SLIGP 2.0 Grant Closeout Report					2. Award or Grant Number:	16-10-S18016
					4. EIN:	82-6000952
1. Recipient Name	Idaho Military Division, Idaho Office of Emergency Management				6. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)	06/03/2021
3. Street Address	4040 W. Guard St. Bldg 600				7. Reporting Period End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/31/2021
5. City, State, Zip Code	Boise, ID, 83705-5004				8. Final Report Yes ☑ No ☐	

9. Project/Grant Period					
9a. Start Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/01/2018	9b. End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/31/2021	10. Reserved for Reviewer	

11. Program Activities

11a. Identify the activities you performed during SLIGP2.0 grant period of performance

	Activity Type (Planning, Governance Meetings, etc.)	Was this Activity Performed during the grant period? (Yes/No)	Total Project Deliverable Quantity (Number)	Description of Activity Deliverable Quantity
1	Governance Meetings	YES	65	Cumulative number of governance, subcommittee, or working group meetings related to the NPSBN held during the grant period
2	Individuals Sent to Broadband Conferences	YES	56	Cumulative number of individuals sent to national or regional third-party conferences with a focus or training track related to the NPSBN using SLIGP 2.0 grant funds during the grant period
3	Convened Stakeholder Events	NO	0	Cumulative number of events coordinated or held using SLIGP 2.0 grant funds during the grant period, as requested by FirstNet.
4	Staff Hired (Full-Time Equivalent)(FTE)	YES	2.00	Cumulative number of state/territory personnel FTEs who began supporting SLIGP 2.0 activities during the grant period (may be a decimal).
5	Contracts Executed	YES	1	Cumulative number of contracts executed during the grant period.
6	Subrecipient Agreements Executed	NO	0	Cumulative number of agreements executed during the grant period.
7	Data Sharing Policies/Agreements Developed	NO		Yes or No if data sharing policies and/or agreements were developed during the grant period.
8	Further Identification of Potential Public Safety Users	YES		Yes or No if further identification of potential public safety users occurred during the grant period.
9	Plans for Emergency Communications Technology Transitions	NO		Yes or No if plans for future emergency communications technology transitions occurred during the grant period.
10	Identified and Planned to Transition PS Apps & Databases	NO		Yes or No if public safety applications or databases within the State or territory were identified and transition plans were developed during the grant period
11	Identify Ongoing Coverage Gaps	YES		Yes or No if participated in identifying ongoing coverage gaps using SLIGP 2.0 funds during the grant period.
12	Data Collection Activities	NO		Yes or No if participated in data collection activities as requested by FirstNet

11b. Please provide a description of each activity reported in response to Question 11; any challenges or obstacles encountered and mitigation strategies you employed; and any additional project milestones or information.

1. Idaho SLIGP attended 65 State and Local Governance meetings.
2. Idaho SLIGPsent 56 Individuals to NPSBN related conferences during the grant period, and that includes virtual conferences held during the COVID 19 pandemic.
4. Idaho started out with 2 FTEs supporting SLIGP2, and finished Q9-Q13 with 1 FTE.
5. Idaho executed a contract for the Pinpoint (Televate) crowd sourcing application during Q10.
8. Potential public safety users identified throughout our engagements at the governance board meetings, were put in contact with AT&T/FirstNet too further discuss their needs/requirements.
11. SLIGP personnel and funds were used for crowdsourcing, working with FirstNet, AT&T, State stakeholders, and local stakeholders to identify coverage gaps that could affect public safety.

11.1: The Idaho Public Safety Communications Commission (IPSCC) is comprised of representatives from counties, cities and the statewide organizations. The purpose of the IPSCC is to assist cities, counties, ambulance districts and fire districts in the establishment, management, operations and accountability of consolidated emergency communications systems. Statewide associations and agencies represented on the IPSCC are:
 Idaho Association of Counties, Association of Idaho Cities, Idaho Sheriffs' Association,
 Idaho Chiefs of Police Association, Idaho Fire Chiefs Association, Idaho State Police,
 Idaho Emergency Medical Services Communications Center, Idaho Technology Authority,
 A member of the Idaho Legislature, A member of the Native American Tribes of the state,
 Members of the six District Interoperability Governance Boards (DIGB)

The Idaho SLIGP personnel attended 13 IPSCC meetings during this Grant period, also in attendance were AT&T and FirstNet personnel. Discussion concerning the Nationwide Public Safety Broadband Network (NPSBN) took place at every meeting.
Idaho has Six District Interoperability Governance Boards (DIGB), which include members from the Public Safety and Emergency Management Stakeholders of their respective Counties and regions. Each DIGB represents a group of counties in their respective regions. SLIGP personnel attended 41 DIGB meetings during the grant period. Discussion centered mainly on communication challenges that were specific to the respective DIGB.
There were 6 Local Emergency Planning Committees (LEPCs) meetings that SLIGP personnel were invited to attend, to discuss NPSBN as well.
11.2: Idaho SLIGP sent 56 individuals to various conferences and workshops during the Grant period, including Public Safety Broadband Stakeholder Meeting (PSCR), Association of Public Safety Communications Officials (APCO), and International Wireless Communications Expo (IWCE). All personnel attended the FirstNet and NPSBN related presentations, workshops, and sessions.
11.4: There were 2 personnel hired for the period of performance: Program Manager and Project Manager. The SLIGP Project Manager replaced the Program Manager upon his departure in December 2019, at which time it was decided not to replace the Project Manager for the rest of the grant cycle.
11.5: Idaho executed one contract during SLIGP 2.0. Idaho contracted with Televate LLC., for Licensing of Crowdsourcing Software (Pinpoint).
11.8: Throughout SLIGP 2.0 Idaho took advantage of all governance meetings, conferences, and workshops, and stakeholder meetings to identify potential users. Once identified, those individuals/Agencies were handed off to FirstNet/AT&T.
11.11: Due to Idaho's rural landscape, there were many coverage gaps identified by the stakeholders in their respective regions at the beginning of this grant period. Most gaps are addressed in the State Portal Plan, but were not scheduled for completion prior to the end of this grant period.

11c. Did you perform activities during the last quarter of the grant that haven't been reported previously (i.e., new programmatic activities, staffing changes)? If so, please describe.
11.1: 3 IPSCC governance meetings held during this quarter. These meetings were included in the overall numbers above.
11.2: Idaho had one Individual attend the virtual webinar conducted by Connect (X) - Policy Summit 2021. This was also included in the overall numbers above.
11.8: Idaho continued to identify potential users through the Governance virtual meetings.
11.11: Coverage gaps are still being identified and addressed.
11.12 There was a reimbursement on travel of $1099 reducing the cost from the prior quarterly report, as well as personnel cost, fringe benefit costs and indirect cost during the last quarter of the grant.

11d. Please share any lessons learned or best practices that your organization implemented during your SLIGP 2.0 project.
Lesson Learned: Idaho SLIGP personnel learned there is a continual need to update our Stakeholders on the capabilities that are available and the progress that has been taking place with the NPSBN, as their opinion and perspective will be the cornerstone of success for the NPSBN.
Narrative: Idaho SLIGP personnel found that the best education tool for the benefits of the NPSBN, were from those stakeholders that were FirstNet subscribers with real world experiences. The Garth Brooks concert in July 2019 was an extremely positive event for FirstNet and AT&T, as only the public safety personnel with FirstNet phones had continual service throughout. Members of the local agencies that were onsite and witnessed the difference in coverage shared that experience and answered questions at the DIGB's and the IPSCC explaining the benefit of the NPSBN and FirstNet from the user level. Other lessons learned, is the need for on-going collaboration with AT&T at the local level, especially and specifically at the DIGB's, that include coverage and capacity briefings/updates from AT&T.

12. Personnel

12a. Staffing Table - Please include all staff that contributed time to the project with utilization. Please only include government staff employed by the state/territory NOT contractors.

Job Title	FTE%	Project (s) Assigned
Program Manager	100%	The Program Manager oversees the entire SLIGP 2.0 project and has final approval for all activities and reports.
Project Manager	100%	The Project Manager runs the day to day operations of the SLIGP 2.0

13. Contractual (Contract and/or Subrecipients)

13a. Contractual Table – Include all contractors. The totals from this table should equal the "Contractual" in Question 14f.

Name	Subcontract Purpose	Type (Contract/Subrec.)	RFP/RFQ Issued (Y/N)	Contract Executed (Y/N)	Start Date	End Date	Total Federal Funds Allocated	Total Matching Funds Allocated
Televate	Crowdsourcing app to identify coverage gaps and quality of coverage	Contract	Y	Y	5/12/2020	3/31/2021	$ 50,000.00	
	project management consultants	Contract	N	N			$ 132,000.00	
	technical &coverage consultant	Contract	N	N			$ 133,466.00	
	legal counsel	Contract	N	N			$ 18,750.00	

Total Funds Allocated to Contracts					$334,216.00	$0.00

14. Budget Worksheet

Columns 2, 3 and 4 must match your project budget for the entire award and your final SF 424A. Columns 5, 6, and 7 should list your final budget figures, cumulative through the last quarter

Project Budget Element (1)	Federal Funds Awarded (2)	Approved Matching Funds (3)	Total Budget (4)	Final Federal Funds Expended (5)	Final Approved Matching Funds Expended (6)	Final Total Funds Expended (7)
a. Personnel Salaries	$144,336.00	$109,606.00	$253,942.00	$149,021.22	$109,784.27	$258,805.49
b. Personnel Fringe Benefits	$56,291.00	$50,419.00	$106,710.00	$55,482.05	$48,669.56	$104,151.61
c. Travel	$116,418.00	$0.00	$116,418.00	$99,047.40	$0.00	$99,047.40
d. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
e. Materials/Supplies	$13,400.00	$0.00	$13,400.00	$5,331.97	$0.00	$5,331.97
f. Contractual	$334,216.00	$0.00	$334,216.00	$57,399.00	$0.00	$57,399.00
g. Other	$2,880.00	$14,975.00	$17,855.00	$326.53	$23,920.23	$24,246.76
h. Indirect	$32,459.00	$0.00	$32,459.00	$32,459.00	$0.00	$32,459.00
i. Total Costs	$700,000.00	$175,000.00	$875,000.00	$399,067.17	$182,374.06	$581,441.23
j. Proportionality Percent	80%	20%	100%	69%	31%	100%

15. Additional Questions: Read each statement below. Rate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement and answer follow-up questions to provide additional information.

Statement	Agree/Disagree	Additional Questions	Response
15a. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in planning for the integration with the NPSBN.	4-Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	(+)Funds provided full-time SLIGP managers to monitor progress and continue collaboration with stakeholders. (-)The cumbersome contracting process with Idaho agencies to put the crowdsourcing contract into place was a big challenge.

Statement	Agree/Disagree	Additional Questions	Response
15b. I plan to continue any SLIGP 2.0 program activities beyond the SLIGP 2.0 period of performance.	5-Strongly Agree	What do you plan to accomplish after the period of performance?	The Statewide Interoperability Coordinator (SWIC) will assume the networking and coordination functions with FirstNet and AT&T.
15c. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in informing my stakeholders about FirstNet.	4-Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	The travel budget that SLIGP provided was utilized to attend the DIGB meetings across Idaho and engage with the agencies, stakeholders, FirstNet and AT&T representatives in person. Of course, when the COVID virus hit in Mar 2020, travel and in person meetings were restricted, which became a major challenge.

15d. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in maintaining a governance structure for broadband in my state/territory.	4-Agree	**What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?**	Keeping the governance entities informed at the State and local level of the progress with the buildout. Although information loosened up this past year, FirstNet and AT&T could have been more transparent with the status of the new site builds, and the overall system improvement progress early on in SLIGP 2.0.
15e. SLIGP 2.0 funds provided resources that were helpful in preparing for FirstNet planning activities in my state/territory (e.g. staffing, attending broadband conferences, participating in training, procuring contract support etc.).	4-Agree	**What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?**	Without SLIGP 2.0 funds we would not have been able to attend broadband conferences and training workshops that provided important learning and outreach opportunities for our staff and Idaho's stakeholders. SLIGP 2.0 funds helped us procure contracts with companies that helped us conduct drive testing and analyze data for future recommendations to FirstNet/AT&T and state leadership on our state's broadband priorities. Challenges that were encountered, included the sluggish contracting process and the COVID disruption. The narrow scope of allowable activities was a constant hinderance in all aspects of the grant.

15f. Overall, SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in preparing for FirstNet.	4-Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	Overall, SLIGP 2.0 funds helped us prepare for the NPSBN by [providing funding for staff dedicated to broadband, providing opportunities and platforms for statewide collaboration on NPSBN integration, building relationships with FirstNet/AT&T to the benefit of our state's broadband coverage and applications priorities, elevating the issue as a statewide priority, increasing our ability to successfully integrate the NPSBN]. Challenges we encountered during the overall SLIGP 2.0 grant period of performance included [the scope of allowable activities was narrow, stakeholders were not interested in planning allowable activities, our governing body identified only unallowable activities, working within allowable activities was difficult to navigate, contractors had difficulty developing work plans that were all allowable tasks, staffing changes prevented consistent program planning]. Idaho struggled to spend the SLIGP 2.0 funds because of a lack of interest by stakeholders in planning for the NPSBN due to the narrow scope of coverage testing parameters. COVID was by far the biggest challenge we faced, as it took away our ability to communicate on a personal level, offline and in person.

16. 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(s) set forth in the award documents.

16a. Typed or printed name and title of Authorized Certifying Official:		
Brad Richy, Director, Idaho Office of Emergency Management	16c. Telephone:	(208)258-6501
16b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official:	16d. Email Address:	brichy@imd.idaho.gov
	16e. Date:	17 Jun 2021