SLIGP 2.0 Grant Closeout Report					2. Award or Grant Number:	48-10-S18048
					4. EIN:	74-6000130
1. Recipient Name	Texas Department of Public Safety				**6. Report Date:**	03/29/2021
3. Street Address	5805 North Lamar Blvd.				**7. Reporting Period End Date:**	12/31/2020
5. City, State, Zip Code	Austin, TX 78752				**8. Final Report** Yes ☑ No ☐	
9. Project/Grant Period						
9a. Start Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/01/2018	**9b. End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)**	12/31/2020	**10. Reserved for Reviewer**		
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	49	*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	67	*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	23	*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	9.00	*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	No	0	*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	Plans for Emergency Communications Technology Transitions	No		*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	No		*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	No		*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 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.

1) TxPSBP held quarterly calls with FirstNet Authority and AT&T to discuss state plan progress and PSBN buildout, challenges, etc. During SLIGP 1.0, TxPSBP held outreach and education meetings with regional public safety stakeholders around the state.
2) TxPSBP sent individuals to conferences such as PSCR's annual stakeholder conference, APCO, IACP Tech Forums, and IWCE.
3) TxPSBP facilitated an in-person workshop on messaging applications for public safety, which FirstNet representatives attended. TxPSBP held annual meetings with its regional councils of governments and radio system owners to discuss PSBN progress. With the allowable activities and topic restrictions under SLIGP 2.0, it was critical that TxPSBP worked together with FirstNet on engagements whenever possible, in order to address the full spectrum of stakeholder questions and concerns. As SLIGP 2.0 period went on and the network was built out, TxPSBP had a shrinking role in proactive outreach.
4) During SLIGP 2.0, hired staff helped facilitate some of the working groups and events associated with interoperability and NPSBN planning, such as the annual Texas Interoperable Communications Coalition event and workshop on public safety messaging applications.

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

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

TXPSBP found that having public safety champions stand alongside FirstNet representatives made a more effective impact at connecting with stakeholders and explaining the value of the Public Safety Broadband Network.

Stakeholders also expressed a desire to see FirstNet be much more than cellular carrier, but rather a provider of solutions to common public safety problems, and a partner.

COVID-19 in the latter half of SLIGP 2.0 cancelled virtually all travel, which exposed how reliant the public safety community was on face-to-face meetings for networking and collaboration. Public Safety Broadband Network stakeholders will need good digital collaboration platforms to encourage effective networking and collaboration, particularly without SLIGP to subsidize travel budgets, and with many agencies facing budget shortfalls.

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: FTE = 1	5%	Provide oversight of all SLIGP activities.
Program Manager: FTE = 2	50%	Program Manager FTE will provide scope and direction for the individual projects within the Texas PSBP including strategy, timeline development, data collection, and assist with state, Tribal and political stakeholder education. Program Manager FTE will also manage the department's enterprise mobility section, as well as an innovation center to explore new broadband technologies and their incorporation into public safety communications.
Project Coordinator: FTE = 1	25%	The Project Coordinator will coordinate statewide Governance meetings and webinars for the state and 24 regions; coordinate regional meetings between the SMEs and regions; provide status updates to the Program Manager and SWIC; oversee production and distribution of education and outreach materials.
Grant Coordinator: FTE = 1	25%	FTE hours will be grant management support, including day to day grant management tasks such as reviewing expenditures for allow ability and compliance and preparing progress reports, reconciliation of grant activity between the grant management and accounting systems, and serve as a liaison with the finance department to review supporting documentation for drawdown of funds.
Program Support Specialist: FTE = 1	30%	The Program Support Specialist will develop materials for and manage audio/video needs at conferences, webinars, and other meetings; develop web-sites and videos for outreach, education, and training for more than 8000 public safety entities; and, facilitate the distribution of newsflashes and program communications.
Lead Project Coordinator/Field Outreach Lead: FTE = 2	100%	These FTE will analyze and coordinate the response to various FirstNet, AT&T, and other relevant detailed/ technical materials for the State of Texas, provide assistance to the Education and Outreach staff to develop outreach materials, and lead data collection efforts.
DPS Grants Accountant: FTE = 1	30%	Duties include drawdown of funds, processing expenditures, and assisting in quarterly financial reporting.

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
Technologist (1 contractor)	Develop design elements, the structure and	Contract	Y	Y	Mar. 2018	Feb. 2020	$57,830.00	$0.00

Project Management Administrator(1 contractor)	Scheduling, facilitating, managing, and inviting public safety entities to participate in ~~tasks include: speaking at conferences,~~	Contract	Y	Y	Mar. 2018	Feb. 2020	$73,120.00	$0.00
Project Manager SME(s) (3 contractors)	workshops and meetings; facilitating regional ~~meetings and other outreach efforts;~~	Contract	Y	Y	Mar. 2018	Feb. 2020	$73,350.00	$0.00
TBD	Support SLIGP allowable activities	Contract	N	N	TBD	TBD	$271,700.00	$0.00
Total Funds Allocated to Contracts							**$476,000.00**	**$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	$316,224.00	$180,962.00	$497,186.00	$186,806.12	$153,822.83	$340,628.95
b. Personnel Fringe Benefits	$94,045.00	$53,818.00	$147,863.00	$55,571.50	$36,983.91	$92,555.41
c. Travel	$180,400.00	$0.00	$180,400.00	$62,686.03	$0.00	$62,686.03
d. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
e. Materials/Supplies	$600.00	$0.00	$600.00	$83.93	$0.00	$83.93
f. Contractual	$476,000.00	$0.00	$476,000.00	$119,347.02	$0.00	$119,347.02
g. Other	$52,730.00	$0.00	$52,730.00	$38,760.26	$0.00	$38,760.26
h. Indirect	$0.00	$45,240.00	$45,240.00	$0.00	$38,455.71	$38,455.71
i. Total Costs	$1,119,999.00	$280,020.00	$1,400,019.00	$463,254.86	$229,262.45	$692,517.31
j. Proportionality Percent	80%	20%	100%	67%	33%	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.	5-Strongly Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	TxPSBP was able to field a group of NPSBN subject matter experts to thoroughly vet and review the FirstNet State Plan. This thorough review process gave TxPSBP confidence in recommending an opt-in decision to the Governor. The closed nature of the State Plan and coverage data to all but a small group made it difficult to share those details with other key stakeholders in the state.

Statement	Agree/Disagree	Additional Questions	Response
15b. I plan to continue any SLIGP 2.0 program activities beyond the SLIGP 2.0 period of performance.	5-Strongly Agree	What do you plan to accomplish after the period of performance?	TxPSBP will continue to have quarterly meetings with the FirstNet Authority and AT&T to monitor the buildout and advancement of the NPSBN solution. Texas DPS will also participate in future data collection efforts, such as those related to Z-axis location services.
15c. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in informing my stakeholders about FirstNet.	5-Strongly Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	Conferences and national level meetings were a great source of breaking news and detailed information related to the NPSBN, and to help understand the direction of the buildout and solutions. TxPSBP could then relay these inside bits of information to Texas stakeholder agencies. The main challenge lay with the scale of Texas as a state. Even doing multiple regional events failed to reach many agencies.

15d. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in maintaining a governance structure for broadband in my state/territory.	**5-Strongly Agree**	**What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?**	SLIGP 2.0 helped fund employees who could focus on and become subject matter experts in NPSBN topics, which in turn strengthened the credibility and efforts of the Texas Statewide Interoperable Communications Office.
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.).	**5-Strongly Agree**	**What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?**	As described in 15a and 15c above, the combination of being able to hire a staff for State Plan review and for user outreach, combined with the ability to attend conferences and workshops, meant that TxPSBP could field a well-informed group that kept stakeholders and leadership updated with the most current information.

15f. Overall, SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in preparing for FirstNet.	5-Strongly Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	Toward the end of SLIGP 2.0, with the AT&T contract in place and restrictions on allowable activities and the types of topics that SLIGP 2.0 staff could discuss, it became difficult to find ways to meaningfully spend SLIGP 2.0 funds.

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:	16c. Telephone:	512-424-2121
Todd M. Early, Assistant Chief:		
16b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official: *Todd M. Early*	16d. Email Address:	todd.early@dps.texas.gov
	16e. Date:	3/29/2021