			Department of Commerce		2. Award or Grant Number:	36-10-S13036	
State and Local Implementation Grant Program Close Out Report					4. EIN:	146013200	
1. Recipient Name	New York State Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services				6. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY):	5/18/2018	
3. Street Address	1220 Washington Ave, State	Campus Building 7A, Suite	610		7. Reporting Period End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	2/28/2018	
5. City, State, Zip Code	Albany, NY 12226						
10a. Project/Grant Period							
Start Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	8/1/2013	10b. End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	2/28/2018				
Part A: Metrics - Final PPR Mile	stone Data (cumulative throu	gh the last quarter)					
,	Project Type (Capacity Building, SCIP Update,	Project Deliverable Quantity (Number & Indicator Description)	Descript	tion of Milestone Category			
1	Stakeholders Engaged	1,042	Actual number of individuals reached via stakeholder meetings duri	ing the period of performance			
2	Individuals Sent to Broadband Conferences	28	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)	1.71	Actual number of state personnel FTEs who began supporting SLIGP activities during the period of performance (may be a decimal)				
4	Contracts Executed	1	Actual number of contracts executed during the period of performance				
5	Governance Meetings	12	Actual number of governance, subcommittee, or working group meetings held during the period of performance				
6	Education and Outreach Materials Distributed	10,228	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 perform	mance			
8	Phase 2 - Coverage	Complete Dataset Submitted to FirstNet					
9	Phase 2 – Users and Their Operational Areas	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:				
10	Phase 2 – Capacity Planning	Complete Dataset Submitted to FirstNet	Not Complete Partial Dataset Submitted to FirstNet 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					•		

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)

Using SLIGP funds, we conducted meetings of our Public Safety Broadband Working Group to engage our stakeholders as well as presented updates at various State association meetings. As part of our outreach efforts, we created a website, psbb.ny.gov, that received approximately 10,000 "hits". In support of outreach, we purchased supplies. We used SLIGP funds for data collection, specifically conducting a survey of the public safety community to collect information and then format and provide to FirstNet. This allowed us to gather information on uses of broadband, costs and challenges. We believe this was useful information to provide to FirstNet to aid in the development of their RFP. Using travel funds, we attended numerous NTIA, FirstNet and PSCR meetings/conferences. We also used travel funds to attend in state meetings related to PSBB, including a series of sessions last summer to educate stakeholders on the State Plan and the overall FirstNet process. Agency staff provided the match to the Federal funds as time spent on working on SLIGP/PSBB activities. A portion of the match was also met using time spent by our Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) on reviewing the State Plan.

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.

Several program areas will be continued in SLIGP 2. These include the State's Public Safety Broadband Working Group (now renamed a User Group, but still a part of our State communications governance model), our psbb.ny.gov will be updated towards adoption (archiving consultation and opt-decision related materials), and we will continue to provide updates to the stakeholder community. Our office is engaged in public safety broadband outreach and regular interaction with FirstNet/AT&T and we plan to continue to be.

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

We conducted a data collection, including a survey, with all data provided to FirstNet during the consultation period. This information consisted of user metrics, cost metrics, use cases, applications used and desired. At this time, we consider that data collection effort concluded. If FirstNet requests additional data collection of related elements during SLIGP 2.0, we will consider that activity at that time.

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

We have begun internal discussion of a SLIGP 2 collection to assess challenges (legal, policy, technology) towards the adoption of public safety broadband/FirstNet, specifically in the data/applications area. While we have not finalized the exact details, we expect that this will collect information on applications used and the policies and laws that affect their use and ability to share data.

Lessons Learned: Please share any lessons learned or best practices that your organization implemented during your SLIGP project.

Continued and wide-scale outreach is essential...if the message is not being distributed in a consistent and on-going manner, misinformation can develop. Another lesson learned was not to underestimate the grant management process; for example, the detail required in budget modifications.

Part C: Staffing

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

Name	FTE%	Project(s) Assigned	Change	
SWIC & OIEC Director	12.78%	Overall SLIGP and policy oversight and liaison	Worked on Project	
Radio Engineer #1	34.59%	SLIGP/State FirstNet Primary	Worked on Project	
Radio Engineer #2	17.56%	Support SLIGP and FirstNet Activities	Worked on Project	
Agency Budget Analyst	17.81%	Supports communications office budget/fiscal. Assists in preparation of SLIGP budget reports.	Worked on Project	
Senior Administrative Analyst	9.06%	Supports office activities, including the interop board and its working groups	Worked on Project	
Senior Administrative Assistant	3.37%	Support office outreach and project management activities	Worked on Project, then retired	
Information Tech Specialist 5 (GIS)	2.74%	Supervises GIS staff, providing overall GIS liaison effort on data collection and mapping	Worked on project	
ITS Specialist (GIS)	3.47%	Performs GIS work related to data collection and mapping	Worked on project	
Assistant Director, OIEC	0.85%	Assistant OIEC director. Works for the SWIC and provides operational and policy oversight	Worked on project	
Excelsior Fellow	3.03%	DHSES Counsel's Office representative (legal)	Worked on project	
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		Type (Vendor/Subrec.)	RFP/RFQ Issued (Y/N)	Total Federal Funds Allocated	Total Matching Funds Allocated
New York State Technology Enterprise Corporation (NYSTEC)	Outreach, Project Management, Support	Vendor	Not needed, existing centralized contract	\$1,737,867.00	\$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	\$0.00	\$215,096.00	\$215,096.00	\$0.00	\$218,002.23	\$218,002.23
b. Personnel Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$123,707.00	\$123,707.00	\$0.00	\$118,679.68	\$118,679.68
c. Travel	\$52,164.00	\$0.00	\$52,164.00	\$39,261.65	\$0.00	\$39,261.65
d. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
e. Materials/Supplies	\$16,499.53	\$0.00	\$16,499.53	\$12,244.43	\$0.00	\$12,244.43
f. Subcontracts Total	\$1,737,867.47	\$0.00	\$1,737,867.47	\$1,228,136.11	\$0.00	\$1,228,136.11
g. Other	\$0.00	\$112,880.00	\$112,880.00	\$0.00	\$19,494.63	\$19,494.63
Indirect	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
h. Total Costs	\$1,806,531.00	\$451,683.00	\$2,258,214.00	\$1,279,642.19	\$356,176.54	\$1,635,818.73
i. % of Total	80%	20%	100%	78%	22%	100%

	what was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter? What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter? What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	Yes, they were. They allowed us to contract for assistance in preparing for consultation, collecting information, conducting outreach, engaging stakeholders and keeping all aspects on track. Without SLIGP funds, it is unlikely that we would have been able to support the effort to the same degree. Yes, we used SLIGP funds to engage stakeholders and invite them to our consultation meeting with FirstNet in 2015. We also used SLIGP funds for data collection to collect elements requested by FirstNet. Yes, through support from our contractor, we produced a newsletter, a website (hosted by the State), and held meetings of our Public Safety Broadband Working Group.
Somewhat Agree Strongly Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter? What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	information, conducting outreach, engaging stakeholders and keeping all aspects on track. Without SLIGP funds, it is unlikely that we would have been able to support the effort to the same degree. Yes, we used SLIGP funds to engage stakeholders and invite them to our consultation meeting with FirstNet in 2015. We also used SLIGP funds for data collection to collect elements requested by FirstNet. Yes, through support from our contractor, we produced a newsletter, a website (hosted by the State), and held meetings of our Public Safety Broadband Working Group.
Strongly Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	FirstNet in 2015. We also used SLIGP funds for data collection to collect elements requested by FirstNet. Yes, through support from our contractor, we produced a newsletter, a website (hosted by the State), and held meetings of our Public Safety Broadband Working Group.
		and held meetings of our Public Safety Broadband Working Group.
Agree	What was most halaful? What shallonges did you appointed?	
	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	While the State already had an existing SICG Board which is not funded under SLIGP, the Board did create a working group for public safety broadband, and those working group activities were funded/matched under SLIGP.
Somewhat Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	Yes, we did use SLIGP funds for travel and for contractor support. While we may have been able to travel to FirstNet related events without SLIGP funds, it is unlikely we would have been able to contract for the extensive outreach and consultation activities we conducted. One challenge we experienced during the out of state conferences planning was having sufficient notice of the conference locations/dates/agenda in order to secure approval to travel out of state.
Disagree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	SCIP updates were done through a TA by DHS-OEC, and therefore updating the SCIP was not a significant event under SLIGP funds (although it was updated during the grant timeframe). We believe there could have been a more coordinated effort between NTIA/FirstNet and DHS-OEC on SCIP updates related to PSBB. We would like to see that occur for SLIGP2.
Strongly Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	Yes, SLIGP funds provided for our contractor who assisted in the review of the State Plan. In addition, significant matching funds came from the review of the State Plan - by OIEC, by State GIS and by our Subject Matter Experts (SMEs). The use of SMEs was very helpful in reviewing the State Plan material. Our SMEs generated approximately 400 questions during the summer review period, which we then culled to approximately 90 questions that were delivered to FirstNet/AT&T.
Strongly Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	Yes, in conjunction with State GIS (match) and our contractor, we collected information from stakeholders, analyzed it and provided the requested data to FirstNet for their use in developing the RFF This information was used during our consultation period with FirstNet.
	Disagree Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter? Disagree What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter? Strongly Agree What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?

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,				
Michael A. Spragge, Director, Office of Interoperable and Emergency Communications	number, and extension)	518-242-8275			
Signature of Authorized Certifying Official:	Email Address:	michael.sprague@dhses.ny.gov			
May 10 Maga	Date:	5/18/2018			
The state of the s					