Utah County Digital Inclusion Plan
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Utah County is a leader in technology. With a young population, highly educated citizens, and ambitious high-tech startups as well as successful high-tech legacy companies, our digital capacity is strong. Except for remote mountain peaks, there is no place that does not have multiple options for broadband connectivity. In fact, in 2022, Provo City was named—for the third consecutive year—a Digital Inclusion Trailblazer City by the National Digital Inclusion Alliance.

However, there are still Utah County residents, particularly in two covered populations, who do not yet benefit from home internet connectivity: low-income seniors and persons of Hispanic or Latino descent. Although our community-based partners have anecdotal, albeit professional, insights into these two groups, we conducted research to ascertain more clearly the status of digital inclusion. By interviewing more than 1,200 individuals whose annual household incomes are within 150 percent of federal poverty guidelines, we learned that

- 57 percent of persons age 65 and older living within the defined household income range do not have broadband connections in their homes;
- 50 percent of Hispanic or Latino persons in this income range do not have home broadband connections;
- 10 percent of seniors, and 4.8 percent of Hispanic or Latino persons, who do not have broadband at home say it is because of cost;
- 21.9 percent of seniors, and 11.3 percent of Hispanic or Latino persons, who do not have broadband at home say they do not know how to use a computer or tablet;
- Of those who do not have broadband at home, the average amount they are willing to pay for monthly service is $32.54; and
- 80.5 percent of seniors, and 66.3 percent of Hispanic or Latino persons, are not aware of the Affordable Connectivity Program.
To help close the digital inclusion gap, we will replicate our proven success in Provo City and other areas in Utah County to

- Help all residents, including seniors and Hispanic or Latino neighbors, have quality, appropriate technology devices in their homes;
- Ensure Utah County residents have access to affordable, quality broadband; and
- Work to help residents have adequate capacity to utilize broadband services.
COMMUNITY PROFILE

Utah County is a fast-growing county in north central Utah. The County has many art galleries, performing arts venues, and museums, including publicly funded facilities, private nonprofit organizations, and university-related sites. Thanks to Brigham Young University and Utah Valley University, the diversity of learning opportunities is strong. Volunteerism, and self-reliance, Faith Groups,

AGE

Utah County’s population growth is the topic of greatest concern among residents, and for good reason. The county’s residential population has increased by 79 percent in 21 years—from 371,648 at the turn of the century to 665,665 in 2021. Population growth is not limited to Utah County: the state of Utah is experiencing tremendous growth overall, gaining nearly 500,000 residents in the past ten years. Although Salt Lake County’s population has increased slightly more than Utah County’s since 2010 (146,060 new residents compared to 135,439), the rate of increase is much higher in Utah County. During the past decade, the state has increased by 18.6 percent; Utah County’s population growth rate has been 27.9 percent, which is much higher than Salt Lake County’s 14.6 percent and Davis County’s 19.1 percent. Only the smaller Wasatch and Washington Counties are growing at a higher pace.

Figure 1: Utah County’s Population Growth, 2000-2021

---

1 U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 2016-2020, Table B01003; Population Estimate, 2021
at 49 percent and 29 percent, respectively. Between 2010 and 2020, Utah County represents 27.4 percent of the state’s overall population growth, while Salt Lake County has 29.6 percent.²

² Derived from ACS Table B01003, multiple years
Utah County’s population is not only the youngest in the state, but also the youngest in the nation (counties with more than 100,000 population). Utah County’s median age of 25 edges out Cache County’s 25.4, and is six years younger than the state median age of 31.1. Nationally, the median age is 38.2.\footnote{U.S. Census Bureau, ACS, Table B01002}

Notwithstanding the number of younger persons in Utah County, the Baby Boomer population is increasing. The percentage of households with at least one person age
65 years or older has increased. In 2010, 15.8 percent of all households had a person age 65 or older; in 2020, 18.9 percent fall into this category. Of all persons age 65 or older living alone, nearly three out of four are female.\(^5\)

Over the last decade, the percentage of all households that have someone age 65 or older that are one-person households has declined, dropping from 28.8 percent to 26.7 percent. In 2020, 8,667 persons age 65 or older are living alone in Utah County. Of these, 72.3 percent are women.\(^6\)

Utah County’s senior population of those age 65 or older will increase in both number and percentage of the total population in the coming years. Today, this demographic is about 8 percent of the population; by 2060, it will be 16.7 percent.\(^7\)

---

\(^4\) U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 ACS, Table B11007  
\(^5\) Ibid.  
\(^6\) Ibid.  
\(^7\) Ibid.
Some of these seniors in our community are raising their own grandchildren. Of the 9,891 grandchildren living with grandparents, the grandparents are responsible for 2,660 of them.\(^8\)

Helping Kids with school

---

\(^8\) U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2020 ACS, Table B10002
And of these 2,660 grandchildren living with guardian grandparents, 2,150 also have parents living with them. Median family income is much lower when grandparents are responsible for the grandchildren living with them and no parent is present.\(^9\)

\(^9\) U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 ACS, Table B10010
INCOME

The U.S. Census Bureau breaks household income down into four age groups based on age of the householder: 15 to 24 years, 25 to 44 years, 45 to 64 years, and 65 years and over. In every category, Utah County households earn more than the national average. However, for seniors on fixed incomes, rising inflation is taking its toll.

Figure 7: Median Household Income by Age of Householder, U.S. vs. State vs. Utah County

U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 ACS, Table S1903
Considering the age of Utah County residents, it is intriguing to compare numbers to the state and nation. For example, householders age 25 to 44 years are 44 percent of the householder population (age 15 and older), compared to 40 percent of the state’s householder population and 32 percent of the nation’s. Yet the median household income for this age group in Utah County is $80,624—compared to $78,035 for the state and $71,738 for nationally.\textsuperscript{11}

### RACE AND ETHNICITY

The Hispanic population in Utah County is just shy of 12 percent. Persons of Hispanic or Latino descent can be of any race; in Utah County, most (68.7 percent are white), and 12.1 percent are two or more races. American Indian or Alaska Native is the self-identified race for 1.7 percent of the Hispanic population; 0.5 percent are black or African American; 0.2 percent are Asian; 0.2 percent are Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander; and 16.6 percent say they are “some other race.”

Among those who are not Hispanic or Latino, 81.9 percent are white, 2.9 percent are two or more races, and 1.4 percent are Asian. The next highest category is Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (also at 0.8 percent) followed by black or African American (0.6 percent), American Indian or Alaska Native (0.4 percent) and “some other race” (0.1 percent).\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{12} U.S. Census Bureau, Table B03002
Persons of Hispanic or Latino descent can be of any race; in Utah County, most (68.7 percent) are white, and 12.1 percent are two or more races. American Indian or Alaska Native is the self-identified race for 1.7 percent of the Hispanic population; 0.5 percent are black or
African American; 0.2 percent are Asian; 0.2 percent are Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander; and 16.6 percent say they are “some other race.”  

**Figure 9: Racial Composition of Hispanic Population, 2020**

During the 2010s, the number of Hispanic individuals living in Utah County has increased by about 50 percent, growing from 49,522 in 2010 to 74,069 in 2020. This number is continuing to grow.

---

13 U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 ACS, Table B03002
14 Ibid.
Most people who live in Utah County speak English. Of the population age 5 and older, 84.9 percent speak English at home; 10.6 percent speak Spanish at home, 2.1 percent speak other Indo-European languages, and 2.0 percent speak Asian and Pacific Island languages at home. Less than one-half of 1 percent speak some other language.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{15} U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 ACS, Table S1601
There are more than 17,000 Spanish speakers in Utah County who report speaking English “less than very well.” There are about 5,000 other residents of our community who also have difficulty with English, but speak another language at home.
There are nearly 8,500 English learner students in K-12 schools in Utah County. About half of these are also economically disadvantaged.

Figure 13: English Learner Student Enrollment: Number and Percent, 2018–2022
Race, Ethnicity and Income

In Utah County, the households with the highest median income are those with a white householder ($78,392), followed by householders of two or more races ($70,682). \(^{16}\)

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{Race/ethnicity} & \text{U.S.} & \text{State} & \text{Utah County} \\
\text{White} & 68,943 & 76,024 & 78,392 \\
\text{Black or African American} & 43,674 & 45,877 & 46,080 \\
\text{American Indian and Alaska Native} & 45,877 & 49,403 & 51,900 \\
\text{Asian} & 91,775 & 66,637 & 61,870 \\
\text{Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander} & 57,216 & 54,362 & 59,291 \\
\text{Some other race} & 51,900 & 58,214 & 65,804 \\
\text{Two or more races} & 70,447 & 66,637 & 61,870 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{Median Household Income by Race of Householder, U.S. vs. State vs. Utah County} \\
\end{array}
\]
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\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{Median Household Income by Race of Householder, U.S. vs. State vs. Utah County} \\
\end{array}
\]

As is the case in most communities where householders of Hispanic ethnicity are a minority group, these households have lower median household incomes in Utah County than non-Hispanic households. However, Utah County’s Hispanic householder median household income of $59,291 exceeds the state ($57,417) and national ($54,632) numbers. \(^{17}\)

\[\text{Figure 14: Median Household Income by Race of Householder, U.S. vs. State vs. Utah County}\]

\[\text{As is the case in most communities where householders of Hispanic ethnicity are a minority group, these households have lower median household incomes in Utah County than non-Hispanic households. However, Utah County’s Hispanic householder median household income of $59,291 exceeds the state ($57,417) and national ($54,632) numbers.}\]

\(^{16}\) Ibid.  
\(^{17}\) Ibid.
IDENTIFIED COVERED POPULATIONS

Our proposal targets two types of low-income households: seniors (age 65 or older) and Hispanic or Latino. In Utah County, we have 16,127 households living in poverty.\(^\text{18}\) We have 3,023 seniors living in poverty, and 8,388 Hispanic or Latino individuals living in poverty.\(^\text{19}\) These numbers do not include those households whose income is less than 150 percent of FPG.

---

\(^{18}\) U.S. Census Bureau, 2021 ACS Table C17017

\(^{19}\) Ibid., Tables B17020i and B17020
DIGITAL ACCESS VISION AND GOALS

VISION
Utah County residents, including our seniors and our Hispanic or Latino neighbors, have high-quality, affordable, and easy access to broadband service in their homes, and are equipped to utilize this service to grow, work, and prosper.

GOALS
Goal 1: Utah County residents, including seniors and Hispanic or Latino neighbors, have quality, appropriate technology devices in their homes.

Goal 2: Utah County residents have access to affordable, quality broadband.

Goal 3: Utah County residents have adequate capacity to utilize broadband services.

CURRENT STATE OF DIGITAL ACCESS
Utah County has aggressively worked to build digital access for many years. As a result, the National Digital Inclusion Alliance named Provo a Digital Inclusion Trailblazer in 2022—the third consecutive year the city was given this honor. Recipients of this recognition are judged based on six criteria:

- having full-time local government staff working on digital inclusion;
- having a digital inclusion plan;
- having an open-access coalition;
- survey research;
- funded digital inclusion programming; and
- efforts to increase affordability of home broadband service (Miller, 2022).
United Way of Utah County is a driving force behind the area's digital inclusion efforts. For more than eight years, the Digital Inclusion Advisory Committee—which originally focused on Provo City only, but expanded its scope to include the entire county some years ago—has been staffed by United Way.

Utah County is fortunate to have a young, highly educated population and two major universities. The Provo-Orem area was ranked the #1 Best Performing City by the Miliken Institute for 2022, and the #10 Most-Educated City in America for the same year. We came in #3 as Most Affordable Living by Goodhire, and the #2 Safest Big City in the U.S. in 2022 by SafeWise.

These recognitions and assets are because of—or have resulted in—the presence of many technology companies in the County. From Ancestry to Vivent Solar to Qualtrics and many others, these corporate entities require significant broadband capacity. And Utah County has provided the resources necessary to meet the demand.

**BROADBAND SERVICE COVERAGE**

The Utah Broadband Center, a program of the Governor's Office of Economic Opportunity, provides broadband coverage data for researchers, public policy makers, corporations, and residents. The following figures depict the extent of broadband coverage in Utah County. The County border is outlined in yellow.
Figure 16: Cable Broadband Service Areas, Utah County
Figure 17: DSL Broadband Service Areas, Utah County
Figure 18: Fiber Broadband Service Areas, Utah County
Figure 19: Mobile Wireless Broadband Service Areas, Utah County
Figure 20: Fixed Wireless Broadband Service Areas, Utah County
Figure 21: All Wired and Wireless Broadband Service Areas, Utah County
Availability of broadband service is abundant in virtually every populated place in the County. However, availability does not mean access. Cost of service and capacity of users are two barriers that appear to be key for our covered populations are discussed below.

TELEPHONE SURVEY

A major endeavor of our planning is a telephone survey of our identified covered populations: aging individuals and persons of Hispanic or Latino descent. We are particularly interested in learning from and assisting low- to moderate-income households. To gain knowledge about the needs of these covered populations, we utilized the services of a professional research firm.

Methodology

Desiring to learn directly from our covered populations, and wanting to know whether other low-income households in the County face the same issues as our covered populations, we conducted a stratified random sample among 1,235 adults who are likely living below 150 percent of federal poverty guidelines. In the aggregate, this level of sampling provides a margin of error of ± 2.8 percent on a confidence level of 95 percent. In other words, we can be 95 percent certain that if the survey were repeated, the results would be within 2.8 percentage points of the survey we completed.

Instrument

We used the state-provided survey instrument in our interviews. However, because the instrument does not obtain data on the age of respondents, nor the age of householders, we relied on our sampling to gather data from our covered population of persons age 65 or older.

Sampling

Funding from the Utah Broadband Center is intended to help households living with incomes less than 150 percent of federal poverty guidelines (FPG). Because FPG is based on
the number of persons in a household, we used Utah County’s average household size of 3.48 in developing our sample list. FPG for households of three is $21,960; for households of four, it is $26,500.

Table 1: Sampling for 150% of FPG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>Federal Poverty Guideline</th>
<th>150% or FPG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$21,960</td>
<td>$32,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$26,500</td>
<td>$39,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the survey instrument does not include an item regarding household size, it is impossible to determine whether respondents have incomes less than 150 percent of FPG. For these reasons, we targeted individuals whose annual household income is less than $40,000.

The survey is stratified among persons age 65 or older, persons of Hispanic or Latino descent, and random adults. The reason for including random adults whose income is below 150 percent of FPG was to determine whether our covered populations’ needs, skills, and interests varied statistically from those of the general population. We interviewed 407 seniors, 400 persons of Hispanic or Latino descent, and 428 random adults. Segregating the groups into distinct samples, the seniors data has a margin of error of ± 4.9 percent; Hispanic or Latino data has a margin of error of ± 4.9 percent; the general adults data is likewise ± 4.8 percent.

Professional interviewers conducted the surveys in April 2023. Sampling of telephone numbers included 70 percent mobile phones and 30 percent landlines. Using proprietary methods, our telephone sampling includes cell phone numbers of out-of-Utah area codes, but are being used in Utah County.
Method of Analysis

We analyzed data using SPSS statistical software, the foremost application in social science research. Data were segregated and cross tabulated by covered population groups using codes inserted by interviewers based on the list from which the completed phone interview came. By utilizing this method, we were able to abide by the requirement that we use only the instrument provided by the Utah Broadband Center, yet still assure that we were interviewing our identified covered populations.

Analysis included tests of association and correlation between the three populations interviewed.

Results

For convenience of reporting, the three groups studied are referred to as seniors, Hispanic or Latino persons, and adults. The “adults” category is random adults whose household income is less than 150 percent of federal poverty guidelines.

Connectivity

The survey found that 55.4 percent of respondents say they have an internet connection in their homes. This level of connectivity is highest in the general adult category (seniors: 42.8 percent; Hispanic or Latino: 50.0 percent; random adults: 73.4 percent). There is a statistically significant difference between the three groups; there is also a correlation between belonging to one of these groups and having internet access.
Table 2: Internet at Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&gt; 65</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>18+</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Statistically Significant Difference Between Groups?</th>
<th>Correlation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant to .05  
**Significant to .005

The most common types of connections are wireless (46.2 percent) and fiber optic (32.3 percent) connections. Exactly half of Hispanic or Latino respondents indicated they have wireless connections, while 37.4 percent of seniors have it. Nearly 49 percent of adult respondents have wireless.

Table 3: Type of Internet at Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Internet</th>
<th>&gt; 65</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>18+</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Statistically Significant Difference Between Groups?</th>
<th>Correlation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cable or digital</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiber Optics</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant to .05  
**Significant to .005

About 7 percent of seniors indicated they have more than one type of connection, while only 1.3 percent of adults indicated so.
Nearly half of respondents do not know the speed of their internet connections. Seniors are the least to know, with 71.2 percent indicating so. Nearly a third of adults say their speed is up to 1 Gbps.

Table 4: Speed of Internet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed of Internet</th>
<th>10 Mbps or less</th>
<th>Up to 25 Mbps</th>
<th>Up to 1 Gigabit</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 65 Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18+ Total</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistically Significant Difference Between Groups? Correlation?

*Significant to .05
**Significant to .005
Xfinity/Comcast is the most common internet service provider, with 33.0 percent of respondents using this service. Google Fiber is next, at 18.6 percent.

**Table 5: Internet Providers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internet Provider</th>
<th>&gt; 65</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>18+</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Statistically Significant Difference Between Groups?</th>
<th>Correlation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Century Link/Qwest</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xfinity/Comcast</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google Fiber</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HughesNet</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verizon</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant to .05
**Significant to .005

Hispanic or Latino respondents are less likely to receive internet service bundled with other services, such as streaming entertainment; 28.6 percent of respondents in this group say they do have bundled services, while 52.4 percent of seniors and 68.5 percent of adults do.
Table 6: Bundled Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&gt; 65</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>18+</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Statistically Significant Difference Between Groups?</th>
<th>Correlation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant to .05  
**Significant to .005

Reasons for No Connectivity

The most common reason that respondents provided for not having broadband connections at home is because they use their smartphone 52.5 percent). Hispanic or Latino respondents provide this reasoning more than any other group, at 71 percent. Nearly 20 percent of respondents say they don’t have a connection because the monthly charges are too high; 14.7 percent say they do not know how to use a computer or tablet.
Table 7: Why Don’t Have Internet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why Don’t Have Internet</th>
<th>Statistically Significant Difference Between Groups?</th>
<th>Correlation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use smartphone instead</td>
<td>&gt; 65</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly charges too</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expensive</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know how to use</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer or tablet</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not need it/ not</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interested in it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worried about privacy/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others getting info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant to .05
**Significant to .005

Home Internet Uses

Among all survey respondents, video conferencing or chatting is the most common response on how one uses their broadband internet, with 48.2 percent. Gaming is the next most common, at 42.3 percent. Among seniors, 60.9 percent say entertainment or streaming services, while the most common, while only 37.3 percent of Hispanic or Latino respondents say so. For adults, gaming is the most common response, at 62.9 percent. There is a statistically
significant difference between all groups and these uses; there is a correlation for each of them as well.

Table 8: Internet Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internet Uses</th>
<th>&gt; 65</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>18+</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Statistically Significant Difference Between Groups?</th>
<th>Correlation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remote work</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote learning</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote healthcare</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video conference/Chat</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment/streaming</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaming</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant to .05  
**Significant to .005

Home Internet Cost

Of the 684 respondents who say they have broadband connections at home, 4.8 percent indicate the monthly fee is zero, or free. Landlords are likely providing connectivity as part of rent. Another 139 respondents indicated they pay $1 per month, and 39 respondents said they pay $2. Of all respondents who say they pay more than $0.00, the average is about $47. However, averaging the fees of those who reported they pay more than $2 results in an average of 72.

Of those who do not have internet connectivity in the home, the average amount they are willing to pay is $32.54 per month.
Awareness of Affordable Connectivity Program

There is very low awareness of the Affordable Connectivity Program among those we surveyed. Only 14.8 percent of all respondents indicated they are aware of it, and 3.5 percent participate in it. Nearly half (47.4 percent) of seniors indicated they would like more information about it; 37.9 percent of Hispanic or Latino respondents and 19.1 percent of adults likewise would like more information.

Table 9: Awareness of Affordable Connectivity Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness of Affordable Connectivity Program</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes. I participate</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes. Not interested/not eligible</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Would like more info</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Not interested</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant to .05  
**Significant to .005
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Each of our goals has both strategies and programs or initiatives we intend to pursue to achieve our vision for connectivity in Utah County.

GOAL 1: UTAH COUNTY RESIDENTS, INCLUDING SENIORS AND HISPANIC OR LATINO NEIGHBORS, HAVE QUALITY, APPROPRIATE TECHNOLOGY DEVICES IN THEIR HOMES.

Strategy 1.1: Build on existing momentum to create more opportunities for households without devices.

Program 1.1.1: Expand the Digital Inclusion Coalition of Utah County to include every municipality and more human service providers in Utah County. For nearly 10 years, Utah County has collaborated on community-based efforts to bring broadband internet to homes throughout the county. United Way provides organizational leadership and staff support for this coalition, which is chaired by Joshua Ihrig, a Provo City employee, and includes representatives from various municipalities, school districts, businesses, non-profits, libraries, and community organizations. This grant will allow us to expand the composition and influence of the committee to include, over time, representatives from every municipality, from all major human service organizations, all school districts, major healthcare providers, faith organizations, and universities. This growing network will permit us to reach more individuals and families in our covered populations.

List current supporters

Strategy 1.2: Identify and provide qualified households with refurbished and refreshed devices through programming.
Program 1.2.1: Through existing and new partners such as school districts, food pantries, faith-based groups, housing authorities, and others, develop and implement processes to identify households unable to purchase devices. As our Digital Inclusion Advisory Committee membership grows, we will formalize methods and processes of identifying households who do not have access to broadband in their home, whether it is because they have no connection or because they do not have suitable devices. For example, take advantage of human service intake processes to potentially identify those seeking care for mental health or nutrition whether they have computers or tablets in their home. Schools could work through their natural networks to identify families who are lacking this resource. Faith groups could likewise perform outreach and identification of households whose circumstances dissuade them from having broadband connections or purchase suitable devices. Partnering with these organizations we can share information between each other to benefit both the organization and the individuals who would benefit from services.

Program 1.2.2: Expand the Digital Inclusion Coalition of Utah County’s current device refurbishing program in order to provide quality, affordable devices to identified households. For over 6 years, the Digital Inclusion Coalition of Utah County has been running a program to accept donated devices and refurbish them, largely with the help of volunteers. This plan will target the expansion of this program by recruiting more volunteers, soliciting donations of hardware, and, when necessary, purchasing new parts such as memory or motherboards to refurbish and refresh the donated items.

As this program matures, we intend to partner with schools and post-secondary institutions to recruit learners who can assist with the refurbishment of donated items while learning marketable skills for future employment.
GOAL 2: UTAH COUNTY RESIDENTS HAVE DIGITAL SKILLS NECESSARY TO UTILIZE DEVICES TO ACCESS AFFORDABLE, QUALITY BROADBAND.

Strategy 2.1: Work to expand existing broadband access programming and awareness throughout the county.

Program 2.1.1: Identify willing community partners to expand broadband access within Utah County. By utilizing members of the Digital Inclusion Coalitions of Utah County we will replicate many of the successful broadband expansion efforts throughout communities in Utah County. Successful efforts have included the following:

- Publicly funded Wi-Fi at municipal properties such as libraries, community centers, recreation centers, public works, and other facilities.
- Raising awareness of reduced-rate programs from providers such as Comcast, CenturyLink, and others.
- Provide information about USAC’s Lifeline program.
- Assistance with applying for the Affordable Connectivity Program.
- School district connectivity assurance efforts.
- Library hotspot device loan program.

Strategy 2.2: Capitalize on Utah County’s volunteer culture to build capacity for device access.

Program 2.2.1: Establish, maintain, and promote volunteer opportunities for expanded device refurbishing efforts. We currently rely on volunteers to assist with our refurbishing program. Our intention is to scale our current program to reach every household in our covered populations throughout the county. Through promotion at
secondary and higher education institutions, local businesses, and faith groups, we will recruit diverse volunteers to assist with refurbishing and refreshing donated devices.

**Program 2.2.2: Expanding group instruction opportunities to provide necessary skills, particularly to covered populations.** In addition to providing devices and access, we will engage volunteers to teach computer skills in group settings. These will include existing groups in partnership with locations such as the South Franklin Community Center, public schools, recreation centers, libraries, senior centers, and faith groups throughout the county.

**GOAL 3: IDENTIFY AND ACQUIRE FUNDING TO CONTINUE GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF EXISTING PROGRAMS.**

**Strategy 3.1: Apply for implementation funding through the state.**

**Program 3.1.1: Maintain relationship with state broadband office to keep informed about updates and deadlines for upcoming grant funding for digital inclusion.** The Digital Inclusion Coalition of Utah County currently has a good working relationship with the state broadband office. Maintaining that relationship and continuing to build it will align with both our goals and the states to grow digital inclusion efforts around the state. This will also create opportunities for our Coalition to share resources with other areas in our state and learn more best practices.

**Strategy 3.2: Research and acquire funding through a variety of sources to build lasting partnerships and promote digital inclusion throughout the county.**

**Program 3.2.1: Through existing partnerships and growing the Digital Inclusion Coalition, find and work together to apply for available grants applicable to current efforts building digital inclusion.** Working with partners, we will have the ability to
collaborate on finding and applying towards grants and other funding sources that would otherwise be inaccessible to our community. As the Digital Inclusion Coalition has been able to come together to apply for this current grant, we can continue patterns of teamwork and collaboration to continue finding financial funding for our efforts.

Program 3.2.2: Continue building partnerships with local businesses and nationwide companies that have a basis in Utah and the Utah County area. Using the myriad of connections, we currently have access within our Digital Inclusion Coalition, we will continue to reach out to businesses in the area, to support digital inclusion efforts. These can be businesses that may benefit from greater digital access, or groups that are already making efforts to maximize the work that they are already doing.
Vision: Utah County residents, including our seniors and our Hispanic or Latino neighbors, have high-quality, affordable, and easy access to broadband service in their homes, and are equipped to utilize this service to grow, work, and prosper.

Goal 1: Utah County residents, including seniors and Hispanic or Latino neighbors, have quality, appropriate technology devices in their homes

Strategy 1.1: Build on existing momentum to create more opportunities for households without devices

Program 1.1.1: Expand the Digital Inclusion Advisory Committee

Strategy 1.2: Provide qualified households with refurbished and refreshed devices through programming

Program 1.2.1: Implement processes to identify households needing assistance

Program 1.2.2: Expand current device refurbishing program

Goal 2: Utah County residents have access to affordable, quality broadband

Strategy 2.1: Work to replicate successful broadband access programming throughout the county

Program 2.1.1: Identify municipal partners to expand access to every community

Strategy 2.2: Expand awareness of and participation in programs for qualifying covered populations

Program 2.1.2: Prioritize the most successful existing programs for replication

Program 2.2.1: Public awareness for Affordable Connectivity and other programs

Goal 3: Build capacity to help citizens utilize broadband services

Strategy 3.1: Capitalize on County’s volunteer culture to build capacity for broadband usage

Program 3.1.1: Expand device refurbishing efforts through volunteers

Program 3.1.2: Volunteer mentors to teach skills, to covered populations

Program 3.1.3: Material and tools to teach and practice skills to benefit from broadband

Program 3.1.4: Encourage all to help neighbors learn and master broadband skills

Get full time DI person

Program 3.1.5: Material and tools to teach and practice skills to benefit from broadband
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