

SLIGP 2.0 Grant Closeout Report					2. Award or Grant Number:	32-10-S18032
					4. EIN:	88-6000022
1. Recipient Name	State of Nevada, Department of Public Safety, Division of Emergency Management & Homeland Security				6. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)	06/25/2021
3. Street Address	2478 Fairview Drive				7. Reporting Period End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/31/2021
5. City, State, Zip Code	Carson City, Nevada, 89701				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	26	Cumulative number of governance, subcommittee, or working group meetings related to the NPSBN held during the grant period		
2	Individuals Sent to Broadband Conferences	No	0	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	4.00	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	Yes		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	Yes		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.

One good of the State Contract was executed and four individuals began working part-time on SLIGP 2.0 activities. •Nevada held 30 governance meetings and the SWIC was able to address many topics such as data sharing policies/agreement and communications transitions. The SWIC worked to identify coverage gaps through statewide queries, had discussions regarding shared radio systems, as well as worked in preparing and RFP to explore options of a contractor to complete a comprehensive statewide survey. The SWIC worked with purchasing to get a contract in place for drive testing to identify further coverage gaps. Due to COVID-19 much of the latter efforts were sidelined due to Nevada's primary focus being on the pandemic.

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.

No activities during the last quarter, this was due to COVID-19 demands that made any additional activities unaccomplishable.

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

Lessons learned and best practices include: implenting FirstNet statewide, increased outreach statewide to collboartiors and stakeholders, presentations regarding FirstNet to Homeland Security Commission, Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee and the Nevada Tribal Emergency Coordinating Council to raise awarness. Challenges include the inability to do testing due to unallowable costs such as purchasing equipment. Continuted education statewise is essential. Lack of coverage in rural ares is a challenge for Nevada. Although COVID-19 created challenges for the last year or so of the grant, Nevada was successful in education , connecting, collaborating all in an effort to imporve communication across the state. After this grant program, the state is encouraged by efforts that will continue to increase broadband coverage specifically in the Tahoe Basin, Douglas County and Rural and Tribal locations.

<p>15b. I plan to continue any SLIGP 2.0 program activities beyond the SLIGP 2.0 period of performance.</p>	<p>4-Agree</p>	<p>What do you plan to accomplish after the period of performance?</p>	<p>Yes. Plans to continue SLIGP 2.0 program activities beyond the period of performance are underway. Specifically, working towards broadband for the entire Lake Tahoe Basin, Douglas County as well as Rural and Tribal locations. Douglas county and the Lake Tahoe Basin driven by the county and stakeholder education will keep these program activities going past the period of performance. For the rural and tribal locations upcoming grant opportunities will continue their progress towards Broadband access.</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>SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in informing Nevada's stakeholders about FirstNet due to the ability to travel and execute in-person stakeholder meetings. The main challenge was when COVID-19 hit. Given that we are the Division of Emergency Management and Homeland Security, and activated during this pandemic disaster, hardships were met in moving forward with regular FirstNet Stakeholder meetings.</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>Yes, SLIGP funds assisted with funding meetings to work on broadband issues including working on the governance structure in the Tahoe Basin. Early on, Nevadas governing body shifted from the Nevada Public Safety Coordinating Coucil to the Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee early on in the SLIGP grant. This platform gave opportunity for SLIGP 2.0 outreach which was quite helpful.</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>Without SLIGP 2.0 funds, important learning and outreach to stakeholders across the State of Nevada would not have been realized. Regular stakeholder meetings and in person meetings increased our dialog and connectivity across the state. Nevada's staffing is typically lower in comparison to other states, when COVID-19 hit, staffing was pulled to Emergency response which impacted SLIGP 2.0 progress.</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>Yes, overall the SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in preparing for FirstNet. Specifically, the the ability to travel for in person meetings allowed for more effective stakeholder buy in which greater impacted our ability to prepare for FirstNet. Our main challenge was: COVID-19 shut down.</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>16a. Typed or printed name and title of Authorized Certifying Official:</p> <p>Kelli Anderson, Emergency Management Programs Manager</p>	<p>16c. Telephone:</p>	<p>775-687-0321</p>
<p>16b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official: </p>	<p>16d. Email Address:</p>	<p>kanderson@dps.state.nv.us</p>
	<p>16e. Date:</p>	<p>6/25/2021</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.