

| U.S. Department of Commerce State and Local Implementation Grant Program Close Out Report | | | | 2. Award or Grant Number: | 38-10-S13038 |
|---|---|---|--|---|--------------|
| 1. Recipient Name State of North Dakota, Information Technology Department | | | | 4. EIN: | 45-0309764 |
| | | | | 6. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY): | 5/29/2018 |
| 3. Street Address 600 East Boulevard Ave, Dept. 112 | | | | 7. Reporting Period End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY) | 2/28/2018 |
| | | | | 5. City, State, Zip Code Bismarck, ND, 58503 | |
| 10a. Project/Grant Period | | | | | |
| Start Date: (MM/DD/YYYY) | | 9/1/2013 | 10b. End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY) | | 2/28/2018 |
| Part A: Metrics - Final PPR Milestone Data (cumulative through the last quarter) | | | | | |
| | Project Type (Capacity Building, SCIP Update, | Project Deliverable Quantity (Number & Indicator Description) | Description of Milestone Category | | |
| 1 | Stakeholders Engaged | 1659 | Actual number of individuals reached via stakeholder meetings during the period of performance | | |
| 2 | Individuals Sent to Broadband Conferences | 33 | Actual number of individuals who were sent to third-party broadband conferences using SLIGP grant funds during the period of performance | | |
| 3 | Staff Hired (Full-Time Equivalent)(FTE) | 0.62 | Actual number of state personnel FTEs who began supporting SLIGP activities during the period of performance (may be a decimal) | | |
| 4 | Contracts Executed | 2 | Actual number of contracts executed during the period of performance | | |
| 5 | Governance Meetings | 36 | Actual number of governance, subcommittee, or working group meetings held during the period of performance | | |
| 6 | Education and Outreach Materials Distributed | 7295 | Actual volume of materials distributed (inclusive of paper and electronic materials) plus hits to any website or social media account supported by SLIGP during the period of performance | | |
| 7 | Subrecipient Agreements Executed | 0 | Actual number of agreements executed during the period of performance | | |
| 8 | Phase 2 - Coverage | Complete Dataset Submitted to FirstNet | Please choose the option that best describes the data you provided to FirstNet in each category during the period of performance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Complete • Partial Dataset Submitted to FirstNet • Complete Dataset Submitted to FirstNet | | |
| 9 | Phase 2 – Users and Their Operational Areas | Complete Dataset Submitted to FirstNet | | | |
| 10 | Phase 2 – Capacity Planning | Complete Dataset Submitted to FirstNet | | | |
| 11 | Phase 2 – Current Providers/Procurement | Complete Dataset Submitted to FirstNet | | | |
| 12 | Phase 2 – State Plan Decision | Complete Dataset Submitted to FirstNet | | | |
| Part B: Narrative | | | | | |
| Milestone Data Narrative: Please Describe in detail the types of milestone activities your SLIGP grant funded (Please reference each project type you engaged in. Example: Governance Meetings, Stakeholders Engaged) | | | | | |
| <p>Thanks to access to the SLIGP 1.0 grant, the State of North Dakota was able to reach out to 1,659 public safety stakeholders across the state of North Dakota, facilitating broader understanding and universal communication on the benefits of using a nationally supported broadband public safety data system. We were also able to send multiple staff on a sum total of 33 different trips to national discussions on the FirstNet and related broadband discussion on the feasibility and use of a public safety networks and also adequately ensured national considerations were taken with regard to North Dakota needs. Because of the availability of federal funds, North Dakota was able to expand our staff support to plan for FirstNet over the last 4 years, and hire contractors on two separate occasions, one long-term. North Dakota was also able to elevate a statewide committee involving state, tribal, and local representatives and set the foundations for regional and local governance, which will ensure a more effective implementation as FirstNet becomes available, meeting and discussing this system 36 times over the course of over 4 years. The State of North Dakota was also able to utilize this structure to make valued FirstNet-oriented changes to the Statewide Communications Interoperability Plan, with greater assurance of buy-in. Just as importantly, federal funds were key in the development and dissemination of knowledge to stakeholders.</p> | | | | | |
| Please describe in detail any SLIGP program priority areas (education and outreach, governance, etc.) that you plan to continue beyond the SLIGP period of performance. | | | | | |
| <p>With the award for the SLIGP 2.0 grant funds, the State of North Dakota will continue to work with FirstNet to conduct effective planning and outreach in preparation for delivery and implementation of a permanent data solution. However, the State has worked to establish a durably effective, integrated, and independent program of governance supporting public safety communications strategic infrastructure that will continue to collaboratively support public safety communications for the foreseeable future. This governance structure, when combined with a resurgent SCIP management program and statewide initiatives to reinvent the statewide approach to effective day to day support for the public and fellow public safety providers will also continue to directly benefit from the foundations outlined through partnered planning and financial support from the federal government.</p> | | | | | |

Data collection narrative: Please describe in detail the status of your SLIGP funded data collection activities.

The State was able to collect data on one of the cellular carriers here in ND. This data has been helpful in calculating the performance of the carriers network performance with signal strength gathering and technology types used by carrier.

Please describe in detail any data collection activities you plan to continue beyond the SLIGP period of performance.

Based on the outcome of the negotiated FirstNet contract, the State of North Dakota continues to carry a significant concern with regard to effective coverage in the state, especially in rural areas where public safety officials work by themselves or with limited near proximity support daily in austere conditions that can experience a temperature range swing annually in excess of 100 degrees Fahrenheit. These conditions make the availability, direct contact and the ability to maintain cognitive awareness of officers and public safety officials in the field vitally important. Effective coverage will continue to drive our primary focus for the foreseeable future until proven otherwise. Based on this, it is our intent to continue collecting data and conducting analysis of coverage provided by viable commercial carriers.

Lessons Learned: Please share any lessons learned or best practices that your organization implemented during your SLIGP project. ND best practice learned was the depth to which we needed to communicate, not just once, but multiple times on this topic and the time needed to do so. Without that time, it's unclear how acceptable the system would have been at implementation.

Part C: Staffing

Staffing Table - Please provide a summary of all positions funded by SLIGP.

| Name | FTE% | Project(s) Assigned | Change |
|-------------------------------|------|---|-----------|
| Program Manager | 50 | Development of program activities and oversight of Subcontractors | No Change |
| Project Sponsor | 4 | Oversight of Program Manager and Subrecipient, steering of project | No Change |
| CIO | 1 | Oversight of project, interface with Governor's Office | No Change |
| CFO | 1 | Oversight of financial planning, tracking, and reporting practices | No Change |
| Accountant | 1 | Execution of financial tracking, and reporting practices | No Change |
| Project Management Specialist | 4 | Management of project management processes | No Change |
| Procurement Officer | 1 | Develop, implement, and oversight of contract for subrecipient services | No Change |

Part D: Contracts and Funding

Subcontracts Table – Include all subcontractors engaged during the period of performance. The totals from this table must equal the "Subcontracts Total" in your Budget Worksheet


| Name | Subcontract Purpose | Type (Vendor/Subrec.) | RFP/RFQ Issued (Y/N) | Total Federal Funds Allocated | Total Matching Funds Allocated |
|----------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Telestate, LLC | SLIGP Support | Vendor | Y | \$734,502.47 | \$0.00 |
| Agency MABU | Design report | Vendor | N | \$373.53 | \$0.00 |
| | | | | | |

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 | \$167,100.00 | \$26,220.00 | \$193,320.00 | \$175,766.98 | \$41,593.48 | \$217,360.46 |
| b. Personnel Fringe Benefits | \$55,143.00 | \$8,653.00 | \$63,796.00 | \$63,316.20 | \$18,142.55 | \$81,458.75 |
| c. Travel | \$92,433.00 | \$7,321.00 | \$99,754.00 | \$53,966.09 | \$795.96 | \$54,762.05 |
| d. Equipment | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| e. Materials/Supplies | \$5,572.00 | \$2,800.00 | \$8,372.00 | \$8.00 | \$0.00 | \$8.00 |
| f. Subcontracts Total | \$819,227.00 | \$0.00 | \$819,227.00 | \$734,877.16 | \$0.00 | \$734,877.16 |
| g. Other | \$28,500.00 | \$247,000.00 | \$275,500.00 | \$31,266.05 | \$277,641.45 | \$308,907.50 |
| Indirect | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| h. Total Costs | \$1,167,975.00 | \$291,994.00 | \$1,459,969.00 | \$1,059,200.48 | \$338,173.43 | \$1,397,373.91 |
| i. % of Total | 80% | 20% | 100% | 76% | 24% | 100% |

| Part E: Additional Questions: Please select the option (Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, Somewhat Agree, Strongly Agree) that best suits your answer. | | | |
|---|----------------|---|---|
| Overall, were SLIGP funds helpful in preparing for FirstNet? | Strongly Agree | What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter? | <i>Narrative. Yes, the funds allowed us to develop a plan, lay down a structure to support planning, and prepare so that we would be ready at the time of implementation.</i> |
| Were SLIGP funds helpful in planning for your FirstNet consultation? | Strongly Agree | What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter? | <i>Narrative. Access to funds was the most helpful. Without the funds, participation would have been limited until FirstNet came online.</i> |
| Were SLIGP funds helpful in informing your stakeholders about FirstNet? | Strongly Agree | What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter? | <i>Narrative. We used grant funds travel around the State, an expense that would have been prohibitive otherwise. The biggest challenge was developing a suitable format to communicate with stakeholders among the choices without overwhelming or desensitizing them.</i> |
| Were SLIGP funds helpful in developing a governance structure for broadband in your state? | Strongly Agree | What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter? | <i>Narrative. North Dakota was able to hire a technical governance expert to advise the State on a suitable governance structure. The challenge we had was in implementing the structure with adequate involvement across the state.</i> |
| Were SLIGP funds helpful in preparing your staff for FirstNet activities in your state (e.g. attending broadband conferences, participating in training, purchasing software, procuring contract support etc.)? | Strongly Agree | What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter? | <i>Narrative. The grant allowed the state team to participate in the FirstNet conferences, purchase data collection software and hire a professional consultant to assist the state staff with all the required elements of the program.</i> |
| Were SLIGP funds helpful in updating your Statewide Communications Interoperability Plan? | Strongly Agree | What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter? | <i>Narrative. Most helpful was the ability to bring both additional staff as well as contracted technical expertise. The biggest challenge was developing the background and information to correctly document the in-kind matching. Some additional guidance would have helped here.</i> |
| Were SLIGP funds helpful in preparing for your review of the FirstNet developed State Plan? | Strongly Agree | What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter? | <i>Narrative. The grant funds allowed the state to assemble a state plan review team made up of both local and state employees and hold multiple meetings where they reviewed the state plan and ultimately provided a recommendation back to the SPOC and SIEC members.</i> |
| Were SLIGP funds helpful in conducting FirstNet determined data collection? | Strongly Agree | What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter? | <i>Narrative. Through this grant we were able to collect performance data on carriers. One of our largest challenges was that most of the public safety agencies across the state use Verizon for service, so collection of AT&T performance was difficult.</i> |

| Part F: 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. | | |
|---|--|--|
| Typed or printed name and title of Authorized Certifying Official: | | Telephone (area code, number, and extension) |
| Duane Schell, Program Sponsor | | 701.328.4360 |
| Signature of Authorized Certifying Official: | | Email Address: |
|  | | dschell@nd.gov |
| | | Date: |
| | | 5/29/2018 |