

SLIGP 2.0 Grant Closeout Report				2. Award or Grant Number:	13-10-S18013
				4. EIN:	58-0973190
1. Recipient Name	Georgia Emergency Management and Homeland Security Agency			6. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)	07/15/2020
3. Street Address	935 United Avenue SE, Building 2			7. Reporting Period End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/31/2020
5. City, State, Zip Code	Atlanta, Georgia 30316			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)	03/31/2020		
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	4	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	3	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	4	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	1.75	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	No	0	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.

The FirstNet Authority will be forwarding the Governance Letters directly to Yuki Miyamoto's attention to support the four meetings referenced above. We met monthly with AT&T FirstNet to discuss ongoing coverage gaps, the progress of the buildout, and the tools available to keep up to date on these items. We also met with stakeholders who were experiencing coverage gaps and worked with AT&T FirstNet to further identify them. Additionally, through our stakeholder meetings, we were able to identify and inform additional public safety users for FirstNet. These events occurred in the last quarter of the grant.

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.

Yes. We had four regional FirstNet workshops throughout the state. We spread them out so that there was at least one workshop accessible from everywhere in Georgia. We worked with the FirstNet Authority, as well as AT&T FirstNet to put these workshops out.

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

We learned that engagement and education on the FirstNet grant was needed as we moved through different phases of the grant. We also learned that in person workshops were important in reaching out, especially learning the various needs and questions from different areas throughout the state.

Total Funds Allocated to Contracts							\$28,000.00	\$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	\$197,956.00	\$62,636.00	\$260,592.00	\$114,014.65	\$33,404.43	\$147,419.08
b. Personnel Fringe Benefits	\$124,542.00	\$39,139.00	\$163,681.00	\$68,925.50	\$20,194.04	\$89,119.54
c. Travel	\$32,752.00		\$32,752.00	\$8,717.17		\$8,717.17
d. Equipment			\$0.00			\$0.00
e. Materials/Supplies	\$14,252.00		\$14,252.00	\$8,407.97		\$8,407.97
f. Contractual	\$28,000.00		\$28,000.00	\$0.00		\$0.00
g. Other	\$9,600.00		\$9,600.00	\$14,328.60		\$14,328.60
h. Indirect			\$0.00			\$0.00
i. Total Costs	\$407,102.00	\$101,775.00	\$508,877.00	\$214,393.89	\$53,598.47	\$267,992.36
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?	We were able to attend multiple conferences and learn what other grant recipients were utilizing their grant funds for, which was helpful in creating our roadmap and implementation in Georgia. The conferences attended were the Georgia Emergency Communications Conference in Columbus, GA, APCO International 2019 in Baltimore, MD, which included a FirstNet specific track, Emergency Management Association of Georgia (EMAG) 2019 in Savannah, GA, and APCO Public Safety Broadband Summit in May 2019. The EMAG Conference was the most useful in terms of us being able to educate and spread information. All the conferences allowed us either to gather information and learn from other states and entities or educate stakeholders, so the SLIGP funds were crucial in terms of these developments.

<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>We plan to continue our regular meetings with AT&T FirstNet, which will keep us up to date on the progression of the buildout and the updates on the FirstNet network.</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>Using the SLIGP 2.0 funds, we were able to travel to four different regions in Georgia, along with FirstNet Authority and AT&T FirstNet, and put on workshops for stakeholders. These workshops allowed us to inform stakeholders who otherwise could not attend large conferences or meetings at GEMA headquarters in Atlanta, so the travel that the funds covered was crucial in reaching those people. They were held in Glynn county, Crisp county, Athens-Clarke, and Floyd County. With the help of local officials, we were able to host the workshops in their facilities which are already familiar to stakeholders in those areas. Please see the attached is the PowerPoint presentations used by AT&T FirstNet and the FirstNet Authority at the workshops.</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>3-Neutral</p>	<p>What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?</p>	<p>The funds covered the salary of the FirstNet coordinator, so there was a person solely working on broadband in Georgia. This position also was able to be the staff contact for the Broadband Subcommittee of the Georgia Emergency Communications Board.</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>5-Strongly Agree</p>	<p>What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?</p>	<p>Staffing and conference attendance funded by SLIGP 2.0 were extremely helpful in preparing for FirstNet activities in Georgia. We were able to have a FirstNet coordinator fully dedicated to the project, along with other staff members who contributed a portion of their time to these activities.</p>

<p>15f. Overall, SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in preparing for FirstNet.</p>	<p>5-Strongly Agree</p>	<p>What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?</p>	<p>The funding for conferences and travel was the most helpful. A challenge we faced was the various stages of knowledge on FirstNet that stakeholders already had. This made it difficult to plan activities for the state as a whole.</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>Ceporia McMillian, Preparedness Grants and Programs Manager</p>		<p>16c. Telephone:</p>	<p>(404) 635-7041</p>
<p>16b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official:</p> <p><i>Ceporia McMillian</i></p>		<p>16d. Email Address:</p>	<p>ceporia.mcmillian@gema.ga.gov</p>
		<p>16e. Date:</p>	<p>7/15/2020</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.