

U.S. Department of Commerce State and Local Implementation Grant Program Close Out Report				2. Award or Grant Number: 49-10-S13049N
				4. EIN: 87-0587139
1. Recipient Name	Utah Communications Authority			6. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY): 5/23/2018
3. Street Address	5215 Wiley Post Way Suite 550			7. Reporting Period End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY) 5/29/2018
5. City, State, Zip Code	Salt Lake City, Utah 84116			
10a. Project/Grant Period				
Start Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)		10b. End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)		
11/1/2014		2/28/2018		
Part A: Metrics - Final PPR Milestone Data (cumulative through the last quarter)				
	Project Type (Capacity Building, SCIP Update,	Project Deliverable Quantity (Number & Indicator Description)	Description of Milestone Category	
1	Stakeholders Engaged	3,486	Actual number of individuals reached via stakeholder meetings during the period of performance	
2	Individuals Sent to Broadband Conferences	53	Actual number of individuals who were sent to third-party broadband conferences using SLIGP grant funds during the period of performance	
3	Staff Hired (Full-Time Equivalent)(FTE)	1.2	Actual number of state personnel FTEs who began supporting SLIGP activities during the period of performance (may be a decimal)	
4	Contracts Executed	6	Actual number of contracts executed during the period of performance	
5	Governance Meetings	47	Actual number of governance, subcommittee, or working group meetings held during the period of performance	
6	Education and Outreach Materials Distributed	6,963	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	
7	Subrecipient Agreements Executed	0	Actual number of agreements executed during the period of performance	
8	Phase 2 - Coverage	Complete Dataset Submitted to FirstNet	Please choose the option that best describes the data you provided to FirstNet in each category during the period of performance: • Not Complete • Partial Dataset Submitted to FirstNet • Complete Dataset Submitted to FirstNet	
9	Phase 2 – Users and Their Operational Areas	Complete Dataset Submitted to FirstNet		
10	Phase 2 – Capacity Planning	Complete Dataset Submitted to FirstNet		
11	Phase 2 – Current Providers/Procurement	Complete Dataset Submitted to FirstNet		
12	Phase 2 – State Plan Decision	Complete Dataset Submitted to FirstNet		
Part B: Narrative				
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)				
<p>Governance Meetings: SPOC attended governance meetings where updates/presentations were given in regards to FirstNet timeline, in-state stakeholder meetings, FirstNet national events i.e SPOC meetings, PSCR meetings etc. Governance meetings included Utah Communications Authority Board meetings, Utah Executive Leadership meeting with 15 Utah legislators, Wasatch Front Public Safety Executives, Utah Emergency Management Administrative Council(co-chaired by Lt. Governor Spencer Cox and DPS Commissioner Keith Squires, and a meeting with Governor Gary Herbert and his staff to discuss the final state plan from AT&T/FirstNet. Stake Holder Engagements:SPOC attended other in state meetings where NPSBN updates/presentations were given to large and small stakeholder groups. These meetings included the Utah 911 committee, Utah Broadband Advisory Council, Utah Lifeline Infrastructure Resiliency Coordination Council (LIRCC), Utah Association of Police Chiefs, Utha Fire Chief's Association, EMS Bureau, Utah Tribal Leaders meeting, 3 separate trips to Navajo Nation where we met with Vice President Jonathan Nez and other executive level leaders, technical staff, and spent a</p>				
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.				
<p>Coverage: After AT&T completes a build phase we plan to perform user survey's to identify if any coverage gaps exist between the actual finished IOC and the coverage promised by AT&T. If it is proven that gaps exist, we plan to perform drive testing and data gathering to inform AT&T of the deficiencies. Stake Holder Engagements: We also plan to work with FirstNet and AT&T region 8 leads, as they request assistance, to help them reach out to stakeholders. We have already been asked by the FirstNet Region 8 outreach lead, to help arrange and host meetings with each of the UCA regional advisory committees to start this process going forward.</p>				

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

We drafted a letter explaining who and what the First Responder Network Authority is, and explained the data collection effort we were asked to conduct of behalf of FirstNet. We utilized the services of a research group named Strata who helped us put together contact lists of ~600 agencies in Utah, which included state, local, tribal, police, fire, EMS, National Guard, emergency management etc. The letter provided a link to a Texas learning website where instructions were given for completing the survey and of course, a link to the survey. After the letters were sent, we contacted each of the agencies to insure that the letter was received and made it to the appropriate person that would champion the completion of the survey. We also held two data collection seminars, one in Salt Lake and one in Richfield where we invited all to come and have any questions answered about the survey. The FirstNet region 8 outreach lead and the Utah SPOC attended and please describe in detail any data collection activities you plan to continue beyond the SLIGP period of performance.

The coverage gap analysis, described above, after completion of an IOC is currently the only data collection we are planning to continue with.

Lessons Learned: Please share any lessons learned or best practices that your organization implemented during your SLIGP project. We learned it was difficult to achieve high levels of participation during outreach gatherings if we called a special FirstNet only meeting. The number of stakeholders reached increased greatly by talking with agencies and associations and getting them to add the outreach discussion to the agenda of an already planned event.

Part C: Staffing

Staffing Table - Please provide a summary of all positions funded by SLIGP.

Name	FTE%	Project(s) Assigned	Change
Statewide Interoperability Coordinator (SWIC)	0.9	Oversee SLIGP Activities	
UCA Executive Director	0.2	Oversight	
UCA Operations Manager	0.1	Oversight	

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
Fletcher, Heald, & Healdreth	Assistanc in Project Management	Vendor	Y	\$74,250.00	\$0.00
AGRC	Data Gathering and Analysis	Vendor	Y	\$227,760.00	\$0.00
Strata	Data Gathering and Analysis	Vendor	Y	\$81,000.00	\$0.00
Third Sun Productions	Website Development	Vendor	N	\$11,400.00	\$0.00
HEB Business Solutions	Financial Management	Vendor	N	\$16,045.00	\$0.00
SAIC through Knowledge Services Contract	SLIGP Programmatic Support, outreach & education & web co	Vendor	Y	\$189,964.00	\$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	\$195,800.00	\$124,502.00	\$320,302.00	\$154,752.36	\$130,611.58	\$285,363.94
b. Personnel Fringe Benefits	\$93,788.00	\$57,453.00	\$151,241.00	\$63,492.05	\$59,085.05	\$122,577.10
c. Travel	\$50,000.00		\$50,000.00	\$27,523.27		\$27,523.27
d. Equipment			\$0.00			\$0.00
e. Materials/Supplies	\$12,109.00		\$12,109.00	\$2,164.63		\$2,164.63
f. Subcontracts Total	\$350,000.00		\$350,000.00	\$248,549.91		\$248,549.91
g. Other	\$26,123.00		\$26,123.00	\$13,551.22		\$13,551.22
Indirect			\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00
h. Total Costs	\$727,820.00	\$181,955.00	\$909,775.00	\$510,033.44	\$189,696.63	\$699,730.07
i. % of Total	80%	20%	100%	73%	27%	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?	Strongly Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	<i>We would not have been able to perform any of the tasks asked of us by FirstNet without the grant funding to cover these costs.</i>
Were SLIGP funds helpful in planning for your FirstNet consultation?	Strongly Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	<i>Grant funds were necessary to pay for the venue large enough to bring together the large number of stake holders for consultation.</i>
Were SLIGP funds helpful in informing your stakeholders about FirstNet?	Strongly Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	<i>Again, it would have been impossible to have the level of work performed without the grant funding to cover these costs. No funding would have meant FirstNet would have had to do all this work themselves.</i>
Were SLIGP funds helpful in developing a governance structure for broadband in your state?	Neutral	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	<i>We had a strong governance structure in Utah prior to SLIGP, our existing governance body oversaw the grant activities.</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.)?	Strongly Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	<i>Yes, the conferences and the networking that took place at them were invaluable. We would not have been able to attend the conferences without grant funding to cover the travel costs.</i>
Were SLIGP funds helpful in updating your Statewide Communications Interoperability Plan?	Disagree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	<i>SCIP update was performed through an OEC TA, no grant funds were used for the SCIP update.</i>
Were SLIGP funds helpful in preparing for your review of the FirstNet developed State Plan?	Strongly Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	<i>Grant funds were necessary to pay for the data collection services we received from AGRC during state plan review.</i>
Were SLIGP funds helpful in conducting FirstNet determined data collection?	Strongly Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	<i>Grant funds were necessary again to pay for the data collection efforts by AGRC and Strata. Without funding we could not have met the requirements for the data collection phase.</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)	801-840-4201
David A. Edmunds Executive Director Utah Communications Authority		Email Address:	dedmunds@uca911.org
Signature of Authorized Certifying Official:		Date:	5/29/2018
Sign here 			