

U.S. Department of Commerce State and Local Implementation Grant Program Close Out Report				2. Award or Grant Number:	16-10-S13016
				4. EIN:	82-6000952
1. Recipient Name	State of Idaho Military Division			6. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY):	4/27/2018
3. Street Address	4040 Guard St, Bld. 600			7. Reporting Period End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	2/28/2018
5. City, State, Zip Code	Boise, ID 83705				
10a. Project/Grant Period					
Start Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	8/1/2013	10b. End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	2/28/2018		
<b>Part A: Metrics - Final PPR Milestone Data (cumulative through the last quarter)</b>					
	Project Type (Capacity Building, SCIP Update,	Project Deliverable Quantity (Number & Indicator Description)	Description of Milestone Category		
1	Stakeholders Engaged	5613	<i>Actual number of individuals reached via stakeholder meetings during the period of performance</i>		
2	Individuals Sent to Broadband Conferences	50	<i>Actual number of individuals who were sent to third-party broadband conferences using SLIGP grant funds during the period of performance</i>		
3	Staff Hired (Full-Time Equivalent)(FTE)	6.7	<i>Actual number of state personnel FTEs who began supporting SLIGP activities during the period of performance (may be a decimal)</i>		
4	Contracts Executed	13	<i>Actual number of contracts executed during the period of performance</i>		
5	Governance Meetings	28	<i>Actual number of governance, subcommittee, or working group meetings held during the period of performance</i>		
6	Education and Outreach Materials Distributed	14198	<i>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</i>		
7	Subrecipient Agreements Executed	NA	<i>Actual number of agreements executed during the period of performance</i>		
8	Phase 2 - Coverage	Complete Dataset Submitted to FirstNet	<i>Please choose the option that best describes the data you provided to FirstNet in each category during the period of performance:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Complete</li> <li>• Partial Dataset Submitted to FirstNet</li> <li>• Complete Dataset Submitted to FirstNet</li> </ul>		
9	Phase 2 – Users and Their Operational Areas	Partial Dataset Submitted to FirstNet			
10	Phase 2 – Capacity Planning	Partial Dataset Submitted to FirstNet			
11	Phase 2 – Current Providers/Procurement	Partial Dataset Submitted to FirstNet			
12	Phase 2 – State Plan Decision	Complete Dataset Submitted to FirstNet			
<b>Part B: Narrative</b>					
<b>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)</b>					
<p>In summary of SLIGP grant activities (2013-2017), Idaho conducted four years of community outreach and education within the State of Idaho. Multiple stakeholders were informed of the National Public Safety Broadband Network concept and specifically informed of impending FirstNet services. Data collection efforts took place with professional assistance and consultation. Governance mechanisms changed during this first grant period and eventually settled in with a more structured governance model that will be sustainable and effective during upcoming years. Stakeholders from all public safety entities, extended agencies and voluntary response agencies were engaged on a frequent and periodic basis. Planners also attended regional and national level planning sessions and/or conferences to further network with FirstNet and current technology trends. As a culmination of this grant period, the SLIGP program played a major role in the decision cycle of whether or not Idaho should opt in to the FirstNet concept. Idaho was the 12th state to proactively opt in.</p>					
<b>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.</b>					
<p>Idaho will focus primarily on working with the public safety communications governance entities within the state moving forward. These groups represent the broadest spectrum of public safety entities from across the state to include first responders, extended users, and voluntary organizations. Additional effort will include updating emergency planners across the state via attendance at Local Emergency Planning Committees (LEPCs) and/or emergency planning workshops. The Idaho SLIGP program will continue to collaborate with FirstNet and AT&amp;T planners for stakeholder engagement throughout the course of the new grant period.</p>					

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

Data collection activities took place in roughly two phases. The first included a robust data collection effort supported by FirstNet planners and outside consulting assistance with Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC). This data was gathered and passed to FirstNet. A second phase of data collection was completed during the "Idaho Listening Tour". The tour included support by a separate local consultant, Idaho Policy and Consulting, LLC. The purpose of the tour was to gather input from first responders across the state as well as informing them of impending launch of FirstNet services.

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

Idaho will coordinate any data collection efforts moving forward with FirstNet. Idaho does plan to potentially contract for gap and coverage analysis collection by region based on bona fide need as the radio access network buildout occurs. These efforts will be coordinated via governance entities within the state, the Idaho Public Safety Communications Commission, and the District Interoperability Governance Boards.

**Lessons Learned: Please share any lessons learned or best practices that your organization implemented during your SLIGP project.****Part C: Staffing****Staffing Table - Please provide a summary of all positions funded by SLIGP.**

Name	FTE%	Project(s) Assigned	Change
Program Manager	100%		N/C
Project Manager	80%		N/C
Project Manager	80%		N/C

**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	Subcontract Purpose	Type (Vendor/Subrec.)	RFP/RFQ Issued (Y/N)	Total Federal Funds Allocated	Total Matching Funds Allocated
Val Technologies	SLIGP and PSBAG Consulting	Vendor	N	\$2,580.00	\$0.00
Gloria Totoricaguena	Idaho Technology Summit-Professional Planning Services	Vendor	N	\$20,000.00	\$0.00
DePaul	Personnel State Contract	Vendor	N	\$1,260.00	\$0.00
Various Vendors	Conference Room for Meetings	Vendor	N	\$9,600.00	\$0.00
Science Applications International Corporation	Professional Planning, Outreach, and Programmatic Support Services	Vendor	Y	\$227,512.00	\$0.00
Legal Council		Vendor	N	\$18,750.00	\$0.00
Gloria Totoricaguena	Professional Planning, Outreach, and Programmatic Support Services	Vendor	N	\$46,000.00	\$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	\$614,543.00	\$73,240.00	\$687,783.00	\$562,058.55	\$105,035.61	\$667,094.16
b. Personnel Fringe Benefits	\$245,817.00	\$29,296.00	\$275,113.00	\$226,605.90	\$43,195.72	\$269,801.62
c. Travel	\$197,046.00	\$0.00	\$197,046.00	\$162,814.65	\$0.00	\$162,814.65
d. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
e. Materials/Supplies	\$40,703.00	\$0.00	\$40,703.00	\$38,089.44	\$0.00	\$38,089.44
f. Subcontracts Total	\$279,701.00	\$0.00	\$279,701.00	\$301,814.25	\$0.00	\$301,814.25
g. Other	\$16,142.00	\$270,025.00	\$286,167.00	\$15,969.64	\$205,122.39	\$221,092.03
Indirect	\$96,290.00		\$96,290.00	\$92,127.29	\$0.00	\$92,127.29
h. Total Costs	\$1,490,242.00	\$372,561.00	\$1,862,803.00	\$1,399,479.72	\$353,353.72	\$1,752,833.44
i. % of Total	80%	20%	100%	80%	20%	100%

Part E: Additional Questions: Please select the option (Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, Somewhat Agree, Strongly Agree) that best suits your answer.			
Overall, were SLIGP funds helpful in preparing for FirstNet?	Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	<i>Funds were timely and available for all planned state activities surrounding FirstNet concept planning within Idaho.</i>
Were SLIGP funds helpful in planning for your FirstNet consultation?	Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	<i>Funds allowed for a robust consultation visit in Idaho involving key stakeholders.</i>
Were SLIGP funds helpful in informing your stakeholders about FirstNet?	Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	<i>Funds allowed for an even and sustainable outreach program across the state. Funds also allowed for multiple events reaching out to First Responders across the state to obtain their input.</i>
Were SLIGP funds helpful in developing a governance structure for broadband in your state?	Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	<i>Funds allowed participation in existing governance structures to include decision cycle activities surrounding the Opt In or Out decision.</i>
Were SLIGP funds helpful in preparing your staff for FirstNet activities in your state (e.g. attending broadband conferences, participating in training, purchasing software, procuring contract support etc.)?	Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	<i>Funds were adequate for attending relevant and on-going public safety communications events, conferences, SPOC meetings both regionally and nationwide. All in-state contracting needs were met utilizing SLIGP funds.</i>
Were SLIGP funds helpful in updating your Statewide Communications Interoperability Plan?	Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	<i>Funds were available but only partially helpful in updating meaningful cohesive interoperability activities. Challenges were internal to state process versus availability of funds.</i>
Were SLIGP funds helpful in preparing for your review of the FirstNet developed State Plan?	Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	<i>Funding allowed for proactive collection of data and stakeholder input during the review process. This in turn allowed for a timely recommendation to the Governor with Opt In decision made proactively.</i>
Were SLIGP funds helpful in conducting FirstNet determined data collection?	Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	<i>Idaho was not solicited for excessive data collection from FirstNet planners. No challenges noted.</i>

**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, number, and extension)	208-258-6501
Brad Richy, Director, Idaho Office of Emergency Management		Email Address:	brichy@imd.idaho.gov
Signature of Authorized Certifying Official:		Date:	6/20/2018
 Sign here			