U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE	2. Award Or Grant Number
	24-50-M09019
Performance Progress Report	4. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)
	01-30-2011

| 1. Recipient Name | 6. Designated Entity On Behalf Of: |
| Maryland Broadband Cooperative, Inc. | Maryland |

3. Street Address	8. Final Report?	9. Report Frequency
212 West Main Street, Suite 304,	○ Yes	◉ Quarterly
	◉ No	○ Semi Annual
5. City, State, Zip Code		○ Annual
Salisbury, MD 21801		○ Final

| 7. Project / Grant Period Start Date: (MM/DD/YYYY) | 7a. End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY) | 7b. Reporting Period End Date: | 9a. If Other, please describe: |
| 11-01-2009 | 10-31-2014 | 12-31-2010 | 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. 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 SBDD or, that their NDAs with the ILEC, forbid their participation even if they thought it advantageous to do so. The following 11 providers continue to flatly refuse participation: Airespring, Atlantech, BullsEye, CONXX, Eventis, LightEdge, Metropolitan Telecommunications, Qwest, Southwest Wireless, Telovations, and 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

We are not at this time attempting to collect data through other means.

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

A maximum of fourteen data checks were conducted on the provider-submitted broadband availability data, listed below. Please refer to the Submission Summary Whitepaper that was submitted to the NTIA on October 1st for more information about the verification tests and their results.

1. Maximum download/upload speeds reported by provider
2. Typical download/upload speeds reported by provider
3. Typical download/upload speed from 2010 speed test
4. Speed tests match reported typical speeds or are within one speed tier
5. %/# of census blocks verified by 2010 FCC and Ookla speed tests
6. Number of census blocks reported to project, but no tract reported to FCC
7. Number of tracts reported to FCC, but no census blocks reported to project
8. Number of census blocks with dead zones reported
9. Total number of dead zones 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 Verification

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 2 and we plan to review, modify, and improve the tests for round 3.

The ESRGC, in partnership with the Center for GIS at Towson University and as a subcontract to the SBDD 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, no changes were made to the provider-submitted data during this data delivery round. We expect to have the confidence to begin modifying provider-submitted data as a result of our testing/ research during the 3rd round of data submissions in April 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 4Q 2010, we are reporting 7 1/4 FTEs created or retained using ARRA funds. In addition to our normal staff complement, we employed 4 FTE of university students that performed wireless coverage area field verification during the summer. These students were not be employed during 4Q 2010; however, we expect to use student workers again when we re-verify the wireless coverage areas in 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

During 3Q 2010 we won a project extension for years 3-5 and $975,115 for State Broadband Capacity Building (SBCB). The SBCB project will require the hiring of three new full-time employees. Each of these employees is critical to the project's overall success. The hiring process has been initiated.

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

14 1/4 FTE

10n. Staffing Table

Job Title	FTE %	Date of Hire
GIS Manager	75	11/09/2009
Senior GIS Analyst	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	80	11/09/2009
SBCB PM	100	04/01/2011
SBCB Staff Analysts (2)	100	04/01/2011
Field Coverage Area Verification Tech (4)	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 in Southern MD.	N	Y	11/01/2009	10/30/2012	87,311	0
TCC-Western MD	Broadband Planning coordination and management in the 3 counties in 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? $904,410   10q. How much Remains? $3,851,357

10r. How much matching funds have been expended as of the end of last quarter? $342,172   10s. How much Remains? $850,994

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	$68,862	$10,779	$79,641
Personnel Fringe Benefits	$89,086	$22,521	$111,607	$27,201	$3,540	$30,741
Travel	$17,619	$0	$17,619	$1,869	$0	$1,869
Equipment	$70,000	$115,811	$185,811	$15,150	$70,811	$85,961
Materials / Supplies	$20,847	$0	$20,847	$3,047	$0	$3,047
Subcontracts Total	$3,992,088	$0	$3,992,088	$735,368	$0	$735,368
Subcontract #1	$2,121,160	$0	$2,121,160	$297,152	$0	$297,152
Subcontract #2	$1,444,606	$0	$1,444,606	$372,141	$0	$372,141
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	$26,410	$0	$26,410
Construction	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Other	$343,414	$980,834	$1,324,248	$52,913	$257,042	$309,955
Total Direct Costs	$4,755,768	$1,193,166	$5,948,934	$904,410	$342,172	$1,246,582

Mapping Budget Element	Federal Funds Granted	Proposed In-Kind	Total Budget	Federal Funds Expended	Matching Funds Expended	Total Funds Expended
Total Indirect Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total Costs	$4,755,768	$1,193,166	$5,948,934	$904,410	$342,172	$1,246,582
% Of Total	80	20	100	73	27	100

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 software/hardware purchases in the third 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 in 2009.

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

10aa. If yes, please list
In 3Q 2010 we were awarded an extension of the Mapping effort for years 3 through 5. We also were awarded $975,115 for a State Broadband Capacity Building project. As a result, our award has grown in scope (now $4,755,768 in federal share) and we will now be managing the development of the State of Maryland's first ever comprehensive, strategic plan for Broadband Services. With the expansion of the Mapping and Data Verification effort, as well as the new SBCB work, our team will be submitting updated MS project documents to NTIA that will detail all of the new project milestones we anticipate over the next 4 years.

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 that 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 this 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 community anchor institutions 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 nature of the information we are seeking, and the large number of facilities we are targeting for data collection . Our revised strategy has been to identify a governing body or coordinating entity for a group of related community anchors versus directly contacting individual facilities and contacting County-level IT or GIS coordinators and requesting the required data for all of the community anchors that are under their purview. However, there are still cases where a single entity such as a County IT Coordinator is the best source for the requested data, and they respond that the data is not readily available and there is not time to assemble it. With our new partnership with DoIT, we anticipate this aspect of our work will be greatly facilitated.

10cc. Please provide any other information that you think would be useful to NTIA as it assesses your Broadband Mapping Project
The interactive mapping application was launched September 07. The new online map enables Marylanders to input an address and ZIP Code, or zoom to a location on the map, and discover the various types of broadband service available in that area, as well as the companies that provide the services. The map helps consumers and providers connect through links to the providers' Web sites.

Visitors to the map can report unserved areas, share the map by e-mail, and check their current upload and download speeds. Along

with responses to a 20-question survey, the data collected from the speed tests is creating a picture of broadband availability and usage throughout Maryland, and will ultimately help determine where the state should build and improve upon broadband coverage. The next update will feature a speed test charting component that allows consumers to compare their Internet service speed against average speeds found in their ZIP Code and county.

Also available in the next application update will be a text-based address search capability intended for mobile devices.

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 Shore of Maryland

Next Three Months:
• First General Public Meeting for Western Maryland
• The All-Region Online Survey of Stakeholders
• The Draft Report Template Circulated to All Regions

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

No major challenges. Work is progressing in all rural regions

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

No changes, (other than minor scheduling adjustments) planned at this time.

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
Subcontracts Total	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Subcontract #1	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0

11i. Planning Worksheet						
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

None at this time.

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

None 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 W. Patrick Mitchell President and CEO	12c. Telephone (area code, number, and extension) 410-341-6322
	12d. Email Address pmitchell@mdbc.us
12b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official Submitted Electronically	12e. Date Report Submitted (Month, Day, Year) 01-31-2011