

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Performance Progress Report

2. Award Or Grant Number
22-50-M09030

4. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)
07/30/2010

1. Recipient Name
State of Louisiana / Division of Administration / Office of Information Technology

6. Designated Entity On Behalf Of:
State of Louisiana

3. Street Address
1201 N. Third St., Suite 2-130

8. Final Report? Yes No
9. Report Frequency
 Quarterly
 Semi Annual
 Annual
 Final

5. City, State, Zip Code
Baton Rouge, LA 70802-5249

7. Project / Grant Period
Start Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)
11/01/2009

7a. End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)
10/31/2014

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
74	62	27	3	41	41

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 two (2) providers refused to participate: Buford Media Group and Network USA, LLC.

The following sixteen (16) providers have yet to provide data: 360networks, Bayou Cable, Inc., Bayou Internet, Inc., Bluebird Wireless Broadband Services, LLC, Catcomm Internet Services, LLC, Cellular South, Conterra Broadband Services D/B/A Detel, Hughes Network Systems, LLC, Maximum Access, LLC, Media3, Nexus Systems, Inc., NuVox, Inc., PC One Cable, LLC, Skycom1, Superior Wireless, Wow Technologies, Inc.

One provider (AT&T) provided street address ranges and Tiger TLID, but no street names, which makes it very difficult to geo-locate the served areas. Baker has contacted the national AT&T contact, but their position remains the they have provided a data set according to the requirements listed in the Broadband Mapping NOFA.

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 following additional verification datasets are being collected:

Development of Initial Conservative Estimate of Broadband Service: Data is extracted from internal and commercial databases defining geographic service areas of telephone and cable companies and locations of central office (CO) switches and areas upgraded with fiber. The geographic areas are overlaid with Census demographic data on housing unit counts and density.

Wireless Market Intelligence Data: Commercially available dataset used as an independent source to verify information submitted by Providers of wireless broadband service. This dataset is used as a validation source for provider service area coverage.

Targeted Online Surveys: Questionnaires (e-mail/web based) have been sent directly to businesses and households, including over-sampling in rural area and those where the above conservative estimate indicates are "unserved" and "underserved" areas.

Online Public Survey and Speed Test: A Broadband Mapping Public Survey Site is deployed. Site visitors are requested to provide data on broadband availability, technology, service type (e.g., speed tier) service provider name; monthly prices paid and measured downstream and upstream speeds.

Field Data Acquisition: Broadband technicians visited a sampling of census block locations to gather broadband data to be used for validation. The following criteria were taken into account when developing the census block sampling dataset:

- urban vs. rural census block characteristic
- census block grouping
- land vs. water census block characteristic

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

Development of a System for Evaluation and Assessment Statistics (SEAS) is currently underway. SEAS will automate the validation processing that has been conducted for the May 31 data submittal to the NTIA which is described in section 10h below. The software will auto-join and query the validation data against the Provider data. Identified areas of discrepancy will be flagged for reporting the confidence level of the data per provider at the census block and road segment level. The plan is to then input these unit confidence levels into a statistical model to develop confidence levels for each of the broadband service providers.

Fixed Wireless coverage will be evaluated using contour calculation methods, with key inputs being transmitter location and, where available, data on spectrum power levels and other relevant transmission factors provided by carriers and/or supplemented by data available from public web sites and other sources. Data will then be input to a contour calculation tool to provide estimates of fixed wireless broadband coverage areas. This dataset is used as a source to determine gaps in provider wireless service area coverage.

10g. Have you initiated verification activities? Yes No

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

Stakeholder Validation: Maps of completed Provider service areas and data were furnished back to the Providers for confirmation of the processed/aggregated information. Feedback received in time was integrated into the each Provider's dataset for the May 31 data submittal to the NTIA. Subsequent feedback will be integrated for the September 2010 updates.

Service Area Validation Data: The SNG wireline service area data is tabular and contains a separate record for each provider/technology of transmission combination with an associated census block or TIGER road segment, depending on the whether the size of the census block area (\leq or $>$ 2 sq. mi.). This data was exported into an ArcGIS data format. The American Roamer wireless service area data is already in an ArcGIS data format.

Online Survey and Field Validation Data: The Public and Targeted Business/Household survey and field data were also collected in tabular database format, and represent a specific lat/long spatial location for each record.

Validation Reporting: The validation results recorded in the GIS discrepancy layers created in the previous process were entered into a validation results spreadsheet, along with the total number Provider records, and validation records for that Provider.

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

As described in the previous section, manual verification activities were conducted for the May 31 data submittal to the NTIA. In 10f above, it is noted that development of SEAS software to automate and enhance those validation processes, calculate confidence level and statistical modeling of the data per provider at the census block and road segment level is currently underway. Evaluation of reported fixed wireless coverage utilizing contour calculation tools, as described in 10f above, will also be implemented. Deployment is planned for the September 2010 delivery to the NTIA

Maps of completed Provider service areas and data will continue to be furnished back to the Providers for confirmation of the processed/aggregated information and feedback integrated into each Provider's dataset. In addition, aggregated broadband coverage maps will be provided to the regional Areas Development Districts for review and feedback for their jurisdictions. This stakeholder validation will be conducted for subsequent semi-annual data updates.

Staffing

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

12

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

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

7.95 FTE

10n. Staffing Table

Job Title	FTE %	Date of Hire
GIS Technician	67	01/15/2010
Broadband Engineer	34	02/15/2010
Statistician	34	02/15/2010
Data Analyst / Systems Administrator	100	
GIS Training Coordinator	100	
Field Technician	40	03/15/2010
3 - GIS Specialists	70	
3 - GIS Technicians	70	

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
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	Broadband Mapping Support Services	Y	Y	10/01/2009	09/30/2012	\$1,016,900 +	\$100,700
LA Geographic Information Center	Broadband Mapping Data Validation and Provider Outreach	N	N	01/01/2010	12/31/2013	\$92,880	\$99,705
LA Geographic Information Center	Broadband Planning Support	N	N	01/01/2010	12/31/2013	\$498,648	\$125,292

Add Row

Remove Row

Funding

10p. How much Federal funding has been expended as of the end of the last quarter? \$459,569 10q. How much Remains? \$730,211

10r. How much matching funds have been expended as of the end of last quarter? \$126,072 10s. How much Remains? \$179,776

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	\$0	\$87,500	\$87,500	\$0	\$21,504	\$21,504
Personnel Fringe Benefits	\$0	\$26,250	\$26,250	\$0	\$6,240	\$6,240
Travel	\$0	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Equipment	\$0	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$10,000	\$10,000
Materials / Supplies	\$80,000	\$52,643	\$132,643	\$8,520	\$32,643	\$41,163
Subcontracts Total	\$1,109,780	\$99,705	\$1,209,485	\$451,049	\$55,685	\$506,734
Subcontract #1	\$1,016,900	\$0	\$1,016,900	\$451,049	\$55,685	\$506,734
Subcontract #2	\$92,880	\$99,705	\$192,585	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #3						
Subcontract #4						
Subcontract #5						
Construction	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Direct Costs	\$1,189,780	\$283,098	\$1,472,878	\$459,569	\$126,072	\$585,641
Total Indirect Costs	\$0	\$22,750	\$22,750	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Costs	\$1,189,780	\$305,848	\$1,495,628	\$459,569	\$126,072	\$585,641
% Of Total	79.55	20.45	100.00	78.47	21.53	100.00

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

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

10y. If yes, please list

The InfoUSA data set of email addresses and a second data set of internet connectivity data points have been purchased to support data validation. These data sets will be used for validation of the broadband Provider data. The connectivity data set includes connectivity and speed data down to the address level. It provides provider name, type of technology, and relevant speeds at the address level.

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

Several providers have sent road segment tables which do not contain any spatial ID (TLID). The challenge is to spatially locate these roads to produce a verification map for the providers.

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

- As noted in the last Quarterly Report, LAGIC has completed two online surveys of local government institutions regarding the status of broadband service in their community. We have completed surveys of 64 Louisiana Assessor Offices and 64 Communication District (911) offices (one for each Parish) throughout the state. This data has been mapped at the parish (county) level to provide a crude but effective tool for visualization of under-served areas. It also helps us identify the type of broadband service being provided to these anchor institutions.

- We are still collecting and analyzing the results of earlier surveys of the following statewide groups:

- o Louisiana Industrial Development Executives Association (LIDEA)
- o Louisiana Geographic Information Systems Council

- We have received approval by the Broadband Advisory Council Chair for three additional broadband surveys

- o Broadband Advisory Council
- o Louisiana Association of Business and Industry
- o Louisiana Community Colleges

- We have made presentations to the following broadband stakeholders

- o 13 Parish Communication District Managers in West Monroe, LA.
- o St Bernard Parish Emergency Preparedness and 911 Staff
- o SCAUG – GIS Users Group in Shreveport, LA.
- o Louisiana Geographic Information Systems Council in Baton Rouge, LA.
- o Louisiana Broadband Advisory Council in Baton Rouge, La.

- LAGIC has posted information for Broadband providers at a website we developed for the Broadband Mapping Project; www.broadband.la.gov

- LAGIC met with CoreLOGIC a parcel and street address database provider to determine the cost and usefulness of their geospatial data for the Broadband Planning effort.

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

- Respondents who are unfamiliar with internet speed testing often do not use the speed test link contained in the survey. The results of the speed test are variable depending on the location, time of day, internet technology used, etc.

We have redone the survey form to make it easier to understand and highlighted those sections that require their participation, like the speed test. We are using a different speed test application, which we believe will be more effective.

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

Funding

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

11f. How much Remains? \$498,648

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

11h. How much Remains? \$125,292

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	\$369,680	\$125,292	\$494,972	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #1	\$369,680	\$125,292	\$494,972	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #2						
Subcontract #3						
Subcontract #4						
Subcontract #5						
Construction	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Direct Costs	\$369,680	\$125,292	\$494,972	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Indirect Costs	\$128,968	\$0	\$128,968	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Costs	\$498,648	\$125,292	\$623,940	\$0	\$0	\$0
% Of Total	79.92	20.08	100.00	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

The use of online surveys has not been as successful as we anticipated. The survey completion rate has been poor, and we have gotten minimal assistance from the organizations whose members we are surveying. As a possible mitigation strategy, we will investigate ways to offer a tangible benefit to those who complete the survey.

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

LAGIC has been collecting detailed anchor institution data for the Broadband project using the data format provided by NTIA. Having recently completed surveys of broadband usage among Louisiana Assessors and Communication Districts, we will continue surveying anchor institutions regarding broadband access and capability including county (parish) government, community/senior centers and community colleges.

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

Neal Underwood

Assistant Director Statewide Technology

12b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official

Neal Underwood

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

(225) 219-9470

12d. Email Address

neal.underwood@La.gov

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

07/30/2010

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