

SLIGP 2.0 Grant Closeout Report				2. Award or Grant Number:	27-10-518027
				4. EIN:	41-6007162
1. Recipient Name	State of Minnesota, Department of Public Safety			6. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)	06/29/2021
3. Street Address	445 Minnesota St. Suite #1725			7. Reporting Period End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/29/2021
5. City, State, Zip Code	St Paul MN 55101			8. Final Report	
				Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
				No <input type="checkbox"/>	
9. Project/Grant Period				10. Reserved for Reviewer	
9a. Start Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/01/2018	9b. End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/31/2021		
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	260	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	30	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	yes	8	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	1.00	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	4	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.

Minnesota continued the governance meetings in the regions and at the state level through virtual meetings, totalling 260 through period of performance. The governance continued through the pandemic. Due to the pandemic the regional meetings concluded at eight user group in person meetings. We met for the first User Group in Chaska in 2018, followed by three meetings across the state in early 2019. FirstNet and the FirstNet Authority were in attendance and presented to local participants about FirstNet and the benefits of the National Public Safety Broadband Network. The rest of the meetings were held virtually.

The individuals sent to events were to APCO, IWCE, FirstNet Authority Roadmap Introduction, and DHS JAM Sessions. Totalling eight attendees.

1.00 FTE's were funded.

Two contracts were awarded to Televate for consultant projects, and two contracts for Regional Interoperability Coordinators for regional consultation.

Projects to find Potential public safety users were conducted.

Coverage Gaps were reported to ECN, the Authority and AT&T.

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.

Governance meetings continued through the life of the grant .

11d. Please share any lessons learned or best practices that your organization implemented during your SLIGP 2.0 project.

Total Funds Allocated to Contracts	\$464,000.00	\$116,000.00
---	---------------------	---------------------

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	\$202,211.24	\$50,553.41	\$252,764.65	\$202,211.24	\$50,553.41	\$252,764.65
b. Personnel Fringe Benefits	\$46,159.26	\$11,538.00	\$57,697.26	\$46,159.26	\$11,538.00	\$57,697.26
c. Travel	\$40,206.00	\$10,052.00	\$50,258.00	\$29,157.88	\$7,266.15	\$36,424.03
d. Equipment			\$0.00			\$0.00
e. Materials/Supplies	\$720.00	\$180.00	\$900.00	\$137.80	\$34.46	\$172.26
f. Contractual	\$385,514.28	\$96,379.26	\$481,893.54	\$327,170.70	\$81,817.00	\$408,987.70
g. Other	\$4000.00	\$1000.00	\$5000.00	\$3,103.08	\$776.00	\$3,879.08
h. Indirect	\$21,189.22	\$5,297.33	\$26,486.55	\$21,189.22	\$5,297.33	\$26,486.55
i. Total Costs	\$700,000.00	\$175,000.00	\$875,000.00	\$629,129.18	\$157,282.35	\$786,411.53
j. Proportionality Percent	80%	20%	100%	80%	20%	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?	The biggest challenge was the acceptance of such a large contract being awarded to a single vendor. Since Verizon was the major carrier in the state there is still resistance to switch to AT&T. It is viewed as a monopoly where the ability to choose has been taken away. The membership still believes there is room for agnostic platform for broadband communications. Unfortunately, from a state perspective it is too large a price to pay for a single state. That is why the state concluded that FirstNet was our best opportunity to bring wireless broadband to public safety in MN.

<p>15b. I plan to continue any SLIGP 2.0 program activities beyond the SLIGP 2.0 period of performance.</p>	<p>3-Neutral</p>	<p>What do you plan to accomplish after the period of performance?</p>	<p>It depends on what happens with 911 fee diversion discussions with the FCC.</p>
<p>15c. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in informing my stakeholders about FirstNet.</p>	<p>4-Agree</p>	<p>What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?</p>	<p>It helped focus the program as an essential part of emergency communications, to travel across the state to discuss MN's role in the network.</p>
<p>Statement</p>	<p>Agree/Disagree</p>	<p>Additional Questions</p>	<p>Response</p>

<p>15d. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in maintaining a governance structure for broadband in my state/territory.</p>	<p>4-Agree</p>	<p>What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?</p>	<p>It allowed for a program manager to focus on the program and the next wave of technology coming to public safety. The most visionary role in public safety so far.</p>
<p>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.).</p>	<p>4-Agree</p>	<p>What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?</p>	<p>Televate was able to give us perspective from across the nation. Assisted with surveys and outreach to boots on the ground.</p>

<p>15f. Overall, SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in preparing for FirstNet.</p>	<p>4-Agree</p>	<p>What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?</p>	<p>Planning and delivering on the nationwide RFP data collections.</p>
<p>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.</p>			
<p>16a. Typed or printed name and title of Authorized Certifying Official:</p>		<p>16c. Telephone:</p>	<p>651-201-7546</p>
<p>Dana Wahlberg, Director ECN</p>		<p>16d. Email Address:</p>	<p>Dana.wahlberg@state.mn.us</p>
<p>16b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official:</p>		<p>16e. Date:</p>	<p>11/18/2021</p>
			

Public Burden Statement: According to the Paperwork Reduction Act, as amended, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 25 hours per response. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Natalie Romanoff, Program Director, State and Local Implementation Grant Program, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue, NW, Room 4078, Washington, DC 20230.