

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**Performance Progress Report**

2. Award Or Grant Number

49-50-M09054

4. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)

06-19-2012

1. Recipient Name

Utah Public Service Commission

6. Designated Entity On Behalf Of:

State of Utah

3. Street Address

Heber Wells Building, Fourth Floor, 160 East 300 South,

8. Final Report?

Yes

No

9. Report Frequency

Quarterly

Semi Annual

Annual

Final

5. City, State, Zip Code

Salt Lake City, UT 84111-2305

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

01-01-2010

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

12-31-2014

7b. Reporting Period End Date:

06-30-2012

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

Altazip, a small wireless provider to whom the Project has provided technical support in the past, wished to report speeds above the speed tier domains currently suggested by the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) for terrestrial fixed wireless. The speeds Altazip reported are technically possible and may be currently provisioned to specific users, likely commercial for a limited number of customers. Altazip does not advertise these speeds (or any speed or pricing information) on their website. The Project Team spoke with Altazip and presented a few options and ultimately decided not to upgrade their speeds during the April 2012 Data Submission. In addition, the data provided posed other questions as to completeness and accuracy. The Project Team feels that providers who do not advertise speeds (and pricing) on their web sites do not meet the criteria necessary to depict data outside of the standard category speeds on the National Broadband Map. Any clarification or guidance on this matter would be appreciated. The Project Team plans to schedule a data review session with Altazip before the Fall 2012 Data Submission.

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

N/A

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

\*\*\*Interactive map enhancements: Incorporate state and federal speed tests into state broadband maps—in process. The Project Team plans to incorporate speed tests by either creating a link directly from the map to a live speed test, or displaying speed test data from different time periods on the map.

\*\*\*Interactive map enhancements: Adopt and implement a data confidence rating or similar metadata system to each provider's data as displayed on the interactive map—in process. The Project Team is working on a strategy to establish a confidence rating system for provider data. This information may be incorporated into an upcoming revision of the Utah Broadband Map.

In addition to these milestones, after every data submission or update by a provider, the Project Team continues to compile a submission summary for the provider to review. The submission summary includes the data in FCC format, along with a written summary, highlighting any issues or concerns. The provider is then asked to verify that the data is correct.

The Project Team plans to hold data review sessions with a targeted group of providers in July and August 2012 to verify data accuracy and resolve any pending issues. For the Fall 2012 Data Submission, the Project Team will also compare all provider reported data to Internet advertised speeds.

10g. Have you initiated verification activities?  Yes  No

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

Following the Spring 2012 Data Submission, the Project Team compared all provider reported data to Internet advertised speeds. Any discrepancies between the reported and advertised speeds will be resolved during the data review sessions mentioned previously. The Project Team plans to continue this process during every data submission.

All providers that updated their data during the Spring 2012 Data Submission received a feedback package. The Project Team has also compared all provider reported DSL coverage to Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier (LEC) and Competitive Local Exchange Carrier (CLEC) telecom boundaries as a guide for verification.

The Project Team has also shared data collected from the July 2011 Wireless Drive Test with relevant providers, has made the data available for download, and is continuing to use the data to publish additional analysis in its Map of the Month series, which is available on the Project website. During the quarter, the Map of the Month series analyzed mobile wireless availability at mobile library sites (April 2012) and national parks (June 2012) and presented these findings to the Utah Broadband Advisory Council.

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?

Staffing during Q2 2012: 3.95. Jobs created include hours worked on the Broadband Project for the following activities: Two full time job have been created at the Utah Governor's Office of Economic Development to conduct broadband outreach and planning activities. These jobs are responsible for 2.0 FTEs for Q2. Jobs created/retained by the State include hours worked on the Broadband Project by those employees at the Automated Geographic Reference Center (AGRC) responsible for broadband mapping project management, coordination with other state agencies and vendors, overseeing the development of a geodatabase to manage and store submissions from broadband providers, data coordination, data validation, project support, web application development, and implementation of the address point project. The jobs at the AGRC are responsible for 1012 hours worked or 1.94 FTE for Q2. The mapping support vendor project manager and computer consultant completed web-site back up, file transfer, and shutdown which accounted for 5.75 hours of work or 0.01 FTE for Q2. Total FTE during Q2 is equal to 3.95 (2.0 +1.94+.01).

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?

The Broadband project is fully staffed at the current time. However in the future the Broadband Project Team anticipates a maximum of approximately 6 to 7 jobs during any individual quarter. This does not account for work associated with subawards to local governments for addressing or other approved projects as it is difficult to estimate this number at the present time. The FTE number will vary from quarter to quarter based upon future planned activities and associated work loads. Note: The staffing table below adds to 3.96 due to rounding errors (i.e., the two IRC employees worked 2.75 and 3 hours resulting in .53 FTE and .58 FTE, respectively -- both of which round to 1 in the table below). Also, "0 FTE %" is listed for two jobs below. These employees worked 0.75 and 1 hour, respectively, on the project which round to zero.

10n. Staffing Table

Job Title	FTE %	Date of Hire
GOED Broadband Mapping/Planning Project Manager	100	04/26/2010
GOED Broadband Mapping/Planning Project Coordinator	100	05/11/2011
AGRC Director	20	01/01/2010
AGRC Project Manager	35	01/01/2010
AGRC Data Manager	26	01/01/2010
AGRC Data Coordinator	41	01/01/2010
AGRC Data Coordinator	2	01/01/2010
AGRC Data Coordinator	46	01/01/2010

AGRC Data Coordinator	4	01/01/2010
AGRC Cadastral Manager	20	01/01/2010
AGRC GIS Analyst	0	01/01/2010
AGRC Web Application Developer	0	01/17/2011
IRC Subject Matter Expert/Engagement Manager	1	03/01/2010
IRC Subject Matter Expert/Computer Consultant	1	03/01/2010

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
International Research Center (Subcontract #1)	Broadband mapping provider outreach, data collection, and data verification activities.	Y	Y	02/11/2010	10/11/2014	620,000	0
Utah Interactive (Subcontract #2)	Broadband project web page development and application integration into the Utah State web site.	Y	Y	08/16/2010	12/31/2012	40,000	0
FME/Safe Software Inc. (Subcontract #3)	Data management portal software.	Y	Y	01/31/2011	01/31/2019	230,000	0
To be Determined (Subcontract #4)	Local Government Activity Based Contracts for Addressing Project.	N	N	09/01/2012	12/31/2013	200,000	0
To be Determined (Subcontract #5)	Broadband mapping provider outreach, data collection, and data verification activities. Award years 3 through 5.	N	N	09/01/2012	12/31/2014	600,000	0
To be Determined (Subcontract #6)	Broadband project web page development and application integration into the Utah State web site. Award years 3 through 5.	N	N	10/01/2012	12/31/2014	45,000	0
To be Determined (Subcontract #7)	Contractor for interactive mapping, updating data portal, and use of crowd sourcing data. Award years 3 through 5.	N	N	10/01/2012	12/31/2014	138,000	0
To be Determined (Subcontract #8)	Data sets for wireless data verification.	N	N	10/01/2012	12/31/2014	33,000	0
To be Determined (Subcontract #9)	Local Government Activity Based Contracts for Addressing Project from Supplemental Award.	N	N	09/01/2012	12/31/2014	175,000	0
Utah State University (Subcontract #10)	Conduct Determinants of Broadband Demand Study	Y	Y	01/24/2011	12/31/2014	90,625	0
Public Awareness Campaign (Subcontract #11)	Conduct Public Awareness Campaign	N	N	10/01/2012	12/31/2014	230,000	0

Add Row

Remove Row

## Funding

10p. How much Federal funding has been expended as of the end of the last quarter? \$1,740,220 10q. How much Remains? \$3,455,805

10r. How much matching funds have been expended as of the end of last quarter? \$941,266 10s. How much Remains? \$357,741

### 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	\$2,149,254	\$119,895	\$2,269,149	\$952,556	\$83,442	\$1,035,998
Personnel Fringe Benefits	\$223,800	\$6,720	\$230,520	\$93,034	\$0	\$93,034
Travel	\$138,131	\$0	\$138,131	\$25,009	\$0	\$25,009
Equipment	\$2,000	\$0	\$2,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Materials / Supplies	\$78,625	\$0	\$78,625	\$6,183	\$0	\$6,183
Subcontracts Total	\$2,401,625	\$0	\$2,401,625	\$650,772	\$0	\$650,772
Subcontract #1	\$620,000	\$0	\$620,000	\$493,854	\$0	\$493,854
Subcontract #2	\$40,000	\$0	\$40,000	\$30,518	\$0	\$30,518
Subcontract #3	\$230,000	\$0	\$230,000	\$78,900	\$0	\$78,900
Subcontract #4	\$200,000	\$0	\$200,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #5	\$1,311,625	\$0	\$1,311,625	\$47,500	\$0	\$47,500
Construction	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$202,590	\$1,172,392	\$1,374,982	\$12,666	\$857,824	\$870,490
Total Direct Costs	\$5,196,025	\$1,299,007	\$6,495,032	\$1,732,640	\$941,266	\$2,681,486
Total Indirect Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Costs	\$5,196,025	\$1,299,007	\$6,495,032	\$1,732,640	\$941,266	\$2,681,486
% Of Total	80	20	100	65	35	100

## Hardware / Software

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

10v. If yes, please list

Annual software licensing/maintenance fees for the Utah Broadband Project website and FME Safe Software Desktop and Server were paid during Q1 2012 as part of the Project's website maintenance fees.

The Project recently purchased an upgrade of SurveyMonkey that may be used to survey Community Anchor Institutions (CAI) on their broadband capabilities and future needs. A subscription to Campaign Monitor was also purchased, which is being used to create and distribute monthly Project newsletters.

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

N/A

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

10y. If yes, please list

One-time copies of Media Print Cable Boundaries and American Roamer were purchased in the Spring of 2010 and used in the initial phases of the Project. The Project Team is currently not using commercial data sets as the data collected by the Project is more accurate and current.

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

10aa. If yes, please list

The Project Team kicked off the Master Address List Project and the following activities were completed during the reporting period:

- Gave County Address Point grant presentations to county recorders, surveyors, and commissioners, and discussed the project during a presentation at the Utah Digital Government Summit.
- Received endorsement/support from all county office organizations (assessors, surveyors, recorders, clerks) to create a centralized map-based addressing database and sent County Address Point Grant Contracts to the Authorized Official of all 29 counties in June 2012. In addition, the Project Team has been discussing proposed modifications to the Address Project with NTIA and a revised project proposal will be filed with NTIA in Q3 2012.

Please see Quarter 2 2012 NTIA Reporting Supplemental Information document for additional project milestones or information for this quarter.

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

There are some broadband providers in Utah that do not fit into the defined NTIA data model. For example, some providers use hybrid technologies, such as DSL and fiber, or terrestrial fixed wireless and DOCSIS. These hybrids allow for speeds outside of the NTIA defined subtypes. The Project Team has been working with NTIA on a case-by-case basis to resolve these issues.

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

This report, as well as the accompanying Standard Form 425 for Q2 2012, is based upon the most current financial information. The following note was included in "Section 12. Remarks" of the Standard Form 425 filed with NTIA for the Q2 2012 reporting period:  
Note: The Federal share of expenditures on this report (line e) did not match ARRA 1512 Report (cell E14) filed in early July 2012 due to more recent financial information available after close of reporting period. A revised ARRA 1512 report will be filed to reflect the most recent information and will show an increase of \$7,580.15 from the original ARRA 1512 report.

## 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

\*\*\*\*Release State Broadband Plan: Press release, meetings, and events surrounding release—schedule adjustment needed. The development and release of the State Broadband Plan/Report is dependent upon many sources of information and activities, including the recent completion of the Utah Broadband Advisory Council (Council) Report and NTIA's approval of proposed changes to the Public Awareness Project under discussion with NTIA. In June 2012, the Project officially released the Utah Broadband Advisory Council (Council) Report, which generated radio, print, and trade publication coverage, and will be used to provide Utah Governor Gary R. Herbert, the Utah State Legislature, and other interested parties an overview of the Council's recommendations and policy guidance. The report will be included as an attachment to this PPR. Copies of the report were provided to Lieutenant Governor Greg Bell at the Utah Governor's Rural Partnership Board on June 25 and to Governor Gary Herbert's staff. In August 2012, the Project Team plans to present the Report to the Utah Legislature's Public Utilities and Technology Interim Committee. The Council's report and NTIA's approval of changes to the Project Plan will both be incorporated into the State Broadband Plan. Once the State Broadband Plan is drafted, the Project Team will solicit comments and recommendations from the Council and other relevant stakeholders. It is anticipated that the Broadband Plan will be finalized in early 2013.

\*\*\*Broadband Adoption Public Awareness Campaign Launch: Ongoing airtime, public outreach and events in targeted areas in partnership with local governments and regional development organizations — activities associated with finalizing proposed changes to the current Project Plan have been ongoing during Q2. The Project Team is currently working with NTIA to finalize proposed changes to the Project Plan that will alter this milestone. See 11d for a detailed description of the proposed changes.

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

See 11a above for complete details on the challenges regarding the implementation and execution of the State Broadband Plan and Public Awareness Campaign. The mitigation strategy is to adjust the timeline for the execution of the State Broadband Plan as part of the official changes to the Project Plan. The Project Team is working with NTIA to use the funding allocated to the Public Awareness Campaign to enhance current planning activities by facilitating the development of technology planning and assistance councils and encouraging targeted cities and civic leaders to create or better manage their online presence.

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

The Project Team is actively working with NTIA to discuss changes to the Project Plan. It is anticipated the changes may include: 1) utilizing the funding allocated to the Public Awareness Campaign to enhance current planning activities by facilitating the development of technology planning and assistance councils and encouraging targeted cities and civic leaders to create or better manage their online presence; 2) transferring the funds allocated for a mapping subcontractor in years 3 through 5 to AGRC who has developed in-



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

Carol Revelt

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

12d. Email Address

crevelt@utah.gov

12b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official

Submitted Electronically

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

07-27-2012