SLIGP 2.0 Grant Closeout Report			**2. Award or Grant Number:**	06-10-S18006
			4. EIN:	68-0278801
1. Recipient Name	California Governor's Office of Emergency Services		**6. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)**	06/29/2021
3. Street Address	3650 Schriever Avenue		**7. Reporting Period End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)**	03/31/2021
5. City, State, Zip Code	Mather, CA 95655		**8. Final Report**	

8. Final Report	
Yes	☑
No	☐

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	256	*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	52	*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	1.90	*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	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.

11.1: The California First Responder Network (CalFRN) Board of Directors consists of 12 multi-disciplinary members representing a cross-section of public safety, state, local, and tribal expertise at the executive leadership level. The CalFRN Board serves as California's coordinating body to negotiate with FirstNet. The Board will oversee California's plan to establish, formalize and institutionalize a process to support the statewide public safety broadband network. Responsibilities of the Board include coordination, recommendations and solutions regarding policy, training, and compliance.

11.2: California utilized broadband conferences to gain more knowledge of emerging and existing broadband technologies, and to network with industry professionals. Throughout the grant period, our team regularly attended broadband conferences. For example, at the request of FirstNet, one member of our team participated in a FirstNet-sponsored Search and Rescue Exercise (SAREX) with Santa Clara County's Sheriff's Office, where FirstNet services and devices were demonstrated to the County Sheriff's department.

11.4 The staff consisted of a Telecommunications Systems Manager I, three Telecommunications Systems Analyst II, and a Staff Services Analyst. All these positions will consist of a Full Time Equivalent (FTE) staffing position at 100% funding. All staff positions supported the deployment of the NPSBN.

11.5: FirstNet – Broadband for Public Safety - this contract was executed between CALNET/ Cal OES and AT&T on October 22, 2018 and is open to all mandated public safety state agencies for use, as well as other local public safety entities within the State.

11.7 Data Sharing Policies/Agreements Developed: The 2020 Statewide Communications Interoperability Plan (SCIP) was developed by the California Governor's Office of Emergency Services & California Statewide Interoperability Executive Committee with support from the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA). Representatives collaborated to update the CalSCIP with actionable and measurable goals and objectives that have champions identified to ensure completion. These goals and objectives focus on Governance, Technology, Training and Exercises, Outreach and Information Sharing, and Life Cycle Funding. They are designed to support our state in planning for new technologies and navigating the ever-changing emergency communications landscape.

11.9: SLIGP staff coordinates and participates in quarterly California Statewide interoperability Committee (CalSIEC) meetings to prepare guidelines and checklists for technology transitions, and applications, and to develop best practices for use of the FirstNet uplift tool.

11.10: California is continuously reaching out to public safety agencies regarding the development of applications, and monitors apps that are being introduced to the app store, working with AT&T to mitigate any issues that might arise with new development.

We performed outreach activities focused on identification of potential user adoption agencies and groups. Many of the potential primary users have been identified are being approached directly by FirstNet/AT&T. Some of the extended users and volunteer/private industry partners may need additional follow-up information. We also focused our efforts regarding on-going coverage concerns and priorities. These efforts are evolving the discussion and information sharing amongst all parties involved. We continue our data collection activities related to coverage gaps in the State of California, and we have completed collecting this data through meetings, conference calls and other requests.

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.

N/A

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

We learned that there is a need to continue to educate and discuss the NPSBN with our stakeholders, as their perspectives are imperative to the success of the NPSBN in California.

We also learned that lack of coverage and cost are the two major barriers to subscription in the state. To address these concerns, we utilized SLIGP 2.0 funds to identify and measure coverage gaps. We actively colloborate with FirstNet and AT&T to report areas of coverage concern, and identify interim solutions such as deloyable assets to assist public safety entities.

The Calfornia Statewide Interoperability Committee (CalSIEC) coordinates information, initiatives, and decision items concerning public safety communication matters to include planning for the implementation of the National Public Safety Broadband Network (NPSBN) within California. Our team developed best practices for CalSIEC and this document is meant to serve as a guide in the integration of mobile broadband solutions for field communications.

12. Personnel		
12a. Staffing Table - Please include all staff that contributed time to the project with utilization. Please only include government staff employed by the state/territory NOT contractors.		
Job Title	FTE%	Project (s) Assigned
Associate Governmental Program Analyst - Dumetz	10%	Project Management
Grant Manager AGPA - VACANT	10%	Grant Management
Statewide Interoperability Coordinator - Currier	25%	Telecommunications Guidance
Career Executive Assignment - Currier	25%	Project Management
Associate Information Systems Analyst - Killion	5%	Project Management
Associate Information Systems Analyst -Madani	5%	Project Management
Assistant Director PSCO - Mallon	20%	Public Outreach
Information Officer - May	20%	Public Outreach
Staff Services Manager I - VACANT	10%	Grant Management
Telecommunications Systems Manager I - McMahon	90%	Project Management
Staff Services Analyst - Munoz	90%	Project Management
Telecommunications Systems Analyst II - Nielsen	90%	Project Management
Telecommunications Systems Analyst II - Shells	90%	Project Management
Telecommunications Systems Analyst II - Vacant	90%	Project Management

13. Contractual (Contract and/or Subrecipients)

13a. Contractual Table – Include all contractors. The totals from this table should equal the "Contractual" in Question 14f.

Name	Subcontract Purpose	Type (Contract/Subrec.)	RFP/RFQ Issued (Y/N)	Contract Executed (Y/N)	Start Date	End Date	Total Federal Funds Allocated	Total Matching Funds Allocated
Science Application International Corporation (SAIC)	SAIC will assist with public outreach and education, as well as technical and database management.	Contract	Y	Y	03/01/2018	03/31/2021	$10,000.00	$0.00
Total Funds Allocated to Contracts							$10,000.00	$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	$455,063.00	$191,667.00	$646,730.00	$483,430.78	$191,667.00	$675,097.78
b. Personnel Fringe Benefits	$218,749.00	$92,134.00	$310,883.00	$248,193.81	$92,134.00	$340,327.81
c. Travel	$89,504.00		$89,504.00	$68,292.99		$68,292.99
d. Equipment	$0.00		$0.00			$0.00
e. Materials/Supplies	$42,881.00		$42,881.00	$20,381.41		$20,381.41
f. Contractual	$10,000.00		$10,000.00	$0.00		$0.00
g. Other	$6,646.00		$6,646.00	$10,131.79		$10,131.79
h. Indirect	$297,157.00		$297,157.00	$266,158.14		$266,158.14
i. Total Costs	$1,120,000.00	$283,801.00	$1,403,801.00	$1,096,588.92	$283,801.00	$1,380,389.92
j. Proportionality Percent	80%	20%	100%	79%	21%	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?**	The SLIGP 2.0 grant helped us plan for integration with the NPSBN by providing opportunities to engage and educate stakeholders; improve communication and our relationship with FirstNet/AT&T; data collection efforts and information gathering. For example, California received FirstNet's approval to conduct data collection, specifically gathering input from counties and operational areas regarding their coverage needs, which was incorporated into our annual input to AT&T on potential tower locations. We were able to participate in various FirstNet meetings, trainings and conferences related to the deployment of FirstNet throughout the State. Some of the challenges we encountered were the limitations of the allowable activities and understanding that it was more of a planning grant as opposed to implementing.
15b. I plan to continue any SLIGP 2.0 program activities beyond the SLIGP 2.0 period of performance.	4-Agree	**What do you plan to accomplish after the period of performance?**	We plan to continue prioritizing planning for NPSBN integration through our meetings with public safety entities, and with regular meetings with AT&T/FirstNet representatives. We plan to continue to perform on-going assessment of coverage and capacity needs. We will accomplish and develop best practices, continue our relationship with FirstNet/AT&T and montior the progress of the buildout of Band 14 sites throughout the State of California.

Statement	Agree/Disagree	Additional Questions	Response
15c. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in informing my stakeholders about FirstNet.	4-Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	The SLIGP 2.0 grant helped provide an opportunity for California to work with our regional AT&T/FirstNet rep and AT&T sales manager to develop an agenda and PowerPoint for our governance meetings. Topics covered on the slide deck included aspects of the FirstNet Roadmap, Band 14 coverage, tools, and services available, and how agencies can utilize the network. Some of the challenges we encountered were the misconceptions of the FirstNet network.
15d. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in maintaining a governance structure for broadband in my state/territory.	4-Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	The SLIGP 2.0 grant helped us to establish and maintain a governing body of members representing a cross-section of public safety, state, local, and tribal expertise at the executive leadership level. Responsibilities of the Board included coordination, recommendations and solutions regarding policy, training, and compliance. Challenges we encountered included not all meeting discussions or outcomes were focused on allowable activities, and a lot of the information presented was repetitive demonstrating a lack of progress regarding the status of the 30 sites per year that California was allowed to have input on.

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.).	4-Agree	**What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?**	SLIGP 2.0 funded various staffing positions in California and we were able to attend broadband conferences and training workshops that provided important learning, outreach, and networking opportunities for our staff. SLIGP 2.0 funds also helped us negotiate contract options with FirstNet/AT&T and with the request and approval of FirstNet, we were able to conduct drive testing. Challenges included the narrow scope of allowable activities as well as not receiving information and invitations from FirstNet regarding various upcoming conferences and trainings.
15f. Overall, SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in preparing for FirstNet.	4-Agree	**What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?**	Overall, SLIGP 2.0 funds helped us prepare for the NPSBN by providing funding for staff dedicated to broadband, providing opportunities to engage and educate stakeholders; improve communication and our relationship with FirstNet/AT&T; data collection efforts and information gathering. We were able to hold multiple governance meetings, and attend various FirsNet demonstrations, conferences, trainings and workshops. Some of the challenges we experience included working within allowable activities which were difficult to navigate from veering into the unallowable activities area.

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.

16a. Typed or printed name and title of Authorized Certifying Official: Huy Tram	**16c. Telephone:** 916-845-8649
16b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official: *Huy Tram*	**16d. Email Address:** Huy.Tram@caloes.ca.gov
	16e. Date: 8/17/2021

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.