U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE	2. Award Or Grant Number
	16-50-M09014

Performance Progress Report

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 - Idaho	Idaho

3. Street Address	8. Final Report?	9. Report Frequency
19020 33rd Avenue West, Suite 210,	○ Yes ◉ No	◉ Quarterly ○ Semi Annual ○ Annual ○ Final

5. City, State, Zip Code		
Lynwood, WA 98036-4754		

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	10-30-2014	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
60	60	32	34	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 following providers have officially declined to participate in the program:

Cactus International Inc.: Have had telephone/email discussions to encourage participation. Status: Will try again in Round 3

Cequel Communications LLC: Have had telephone/email discussions to encourage participation. Status: Will try again in Round 3

Stat Network Solutions: Have had telephone/email discussions to encourage participation. Status: Will try again in Round 3

No other Idaho providers have flatly refused to participate, but we do often find that providers are non-responsive to our requests. In the recently completed second round of data collection, a total of 34 providers submitted NEW data. However, we are actually submitting data for 52 total providers. This total number includes 11 providers who gave data in Round 1 but failed to supply an update in Round 2, and 7 providers who were non-responsive but for whom we were able to estimate data.

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

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 Idaho 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

The above activities are repeated with each data collection/processing round - and are ongoing between rounds as we continue to improve the quality of our database.

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

We plan to implement a method for sharing consumer feedback on a given location/area. Users who see coverage reported by providers will be able to see if other users have reported that the provider's claims may be suspect.

Staffing

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

SBDD funding has resulted in 1.72 total FTE. All new/retained FTEs shown here are at the Puget Sound Center for Teaching, Learning and Technology (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?

We (the prime and sub recipient) have created or retained 1.72 FTE jobs. While we reported 2.17 FTE jobs in our ARRA report, after further review, we now realize that number was mistakenly calculated, due to unintentional mathematical errors. The corrected FTE % by job table below now accurately reflects the total of 1.72 FTE jobs created or retained.

10n. Staffing Table

Job Title	FTE %	Date of Hire
Sub Recipient CEO - Supervisory Role	1	11/01/2009
Sub Recipient Project Director	15	11/01/2009
Sub Recipient Project Manager	27	11/01/2009
Sub Recipient GIS Director	25	11/01/2009
Sub Recipient Internal System Support/Architecture	16	11/01/2009
Sub Recipient Provider Relations Manager	31	11/01/2009
Prime Recipient Executive Director/CEO	11	11/01/2009
Prime Recipient Operations Manager	3	11/01/2009
Prime Recipient Grants and Contracts Coordinator	20	11/01/2009
Prime Recipient Project Manager	23	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
Cost Quest Associates	Project Management/GIS Programming & Planning Services	N	Y	11/01/2009	10/31/2011	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? $685,539   10q. How much Remains? $3,800,674

10r. How much matching funds have been expended as of the end of last quarter? $138,678   10s. How much Remains? $982,953

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	$287,489	$557,584	$29,178	$5,910	$35,088
Personnel Fringe Benefits	$67,524	$5,556	$73,080	$6,127	$0	$6,127
Travel	$17,920	$0	$17,920	$1,128	$0	$1,128
Equipment	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Materials / Supplies	$4,225	$0	$4,225	$54	$0	$54
Subcontracts Total	$3,982,782	$27,500	$4,010,282	$625,050	$0	$625,050
Subcontract #1	$3,982,782	$27,500	$4,010,282	$625,050	$0	$625,050

Mapping Budget Element	Federal Funds Granted	Proposed In-Kind	Total Budget	Federal Funds Expended	Matching Funds Expended	Total Funds Expended
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	$701,941	$701,941	$0	$125,000	$125,000
Total Direct Costs	$4,342,547	$1,022,486	$5,365,032	$675,988	$130,910	$806,898
Total Indirect Costs	$143,667	$99,145	$242,812	$9,551	$7,768	$17,319
Total Costs	$4,486,214	$1,121,630	$5,607,844	$685,539	$138,678	$824,217
% Of Total	80	20	100	83	17	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 full-time Project Manager and Provider Relations positions. These items were purchased on June 8, 2010 and July 8, 2010. As the Project Manager and Provider Relations staff are split equally among four states (.25 FTE per state), the State of Idaho is supporting 25% of the total costs of each item. The items purchased include a Dell Mobility Bundle (XDW8598K9) at a cost of $10.65; a Dell-Latitude E550 laptop computer (XDWF3CWW7) at a cost of $328.83 for the Provider Relations staff and a Dell-Latitude E550 laptop computer (XDXWD5P88) at a cost of $352.78. The total software/hardware costs charged to the State of Idaho are $692.26.

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

Further 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

A "beta" version of the Idaho interactive maps was released to the general public in August 2010. It is currently available at www.linkidaho.org and will be updated with the Round 2 data 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. These team members are constantly reaching out to providers to promote participation.

To help with completeness of data in Round 2, we generated a customized instruction sheet for each 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

While not a major issue in Idaho, we have found that many providers in other LinkAMERICA states are not happy with the depiction of coverage using fully shaded areas in small blocks, but only shaded street segments in large blocks. The beta version of our online map has now been public for several months and provider feedback on how coverage is shown in this way has been somewhat negative. We have explained this issue in more detail in the Alabama and Wisconsin reports from LinkAMERICA.

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 completed 26 in-depth interviews with key in-state leaders representing major sectors (government, telecom providers, business, education, health care, public safety, community support organizations). In late Q2 and Q3 they they wrote and refined a comprehensive report of the interview findings- outlining Idaho's readiness for broadband development, an inventory of available resources to be leveraged, and specific strategic actions that can be considered for the Idaho broadband planning process. Short video segments outlining the results we also developed for use in the regional planning process and a web-based planning project "dashboard" was launched.

The team also worked with the Idaho GIOs office to finalize the boundaries of the planning regions and identified a statewide partner for the regional planning team development that begins in Q4.

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

The Planning Team has experienced no significant obstacles in Idaho. We have terrific ongoing support from the state GIO's office, the Broadband Advisory Board, and several other key stakeholders throughout the state.

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) 12-01-2010