

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**Performance Progress Report**

2. Award Or Grant Number  
29-50-m09022

4. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)  
08/02/2010

1. Recipient Name  
Missouri Office of Administration

6. Designated Entity On Behalf Of:  
Missouri

3. Street Address  
Truman Building Room 270, 301 W High St

8. Final Report?

Yes  
 No

9. Report Frequency

Quarterly  
 Semi Annual  
 Annual  
 Final

5. City, State, Zip Code  
Jefferson City, MO 65101

7. Project / Grant Period  
Start Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)  
11/29/2009

7a. End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)  
11/29/2011

8. Reporting Period End Date:  
(MM/DD/YYYY)  
06/30/2010

9a. If Other, please describe:

**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
154	142	98	89	88	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 have been in contact with 216 potential / possible broadband providers in total. Of this total 62 have been discovered as being resellers or not-facilities-based. This dropped our number of providers to 154. A number of these we are still trying to verify their status.

At this point we have two providers that are definitely not going to participate. They are:

Birch Telecom of Missouri Inc. Will not cooperate until mandated by FCC. Too costly  
Pixius Communications Will not cooperate. They claim information is available on ID Insight

One other one said they likely will not participate but are willing to look at the information. We think they were just getting off the phone by saying that but we are following-up. They are:

Poplar Bluff Internet, Inc. (SEMO Communications) Likely not going to participate

There were a few more that did not want to participate beyond what is available on their website. In these cases we have enough information from their websites. For the majority of cases, the providers have been extremely cooperative and supportive of the mapping efforts within the State of Missouri.

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 continue to conduct a public-based search and collection of provider information. We are using a SurveyMonkey form for aiding the collection of the information initially from websites. These are being geo-registered and heads-up digitized from these screen captures. We plan to conduct wireless modeling with GeoDecisions using RadioMobile and the University of Missouri using a HATA model for comparison purposes. We have started some segmentation for wired modeling using census data (housing units, population, demographics, etc.) as well as refining areas based on general land cover modeling. We have not started the collection of information through surveys (in cooperation with local governments) but that will be started in the next quarter.

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

We are using a convergence of evidence approach to both determine coverage as well as provide a measure of confidence for these areas and boundaries. The actual verification activities can be broken down as follows:

1. Provider validation – provider review of developed areas and boundaries
2. Lab-based verification – other publicly available data and maps; tower locations and parameters; Form 477 information when available; marketing materials of providers; web crawling results; wireless footprint modeling (RadioMobile and HATA); new 2010 Census data at the block level when available
3. Field verification – field-based observation and measure; local government sampling and survey
4. Consumer feedback – updates on coverage through web-mapping portal once deployed; State 'Speed Test' results and tracking

10g. Have you initiated verification activities?  Yes  No

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

We are using a convergence of evidence approach to both determine coverage as well as provide a measure of confidence for these areas and boundaries. The actual verification activities can be broken down as follows:

1. Provider validation – provider review of developed areas and boundaries for the October 1 submission will take place
2. Lab-based verification – Initially independently completed by GeoDecisions / CBG and the University of Missouri. These are then compared and feed back into each others systems.
3. Field verification – field-based observation and measure were kicked off in June; GeoDecisions / CBG will complete their assessment of a 35% sample of providers across the entire state. The University of Missouri will wrap-up their field verification in early September on a 35% sampling of counties where 100% of the providers will be evaluated.
4. Consumer feedback – Local government sampling and survey is taking place while field verification is conducted. We have also implemented a customized Missouri OOKLA site to capture information through distributed postcards. We are also participating with booths at county fairs and our State Fair to get a better representation of rural broadband provision.

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

### **Staffing**

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

34

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 lost two personnel due to acceptance of other jobs (we train them well evidently!). We are in the process of hiring to fill these two positions on the project. Since the field verification started in June we hired additional personnel for the in-lab verification build out as well as the field work elements.

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

11.94

10n. Staffing Table

Job Title	FTE %	Date of Hire
Geographic Information Officer	0.66	12/01/2009
Project Manager Mapping - MU	0.75	12/01/2009
Administrative Assistant Mapping - MU	0.25	12/01/2009
Research Specialist Mapping - MU	0.25	12/01/2009
Research Specialist Mapping - MU	1	12/01/2009
Graduate Student Mapping - MU	0.5	09/19/2010
Undergraduate Student Mapping - MU (n=15)	3.75	01/15/2010
Project Manager Summit	0.5	12/01/2009
Administrative Assistant Summit	0.1	01/01/2010
Undergraduate Student Summit	0.38	08/16/2010
Program Director - GeoDecisions	0.15	12/01/2009
Program Manager - GeoDecisions	0.25	12/01/2009
Program Manager - CBG	0.25	12/01/2009
Program Engineer - CBG	0.35	12/01/2009
Research Specialist - CBG	0.2	12/01/2009
Research Assistant - CBG	0.1	12/01/2009
Assistant Program Manager - GeoDecisions	0.25	12/01/2009
Technical Architect - GeoDecisions	0.15	12/01/2009
Sr. Developer - GeoDecisions	0.2	12/01/2009
Database Administrator - GeoDecisions	0.1	12/01/2009
Jr. Developer - GeoDecisions	0.25	12/01/2009
Sr. Analyst - GeoDecisions	0.25	12/01/2009
Jr. Analysts - GeoDecisions (n=5)	0.85	12/01/2009
Intern / Tester - GeoDecisions	0.15	12/01/2009
Web Designer - GeoDecisions	0.1	12/01/2009
Documentation Manager - GeoDecisions	0.2	12/01/2009

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
Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI)	Architecture of State Data Center support for Web Mapping applications and services; Installation of Web Mapping Services for Broadband Map	N	N			\$0	\$75,000
GeoDecisions and CBG Team	Mapping: Support to the State of Missouri to include NDA work, data collection, integration, mapping, database construction, quality control, communications, field verification, lab verification, website development and transfer, and maintenance; Planning	Y	Y			\$1,164,304	\$133,346
University of Missouri	Mapping: Support to the State of Missouri to include public source data collection, integration, mapping, database construction for community anchor points, independent quality control, communications, field verification, lab verification, and maintenance	Y	Y			\$732,778	\$0
Not Selected	State-based Address Points Mapping	N	N			\$0	\$200,000

Add Row

Remove Row

### Funding

10p. How much Federal funding has been expended as of the end of the last quarter? \$0

10q. How much Remains? \$1,503,163

10r. How much matching funds have been expended as of the end of last quarter? \$0

10s. How much Remains? \$360,000

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						
Personnel Fringe Benefits						
Travel						
Equipment	\$0	\$32,600	\$32,600	\$0	\$0	\$0
Materials / Supplies						
Subcontracts Total	\$1,503,163	\$327,400	\$1,830,563	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #1	\$1,490,363	\$0	\$1,490,363	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #2	\$12,800	\$52,400	\$65,200	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #3	\$0	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #4	\$0	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #5						
Construction						
Other						
Total Direct Costs	\$1,503,163	\$360,000	\$1,863,163	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Indirect Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Costs	\$1,503,163	\$360,000	\$1,863,163	\$0	\$0	\$0
% Of Total	80.68	19.32	100	0	0	0

## Hardware / Software

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

10v. If yes, please list

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

We have been awaiting the architectural design completion as well as the development of specifications for the web-mapping elements of the project.

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

10y. If yes, please list

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

10aa. If yes, please list

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

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

## 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

Regional Technology Planning Teams – Not started yet. We are also waiting until we have the first version of the statewide mapping completed so that we can provide more context to the local discussions.

Broadband Summit – Have held meetings with potential partners and have started the assembly of a Steering Committee for the Summit. We have also contacted hotels and conference centers to check on available dates and have tentatively set October 19-20 as the date for the Summit. Finally, we have begun interactions with other states that have held similar events and participated in telecons with these states to leverage their lessons learned. We are continuing the process of brainstorming on the break-out groups to be formed (distance learning, telemedicine, providers, RTPT, etc.), and who would be good representatives to place into those groups to lead them during this activity.

11b. Please describe any challenge or obstacle that you have encountered and detail the mitigation strategies the project team is employing  
The Governor wants to play a role in the Summit and working with his schedule has been difficult. However, having him at the Summit and participating is critical for the success of the Summit and its impact. We have also now tied the Summit to the RTPT as a way to kick-off the RTPT and build up some momentum for the activity. It is critical that the additional funds requested for the RTPT be awarded for this element to really be able to achieve its potential regionally.

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

There may be a slight delay in the timing of the RTPT work due to the Summit kick-off event.

**Funding**

11e. How much Federal funding has been expended as of the end of the last quarter? \$0

11f. How much Remains? \$470,219

11g. How much matching funds have been expended as of the end of last quarter? \$0

11h. How much Remains? \$133,346

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						
Personnel Fringe Benefits						
Travel						
Equipment						
Materials / Supplies						
Subcontracts Total	\$470,219	\$133,346	\$603,565	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #1	\$470,219	\$133,346	\$603,565	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #2						
Subcontract #3						
Subcontract #4						
Subcontract #5						
Construction						
Other						
Total Direct Costs	\$470,219	\$133,346	\$603,565	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Indirect Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Costs	\$470,219	\$133,346	\$603,565	\$0	\$0	\$0
% Of Total	77.91	22.09	100	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

Just working with the Governor's and key staff's schedules.

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

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

TIMOTHY L. HAITHCOAT

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

573-882-2324

MISSOURI GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION OFFICER

12d. Email Address

TIM.HAITHCOAT@CA.MO.GOV

12b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official



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

8-6-2010

Performance Progress Report  
OMB Approval Number: 0660-0034  
Expiration Date: 08/31/2010