SLIGP 2.0 Grant Closeout Report						2. Award or Grant Number:	33-10-518033		
							4. EIN:	02-60000618	
. Recipient Name	New Hampshire Department of Safety						6. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)	07/29/2020	
. Street Address	33 Hazen Drive						7. Reporting Period End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/31/2020	
. City, State, Zip code	tate, Zip Concord, NH 03305						8. Final Report Yes No		
. Project/Grant Perio	bd				10. Reserved for				
a. Start Date: MM/DD/YYYY)	03/01/2018	9b. End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/31/2020		Reviewer				
1. Program Activities	NAME AND ADDRESS OF TAXABLE PARTY.								
1a. Identify the acti	vities you performed	during SLIGP2.0 grant peri					- Hereiter		
		Planning, Governance tings, etc.)	Was this Activity Performed during the grant period? (Yes/No)	Total Project Deliverable Quantity (Number)		Description of Activity De	liverable Quantity		
1	Governance Meetin	gs	Yes	45	Cumulative number of governance, subcommittee, or working group meetings related to the NPSBN held during t grant period				
2	Individuals Sent to I	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 Stakehol	der Events	Yes	29	Cumulative number of events coordinated or held using SLIGP 2.0 grant funds during the grant period, as requested b FirstNet.				
4	Staff Hired (Full-Tim	e Equivalent)(FTE)	Yes	0.60	Cumulative number of state/territory personnel FTEs who began supporting SLIGP 2.0 activities during the grant pe (may be a decimal).				
5	Contracts Executed		No	0	Cumulative number of contracts executed during the grant period.				
6	Subrecipient Agreer	ments Executed	No	0	Cumulative number of agreements executed during the grant period.				
7	Data Sharing Policie	s/Agreements Developed	No		Yes or No if data sharing policies and/or agreements were developed during the grant period.				
8	Further Identification Safety Users	on of Potential Public	Yes		Yes or No if further identification of potential public safety users occurred during the grant period.				
9	Plans for Emergency Technology Transiti		Yes		Yes or No if plans for future emergency communications technology transitions occurred during the grant period.				
10	Identified and Plan & Databases	ned to Transition PS Apps	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 Co	overage Gaps	Yes		Yes or No if participated in identifying ongoing coverage gaps using SLIGP 2.0 funds during the grant period.				
12	Data Collection Acti	vities	No		Yes or No if participated in data collection activities as requested by FirstNet				

11.1: The SIEC meets quarterly each year, and the working groups continued to meet on a monthly or bi-monthly basis throughout the duration of the grant period.
11.2: Broadband conferences attended of note includeSAFECOM/NCSWIC April 22-26, 2019 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and AT&T New England conference that Invited store managers throught the region to a FirstNet day of information and activities.
events were conevned. Events of note include the press event in Derry, NH in which was the first community to transition over to FirstNet/AT&T, in October of 2018 a public announcement was made with FirstNet and AT&T.
11.4: The Office of Interoperability transitioned a part-time support person to full-time status.
11.5: No contracts were excuted.
11.6: No subrecipient agreements were executed.
11.7: No data sharing policie/agreements were developed.
11.8: Further identification of public safety users has been accomplished by New Hampshire collaborating with FirstNet/AT&T to continously make presentations throughout the state regarding FirstNet coverage and capability.
11.9: Plans for emergency communications technology transitions has been accomplished throught the grant period as New Hampshire has met with and continously collaborated with; MutualInk, Sonim, Craddlepoint, and FirstNet Deployable technologies.
11.0: The SIEC established an Applications Subcommittee that was housed under the Data Communications Working Group. The objective of this subcommittee was to explore public safety applications solutuons for first responders.

11.11: In collaboration with FirstNet/AT&T New Hampshire continues to explore areas of degradation throughout the state to identify ongoing coverage gaps.

11.12: New Hampshire did not undertake any data collection activitis during the grant period.

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.

During the final quarter of the grant we held one quarterly SIEC meeting which also coincided with our FirstNet press event to celebrate the the new tower builds and band-14 being deployed in over 100 towns throughout New Hampshire.

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

Every step of the way during this grant period we have worked in lockstep with our partners at FirstNet and AT&T, and this has enabled great collaboration to New Hampshire's benefit. We have successfully held a FirstNet seminar with our local public safety partners, and our regional partners. We have successfully held press events, and helped spread the word throughout our first responder community regarding the opportunity that FirstNet offers.

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				
SWIC/SPOC	40%	Management and coordination of grant activities				
Program Specialist		Financial and program reporting				
IV	10%					
Program Specialist		Coordination of grant related activities				
1	10%					

					· · ·				
		_,							
			• • • •						
13. Contractual (Contract and/or S	ubrecipien	tsl				,			
13a. Contractual Table – Include al			table should equal the "Conti	ractual" in Question 1	4f.				
				RFP/RFQ issued	Contract Executed			Total Federal Funds	Total Matching Funds
Name	Subcontra	act Purpose	Type (Contract/Subrec.)	(Y/N)	(Y/N)	Start Date	End Date	Allocated	Allocated
							· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Total Funds Allocated to Contracts								\$0.00	\$0.00
14. Budget Worksheet									
Columns 2, 3 and 4 must match yo	ur project	budget for the entire aw	ard and your final SF 424A. C	olumns 5, 6, and 7 sho	ould list your final bud	lget figures, cumulativ		rter	
		Federal Funds Awarded	Approved Matching Funds (3)	· · · ·		Final Federal Funds Expended (5)	Final Approved Matching Funds		
Project Budget Element (1)		(2)		Total Bu	dget (4)			Final Total Funds	Expended (7)
							Expended (6)		
a. Personnel Salaries		\$177,051.00		\$312,849.00		\$22.60	\$21,835.49	\$21,858.09	
b. Personnel Fringe Benefits		\$86,955.00		\$108,710.00		\$4.44	\$2,278.45	\$2,282.89	
c. Travel		\$12,544.00	\$17,406.00	\$29,950.00				\$0.00	
d. Equipment		\$7,800.00	\$418.00	\$0.00 \$8,218.00		\$3,450.80	\$823.00	\$0.00 \$4,273.80	
e. Materials/Supplies f. Contractual		\$380,000.00				<i>\$3,430.00</i>	J023.00	\$4,273.80	
g. Other		\$380,000.00		\$380,000.00 \$4,299.00		\$3.91		\$3.91	
h. Indirect		\$31,185.00		\$4,255.00		\$436.93		\$436.93	
i. Total Costs		\$699,834.00		\$875,211.00		\$3,918.68	\$24,936.94	\$28,855.62	
j. Proportionality Percent		80%	20%		0%	14%	86%	1009	
15. Additional Questions: Read ead	ch stateme	nt below. Rate your leve	el of agreement or disagreem	ent with each statem	ent and answer follow	-up questions to provi	de additional informa	ition.	
Statement Agree/Disagree			Additional Questions			Response			
We utilized very little funding to accomplish the myriad of tasks our office took on during the grant period						nt period. The funding			
15a. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful			What was most helpful? Wh	at challenges did vou	was helpful in facilitin	g breakfast and lunch	luring our two day Firs	stNet Seminar which was held	back in September of
planning for the integration with t	he	3-Neutral	encounter?	er enonenbes um You	2019.				
NPSBN.			encounter :						

15b. I plan to continue any SLIGP 2.0 program activities beyond the SLIGP 2.0 period of performance.	2-Disagree	What do you plan to accomplish after the period of performance?	Our office will continue on with our governance meetings and outreach. We will continue our technology transition planning, and we are planning to host a FirstNet summit this fall.			
' IB-Neutrai		What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	As stated previously, very little funding was used during our normal course of activities during the grant period. The most helpful part has been our good relationship with FirstNet and AT&T, particularly the regional staff. Our FirstNet Regional Lead, and out AT&T Principal Consultant Teams have been stellar in collobrating with us to meet our need, and the needs of our public safety community.			
Statement	Agree/Disagree	Additional Questions	Response			
15d. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in maintaining a governance structure for broadband in my state/territory.	2-Disagree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	We didn't utilize SLIGP funds for our governance meetings. New Hampshire is fortunate to have many individuals who take interoperability very seriously and commit themselves to attend our quarterly meetings, as well as our working group meetings. Without the dedication of these selfless individuals we wouldn't be able to make the progress that we have made to date.			
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	2-Disagree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	SLIGP 2.0 funding was never used for any of our staff to attend broadband conferences, or participate in any trainings, or to procure any contract support.			

15f. Overall, SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in preparing for FirstNet.			We found the use of the funding to be very restrictive to support actitvities that we were interested in pursuing. For instance there was a period of time when we were pursuing exploring MCPTT vendor solutions, and wanted to utilize grant funding but we found out the funding could only be used for planning, and couldn't be used for testing devices or apps. The result was that we never pursued that activity.				
16. Certification: I certify to the best of my l	knowledge and belief that	t this report is correct and complete for performan	ce of activities for the purpose(s) set forth in	n the award document	ts.		
16a. Typed or printed name and title of Auth Pamela Urban-Morin, Grants Administrator	orized Certifying Official	16c. Telephone:	603-271-7663				
	ial: Romall	Urlim-mari		16d. Email Address:	pamela.urban-morin@dos.nh.gov		
	50, 11000			16e. Date:	7/29/2020		

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 (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue, NW, Room 4078, Washington, DC 20230.