SLIGP 2.0 Grant Closeout Report						2. Award or Grant Number:	32-10-S18032		
					4. EIN:	88-6000022			
1. Recipient Name	State of Nevada, Department of Public Safety, Division of Emergency Management & Homeland Security 6. (N						06/25/2021		
3. Street Address	2478 Fairview Drive					7. Reporting Period End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/31/2021		
- a: a:						8. Final Report			
5. City, State, Zip	Carson City, Nevada, 89701	Yes							
Code						No 🗆			
9. Project/Grant Perio	d			40 Dansan d fan					
9a. Start Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/01/2018 9b. End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/31/2021		10. Reserved for Reviewer					
11. Program Activities									
11a. Identify the activ	ities you performed during SLIGP2.0 grant peri								
	Activity Type (Planning, Governance	Was this Activity Performed	Total Project						
	Meetings, etc.)	during the grant period?	Deliverable Quantity		Description of Activity Del	Description of Activity Deliverable Quantity			
	Wiccings, etc.)	(Yes/No)	(Number)						
1	Governance Meetings	Yes		Cumulative number o	f governance, subcommittee, or working gi	oup meetings related to the N	PSBN held during the		
1			26	grant period					
_	Individuals Sent to Broadband Conferences			Cumulative number of individuals sent to national or regional third-party conferences with a focus or training track					
2		No	0	related to the NPSBN	using SLIGP 2.0 grant funds during the gran	nt period			
	Convened Stakeholder Events			Cumulative number o	of events coordinated or held using SLIGP 2.	o arant funds durina the arant	period, as requested by		
3		No	0	FirstNet.	,		, , ,		
	Staff Hired (Full-Time Equivalent)(FTE)		Ŭ	Cumulative number of	f state/territory personnel FTEs who began	supporting SLIGP 2.0 activitie	s during the grant period		
4		Yes	4.00	(may be a decimal).	y state, territory personner i 123 timo began	supporting Szior Zio detivities	during the grant period		
	Contracts Executed		4.00	Cumulative number of contracts executed during the grant period.					
5	Contracts executed	Yes		Cumulative number of	ij contracts executed during the grant perio	u.			
			1						
6	Subrecipient Agreements Executed	No		Cumulative number of agreements executed during the grant p		riod.			
		-	0						
7	Data Sharing Policies/Agreements Developed	Yes		Yes or No if data shar	ing policies and/or agreements were devel	oped during the grant period.			
8	Further Identification of Potential Public Safety Users	Yes		Yes or No if further id	entification of potential public safety users	occurred during the grant peri	od.		
	Plans for Emergency Communications	V		Yes or No if plans for	future emergency communications technolo	ogy transitions occurred during	the grant period.		
9	9 Technology Transitions Yes								
	Identified and Planned to Transition PS Apps			Yes or No if public saf	ety applications or databases within the St	ate or territory were identified	and transition plans		
10	& Databases	No		were developed durin	ng 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 participat	ted 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.							
ne good of the State Contract was executed and four individuals began working part-time on SLIGP 2.0 activities. •Nevada held 30 governance meetings and the SWIC was able to address many topics such as data sharing policies/agreement and ommunications transitions. The SWIC worked to identify coverage gaps through statewide queries, had discussions regarding shared radio systems, as well as worked in preparing and RFP to explore options of a contractor to complete a omprehensive statewide survey. The SWIC worked with purchasing to get a contract in place for drive testing to identify further coverage gaps. Due to COVID-19 much of the latter efforts were sidelined due to Nevada's primary focus being on the pandemic.							

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 activities during the last quarter, this was due to COVID-19 demands that made any additional activities unaccomplishable.
11d. Please share any lessons learned or best practices that your organization implemented during your SLIGP 2.0 project.
Lessons learned and best practices include: implenting FirstNet statewide, increased outreach statewide to collboartiors and stakeholders, presentations regarding FirstNet to Homeland Security Commission, Nevada Resilience Advisory
Committee and the Nevada Tribal Emergency Coordinating Council to raise awarness. Challenges include the inability to do testing due to unallowable costs such as purchasing equipment. Continuted education statewise is essential. Lack of
coverage in rural ares is a challenge for Nevada. Although COVID-19 created challenges for the last year or so of the grant, Nevada was successful in education, connecting, collaborating all in an effort to imporve communication across the state.
After this grant program, the state is encouraged by efforts that will continue to increase broadband coverage specifically in the Tahoe Basin, Douglas County and Rural and Tribal locations.

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			
Chief, Emergency		Single Point of Contact							
Management/SPOC	10%								
Emergency		Grants Manager							
Management Program									
Manager	10%								
SWIC Manager	60%	Statewide Interoperabili	ty Coordinator						
Legal Counsel	7%	Attorney for Process and	MOU						
13. Contractual (Contr	act and/or Subrecipi	ents)							
13a. Contractual Table	- Include all contrac	tors. The totals from this	table should equal the "Conti	ractual" in Question 1	4f.				
				RFP/RFQ Issued	Contract Executed			Total Federal Funds	Total Matching Funds
Name	Subcon	tract Purpose	Type (Contract/Subrec.)	(Y/N)	(Y/N)	Start Date	End Date	Allocated	Allocated
				, , ,					
Crant Analyst	Programmatic Grant	c Managomont	Cood of the State Centrast	V	V	2/1/2019	2/21/2021	107452	
Grant Analyst	Programmatic Grant	s iviandgennenit	Good of the State Contract	Y	Y	3/1/2018	3/31/2021	107453	

						\$107,453.00	\$0.00		
budget for the entire aw	ard and your final SF 424A. C	olumns 5, 6, and 7 sh	ould list your final bud	lget figures, cumulative		rter			
Endoral Funds Awarded	Approved Matching Funds			Final Fodoral Funds	Final Approved				
		Total B	udget (4)		Matching Funds	Final Total Funds E	xpended (7)		
(2)	(3)			Expended (5)	Expended (6)				
\$326,944.00		\$326,	944.00	\$172,531.32	\$82,540.08	\$255,071	.40		
\$75,490.00		\$75,4	190.00	\$57,700.44		\$57,700.	44		
\$48,744.00		\$48,7	744.00	\$3,925.11		\$3,925.1	11		
		\$0.00				\$0.00			
\$9,938.00		\$9,938.00		\$6,616.03		\$6,616.0	03		
\$236,434.00		\$236,434.00		\$86,699.62		\$86,699.62			
\$2,450.00		\$2,450.00		\$2,687.80		\$2,687.80			
		\$0.00				\$0.00			
\$700,000.00	\$0.00	\$700,000.00		\$330,160.32	\$82,540.08	\$412,700.40			
j. Proportionality Percent 100%		100%		80%	20%	100%			
ent below. Rate your leve	el of agreement or disagreem	ent with each statem	ent and answer follow	v-up questions to provi	de additional informa	tion.			
Agree/Disagree	Additional Qu	estions			Response				
<u> </u>			SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in planning for the integration with the NPSBN. Nevada met with FirstNet/AT&T to discu				stNet/AT&T to discuss		
			•						
			regarding "opt-in" which was approved. The most helpful aspect was the in person stakeholder meetings. COVID-19						
					· ·	•	•		
						2 shat down in traver and reade	tion of in person		
			contact due to covid	7-13 was our greatest ci	ialienge.				
	What was most helpful? What challenges did you								
4-Agree	encounter?								
	\$326,944.00 \$75,490.00 \$48,744.00 \$9,938.00 \$236,434.00 \$2,450.00 \$700,000.00 100% ent below. Rate your leve Agree/Disagree	Federal Funds Awarded (2) Approved Matching Funds (3) \$326,944.00 \$75,490.00 \$48,744.00 \$9,938.00 \$236,434.00 \$2,450.00 \$700,000.00 \$0.00 100% 0% ent below. Rate your level of agreement or disagreem Agree/Disagree Additional Qu What was most helpful? Wh	Federal Funds Awarded (2) Approved Matching Funds (3) Total Bit (3) \$326,944.00 \$326, \$75,490.00 \$75,490.00 \$75,490.00 \$48,744.00 \$48,744.00 \$9,9938.00 \$9,99 \$236,434.00 \$236, \$2,450.00 \$22,4 \$0.00 \$700, \$0.00 \$700, \$0.00 \$700, \$0.00 \$700, \$0.00 \$700, \$0.00 \$700, \$0.00 \$700, \$0.00 \$700, \$0.00 \$700, \$0.00	Federal Funds Awarded (2) Approved Matching Funds (3) Total Budget (4) \$326,944.00 \$326,944.00 \$75,490.00 \$75,490.00 \$48,744.00 \$48,744.00 \$9,938.00 \$9,938.00 \$236,434.00 \$236,434.00 \$2,450.00 \$2,450.00 \$700,000.00 \$0.00 \$700,000.00 \$100% 0% 100% ent below. Rate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement and answer follow Agree/Disagree Additional Questions SLIGP 2.0 funds were what types of data the regarding "opt-in" with detrailed opportunitic contact due to COVID	Federal Funds Awarded (2)	Federal Funds Awarded (2)	Total Budget (4) Final Federal Funds Expended (5) Expended (6) Expended		

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?	Yes. Plans to continue SLIGP 2.0 program activities beyond the period of performance are underway. Specifically, working towards broadband for the entire Lake Tahoe Basin, Douglas County as well as Rural and Tribal locations. Douglas county and the Lake Tahoe Basin driven by the county and stakeholder education will keep these program activities going past the period of performance. For the rural and tribal locations upcoming grant opportunities will continue their progress towards Broadband access.
15c. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in informing my stakeholders about FirstNet.	4-Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in informing Nevada's stakeholders about FirstNet due to the ability to travel and execute inperson stakeholder meetings. The main challenge was when COVID-19 hit. Given that we are the Division of Emergency Management and Homeland Security, and activiated during this pandmenic disaster, hardships were met in moving forward with regular FirstNet Stakeholder meetings.
Statement	Agree/Disagree	Additional Questions	Response

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?	
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?	Without SLIGP 2.0 funds, important learning and outreach to stakeholders across the State of Nevada would not have been realized. Regular stakeholder meetings and in person meetings increased our dialog and connectivity across the state. Nevada's staffing is typically lower in comparison to other states, when COVID-19 hit, staffing was pulled to Emergency response which impacted SLIGP 2.0 progress.

15f. Overall, SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in preparing for FirstNet.	4-Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	meetings allowed for more effective stakeho main challenge was: COVID-19 shut down.		Net. Specifically, the the ability to travel for in person ater impacted our ability to prepare for FirstNet. Our			
16. Certification: I certify to the best of my k	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:					775-687-0321			
Kelli Anderson, Emergency Management Prog 16b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Offic	GG		16d. Email Address:	kanderson@dps.state.nv.us				
	7555			16e. Date:	6/25/2021			

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.