

SLIGP 2.0 Grant Closeout Report				2. Award or Grant Number:	50-10-S18050
				4. EIN:	03-6000264
1. Recipient Name	Vermont Department of Public Safety			6. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)	5/19/2021 rev. 6.2.21
3. Street Address	45 State Drive			7. Reporting Period End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/31/2021
5. City, State, Zip Code	Waterbury, VT 05671-1300			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	3	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	2	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	5	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	2.00	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	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	no		Yes or No if further identification of potential public safety users occurred during the grant period.	
9	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	Yes		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	Yes		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.

During the performance period of the grant the FirstNet team convened 3 Governance meetings. The primary purpose of these meeting was to update the governance body on FirstNet's progress within Vermont and to address any challenges encountered. A FirstNet representative was present at the governance meetings to address any questions the commission had and to update the commission on national initiatives. The Vermont team attended 2 national meetings. These meeting provided the opportunity for our staff to network with other states, territories, and FirstNet leadership. Staff presented updates at these meetings on Vermont progress and discussed any concerns the state was experiencing with the construction of the RAN. Vermont participated in 5 stakeholder events where information on Vermont's progress and the FirstNet national strategy was shared with front line first responders. These meetings provided the opportunity for the team to work with key members of the public safety community and to discuss plans for emergency communications technology transitions and to learn about applications and data bases currently in use by these organizations. The events provided first responders with the opportunity to share what technology their organizations used with other organizations and to discuss if there was an opportunity to embrace a common technology within Vermont. These events provided first responders a direct channel to our staff and the opportunity to provide feedback to the state team on their experiences with FirstNet solution. Staff used these opportunities to captured essential information regarding coverage gaps and the lack of stated coverage with the FirstNet (AT&T) system. Coverage issues appeared to be the primary reason emergency service providers were reluctant to embrace FirstNet solution. To address the perceived differences in coverage between what FirstNet published and what the users experienced, Vermont hired a public safety technology consulting firm to validate coverage (Televate). Televate field tested coverage and compared their findings to the FirstNet stated coverage maps. The results clearly showed that the users experience was considerable different than the coverage maps. Vermont sent correspondence to FirstNet with the field-test report showing the discrepancies. FirstNet staff deferred addressing the concern until the network in Vermont is fully constructed. Vermont continues to monitor the construction of FirstNet RAN as we approach FOC. State land mobile radio (LMR) technicians acquire empirical coverage data on all new FirstNet sites and the observations are shared with the first responder entities located within the service area. This information is used by these public safety entities to help determine if the FirstNet solution is right for their organization. The SLIGP 2.0 grant provided Vermont with necessary funding to hire dedicated staff focused on ensuring our first responders receive a robust interoperable communications platform and FirstNet fulfills their commitments to Vermont.

**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 new activities to report.

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

The SLIGP 2.0 funding was used to shape the FirstNet program in Vermont. Our staff was successful in helping our first responder community determine if the FirstNet solution would benefit their communities. Program staff with the assistance of contract support was able to validate and challenge the FirstNet coverage predictions by conducting field measurements.



<b>Total Funds Allocated to Contracts</b>						<b>\$86,400.00</b>	<b>\$21,600.00</b>

**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	\$179,471.00	\$65,203.00	\$244,674.00	\$150,601.61	\$79,061.95	\$229,663.56
b. Personnel Fringe Benefits	\$62,637.00	\$18,385.00	\$81,022.00	\$87,474.73	\$31,847.57	\$119,322.30
c. Travel	\$12,792.00	\$0.00	\$12,792.00	\$1,734.86	\$0.00	\$1,734.86
d. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
e. Materials/Supplies	\$3,600.00	\$1,500.00	\$5,100.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
f. Contractual	\$86,400.00	\$21,600.00	\$108,000.00	\$70,866.00	\$0.00	\$70,866.00
g. Other	\$6,941.00	\$1,559.00	\$8,500.00	\$2,685.44	\$138.74	\$2,824.18
h. Indirect	\$81,147.00	\$0.00	\$81,147.00	\$65,575.42	\$0.00	\$65,575.42
i. Total Costs	\$432,988.00	\$108,247.00	\$541,235.00	\$378,938.06	\$111,048.26	\$489,986.32
j. Proportionality Percent	80%	20%	100%	77%	23%	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?	Most Helpful: Funding for dedicated staff working exclusively on the FirstNet program. Challenges included getting FirstNet to direct the necessary resources to Vermont to achieve the national commitment.

<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 will work with AT&amp;T to develop additional coverage within Vermont. We will work with FirstNet to select the deployable assets they committed to providing Vermont.</p>
<p>15c. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in informing my stakeholders about FirstNet.</p>	<p>5-Strongly Agree</p>	<p>What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?</p>	<p>The funds supported staff which directed conducted outreach to our public safety partners across Vermont. The biggest challenge will be maintaining first responder engagement without a state champion providing current and relevant information to our first responders about FirstNet activities in Vermont.</p>
<p><b>Statement</b></p>	<p><b>Agree/Disagree</b></p>	<p><b>Additional Questions</b></p>	<p><b>Response</b></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>Most Helpful: Funding for dedicated staff working exclusively on the FirstNet program.</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>the funding necessary to hire support staff.</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>Funding provided to the state allow us to hire staffing and provide outreach materials.</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><b>16a. Typed or printed name and title of Authorized Certifying Official:</b></p>	<p><b>16c. Telephone:</b></p>	<p>(802) 241-5215</p>
<p>Terry LaValley, Director Radio Technology Services</p>	<p><b>16d. Email Address:</b></p>	<p><a href="mailto:terry.lavalley@vermont.gov">terry.lavalley@vermont.gov</a></p>
<p><b>16b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official:</b></p>	<p><b>16e. Date:</b></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.**