

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Performance Progress Report

2. Award Or Grant Number

24-50-M09019

4. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)

07-25-2011

1. Recipient Name

Maryland Broadband Cooperative, Inc.

6. Designated Entity On Behalf Of:

Maryland

3. Street Address

212 West Main Street, Suite 304,

8. Final Report?

Yes

No

9. Report Frequency

Quarterly

Semi Annual

Annual

Final

5. City, State, Zip Code

Salisbury, MD 21801

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

11-01-2009

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

10-31-2014

7b. Reporting Period End Date:

06-30-2011

9a. If Other, please describe:

NA

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

We continue to enjoy generally excellent support from the provider community, indeed we added 8 new providers since the previous submission. However, there are providers that have been difficult and others that have been utterly unresponsive. We continue to make attempts to gain their participation. Several resellers have said because they are not facilities based they have no reporting responsibility in the SBI or, that their NDA with the ILEC, forbid their participation even if advantageous to do so. The following 11 providers continue to refuse participation: Airespring, BullsEye, CONXX, Frontier Communications/Global Crossings, Global Crossing Telecommunications, LightEdge Solutions, Metropolitan Telecommunications Holding Company, Qwest Communications Company, RapidDSL & Wireless, Southwest Wireless Group/Transcend Broadband, Transbeam.

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

In order to support the NTIA's and FCC's focus on community anchor institution (CAI) data collection, we have re-doubled our efforts to collect comprehensive and accurate data by working directly with the Counties. We sent letters to each County Executive articulating the need for the CAI data requested and explaining the potential opportunity costs to the County from not being fully represented in the CAI census. This effort has received excellent initial support and we are hopeful we will be submitting the largest and most accurate CAI data to date in September.

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

A maximum of fifteen data checks are conducted on each of the provider-submitted broadband availability data, as listed below. Different versions of data verification tests are conducted on submissions from wireline broadband providers versus wireless providers, because of the differing submission geometry. Those tests listed in bold below have the greatest explanatory value.

- 1) Maximum down/upload speeds reported by provider
- 2) Typical down/upload speeds reported by provider
- 3) Typical down/upload speed from 2010 speed test
- 4) Speed tests match reported typical speeds or are within 1 speed tier
- 5) Census blocks/coverage areas verified by 2010 FCC and MBBMI speed tests
- 6) Census blocks/coverage area reported to project, but no tract reported directly to FCC
- 7) Tracts reported directly to FCC, but no census blocks/coverage area reported to project
- 8) Census blocks/coverage areas versus unserved area locations reported
- 9) Total number of unserved area locations reported per provider
- 10) Of census blocks reported as served, how many have zero population based on 2000 census data?
- 11) Web search verification
- 12) Census blocks that are outside Cable Franchise Boundary
- 13) Census blocks that are outside DSL boundary
- 14) Wireless broadband presence and speed systematic field sampling

15) Map review via web conference with broadband service provider

10g. Have you initiated verification activities? Yes No

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

We have completed the verification tests as noted in the Submission Summary Whitepaper for round 3 and we plan to review, modify, and improve the tests for round 4.

The ESRGC, in partnership with the Center for GIS at Towson University and as a subcontract to the SBI grantee in Maryland, the Maryland Broadband Cooperative, conducted a number of verification and validation tests on the provider-submitted broadband availability data. In the event that inconsistencies or errors were found, any changes were made to the provider-submitted data during this data delivery round were noted in the "Read Me" text file. We expect to have the confidence to continue modifying provider-submitted data as a result of our testing/research during the 4th round of data submissions in October 2011.

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

NA

Staffing

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

For 2Q 2011, we are reporting 13 1/4 FTEs created or retained using ARRA funds. In addition to our normal staff complement, we have hired 6 FTEs of student workers to assist in field verification of wireless coverage areas. This work began in June and will continue through the summer. We hope to begin hiring State Broadband Capacity Building staff before the end of 3Q 2011.

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

We anticipate that the project will be fully staffed, including the Capacity Building staff, by the end of 3Q 2011, but hopefully sooner. At this time, we do not foresee any negative impacts to the project time line that cannot be either made up or managed through. However, we will have concerns if the SBCB staff are not hired in 3Q 2011.

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

16

10n. Staffing Table

Job Title	FTE %	Date of Hire
GIS Manager	75	11/09/2009
Senior GIS Specialist	100	12/01/2009
GIS Analyst	100	11/09/2009
GIS Specialist	100	11/09/2009
IT Tech/Specialist/Web	70	11/09/2009
Programmer	60	11/09/2009
Project Manager	80	11/09/2009
Director	60	11/09/2009
Writer/Research Assistant	50	11/09/2009
SBCB PM	100	10/01/2011
SBCB Staff Analysts (2)	100	10/01/2011
Field Coverage Area Verification Techs (6)	100	06/01/2011

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
Salisbury University	Overall Project technical lead, provide all GIS services, Broadband Demand Forecasting.	N	Y	11/01/2009	10/31/2014	2,121,160	0
Towson University	Support data development, verification, and application development.	N	Y	11/01/2009	10/31/2014	1,444,606	0
TCC-Lower Eastern Shore	Broadband Planning coordination and management in the 4 counties of the Lower Eastern Shore.	N	Y	11/01/2009	10/30/2012	94,869	0
TCC-Mid Shore	Broadband Planning coordination and management in the 5 counties of the Mid and Upper Eastern Shore.	N	Y	11/01/2009	10/30/2012	113,069	0
TCC-Southern MD	Broadband Planning coordination and management in the 3 counties of Southern MD.	N	Y	11/01/2009	10/30/2012	87,311	0
TCC-Western	Broadband Planning coordination and management in the 3 counties of Western MD.	N	Y	11/01/2009	10/30/2012	71,613	0
MD Department of Information Technology (DoIT)	State Broadband Capacity Building	N	N	09/28/2010	10/31/2014	51,209	0

Add Row

Remove Row

Funding

10p. How much Federal funding has been expended as of the end of the last quarter? \$1,333,805 10q. How much Remains? \$3,421,963

10r. How much matching funds have been expended as of the end of last quarter? \$425,675 10s. How much Remains? \$767,491

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	\$222,714	\$74,000	\$296,714	\$104,960	\$13,063	\$118,023
Personnel Fringe Benefits	\$89,086	\$22,521	\$111,607	\$41,983	\$4,290	\$46,273
Travel	\$17,619	\$0	\$17,619	\$4,913	\$0	\$4,913
Equipment	\$70,000	\$115,811	\$185,811	\$15,150	\$70,811	\$85,961
Materials / Supplies	\$20,847	\$0	\$20,847	\$4,589	\$0	\$4,589
Subcontracts Total	\$3,992,088	\$0	\$3,992,088	\$1,107,591	\$0	\$1,107,591
Subcontract #1	\$2,121,160	\$0	\$2,121,160	\$473,072	\$0	\$473,072
Subcontract #2	\$1,444,606	\$0	\$1,444,606	\$530,525	\$0	\$530,525
Subcontract #3	\$51,209	\$0	\$51,209	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #4	\$94,869	\$0	\$94,869	\$21,740	\$0	\$21,740
Subcontract #5	\$87,311	\$0	\$87,311	\$31,797	\$0	\$31,797

Mapping Budget Element	Federal Funds Granted	Proposed In-Kind	Total Budget	Federal Funds Expended	Matching Funds Expended	Total Funds Expended
Construction	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$343,414	\$980,834	\$1,324,248	\$54,618	\$337,511	\$392,129
Total Direct Costs	\$4,755,768	\$1,193,166	\$5,948,934	\$1,333,804	\$425,675	\$1,759,479
Total Indirect Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Costs	\$4,755,768	\$1,193,166	\$5,948,934	\$1,333,804	\$425,675	\$1,759,479
% Of Total	80	20	100	28	36	30

Hardware / Software

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

10v. If yes, please list

We purchased the Dell Workstation and the ESRI ArcInfo Software in a previous quarter. There were no additional hardware purchases in the Second Quarter.

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

We have not purchased the servers, licenses or additional storage, because the project schedule does not call for their acquisition as yet.

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

10y. If yes, please list

We had originally planned to purchase wireless coverage areas from a vendor. We have not purchased this data and do not plan to as we have received that information from the providers themselves. We have purchased other data sets that we did not realize that we would need when the proposal was submitted. One example is the Maryland Property View data set which provides a centroid location for every property in Maryland. This has aided in the accuracy of our geocoding and assigning end users to the correct block. We have also acquired historical speed test sample information for the state of Maryland for 2009. In 2Q 2011, we purchased additional data from DirectMail.com, focused on government service providers.

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

10aa. If yes, please list

NA

10bb. Please describe any challenge or obstacle that you have encountered and detail the mitigation strategies the project team is employing
The biggest obstacle we face, besides non-compliance by some facilities-based broadband service providers, is the ability to verify data accuracy and completeness when the data has, by design, only one source. Any data verification effort is going to be an attempt at a rough approximation of what is verified and what is not, unless you can work with the providers directly. They are, after all, the only real source of the data. However, the data validation and verification process listed above will attempt to overcome this obstacle by triangulating the data accuracy and completeness in many indirect ways, thus gaining a good sense of data confidence, or not. Collecting community anchor data has presented several obstacles. 1) Confirming participation is often problematic because many CAIs do not feel comfortable providing the requested data. This is the lesser obstacle, as the team strategy is to communicate the purpose and value of participating in the project. 2) We are often unable to identify the contact that has access to the requested data. This is the larger obstacle due to the specific technical of the information we are seeking, and the large number of facilities targeted for data collection. Our revised strategy has been to contact County Executives directly and communicate the opportunity costs in terms of lost federal funding if the CAI are not counted in the census. Early results have been encouraging and we are hopeful that the September 2011 submission will be comprehensive and accurate. Lastly, we continue to experience a delay in implementing the State Broadband Capacity Building project due to a complicated document negotiation process with our State of Maryland partners; however, we believe the process is winding down and that we can conclude the agreement before the end of 3Q 2011.

10cc. Please provide any other information that you think would be useful to NTIA as it assesses your Broadband Mapping Project
On July 12th the Maryland project hosted a Regional Broadband Mapping Grantee meeting at Towson University. The meeting was attended by delegations from DC, DE, MD, NJ, PA, VA, and WV. Everyone discussed their successes and challenges openly and

candidly. We found that there were several best practices we could share on a state-to-state basis to solve individual issues and deficiencies, but even more excitingly, the attendees want to investigate if we can address some issues that have affected us all as a regional block. It was agreed that the regional focus is something we want more of, so we have committed to get together more often, perhaps twice a year on a rotating basis where other states will follow Maryland's lead in playing host.

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

Completed:

- Initial Meetings with Regional Council Leadership
- Format Design for the Stakeholder Meetings
- Format Design for the Summit Meetings (General Public Meeting)
- First Stakeholder Meeting for Southern Maryland
- First Stakeholder Meetings for Lower and Upper Eastern Shore
- Second Stakeholder Meeting for Southern Maryland
- First General Public Meeting for Southern Maryland
- Second General Public Meeting for Southern Maryland
- First General Public Meeting for The Lower and Upper Eastern Shore Scheduled
- Second Stakeholder Meetings for Lower and Upper Eastern Shore Scheduled
- Third Stakeholder Meeting for Southern Maryland
- First Stakeholder Meeting for Western Maryland
- Fourth Stakeholder Meeting for Southern Maryland
- First General Public Meeting for Western Maryland
- Second Stakeholder Meeting for Western Maryland
- Third Stakeholder Meeting for Lower Eastern Shore of Maryland
- Preliminary Draft of Regional Plan Template

Next Three Months:

- Third Stakeholder Meeting for Western Maryland
- Fourth Stakeholder Meeting for Lower Eastern Shore of Maryland
- Second Stakeholder Meeting for Upper Eastern Shore of Maryland
- The All-Region Online Survey of Stakeholders
- The Preliminary Draft of Regional Plan Template Circulated to All Regions
- Fifth Stakeholder Meeting for Southern Maryland

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

Moving forward, although stakeholders have expressed frustration at the absence of an outline for the federal report. As a result, we are advancing with an outline that is acceptable to the regional teams.

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

NA

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
Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Materials / Supplies	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

11i. Planning Worksheet

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?

No

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

Not at this time.

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

Not at this time.

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

Andrew Van Dopp

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

410-341-6322

12d. Email Address

dvandopp@mdbc.us

12b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official

Submitted Electronically

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

08-03-2011