Manager in 10N reflects the date that the Provider Relations Manager Assumed that role. The FTE provided for the Provider Relations Manager and the Project Manager reflect the hours associated with those positions for Q3.

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

Gary Evenson

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

12d. Email Address

Gary.Evenson@wisconsin.gov

12b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official

Submitted Electronically

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

11-29-2011