SLIGP 2.0 Grant Closeout Report		2. Award or Grant Number:	49-10-S18049
		4. EIN:	87-0587139
1. Recipient Name	Utah Communications Authority	**6. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)**	06/10/2020
3. Street Address	5215 Wiley Post Way Suite 550	**7. Reporting Period End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)**	03/31/2020
5. City, State, Zip Code	Salt Lake City, Utah 84116	**8. Final Report** Yes ☑ No ☐	

9. Project/Grant Period				10. Reserved for Reviewer	
9a. Start Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/01/2018	9b. End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/31/2020		

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	9	*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	1	*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	3	*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	0.20	*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	Yes	1	*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	Yes		*Yes or No if data sharing policies and/or agreements were developed during the grant period.*
8	Further Identification of Potential Public Safety Users	Yes		*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	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 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.

11.1 The Utah SPOC, along with representatives from FirstNet and AT&T presented at 9 seperate governance meetings during the SLIGP2 grant period. One with the Utah Communications Authority (UCA) Board which includes 9 members established by State statute, one meeting with the UCA Operational Advisory Committee (OAC) and one meeting with each of the 7 Regional Advisory Committees (RAC) which include members from all emergency response disciplines in Utah. All together there were 78 members from these committees that were in attendance. The OAC and RAC committees are extensions of the UCA Board. FirstNet and AT&T gave updates of thier activities and responsibilities with regard to the NPSBN and plans for future allowable activities in Utah under the grant were discussed. Note: The OAC and RAC committees were repealed by legislation and are now the Public Safety Advisory and PSAP advisory committees.

11.2 The Utah SPOC attended 1 PSCR broadband conference in June 2018. Attended presentations related to FirstNet and NPSBN.   11.3 During the SLIGP2 grant period of performance the Utah Communications Authority held 3 stakeholder events as requested by FirstNet. All 3 events were held in a workshop format with panelists from agencies that have adopted FirstNet/AT&T broadband services. Stake holders representing all disciplines attended the workshops. All 3 workshops were attended by the SPOC, FirstNet and AT&T who all gave presentations prior to the panel discussions. FirstNet Board Member Paul Patrick also attended and presented at all 3 workshops. Of the the 3 workshops, the data sharing workshop was the most beneficial. Utah coordinated with the DHS S&T prior to the workshop to utilize their Information Sharing Assesemet Tool (ISAT) Which is a survey tool DHS developed that helps agencies determine their data sharing capabilities and gaps. 61 agencies participated in the survey. Most agencies indicated in the survey that intra-agency data sharing was sufficient but, indicated that data sharing external to the agency needed to be addressed. The results of the survey were used in the workshop to lead the discussion on how their agencies could develop SOP's that would bridge the gap in sharing mission critical data during an incident that required multi-agency, multi-jurisdictional and or multi-discipline response. From this, Utah developed the Public Safety Data Sharing Recommendations and Best Practices document which is availble on the FirstNet in Utah website.   11.4 The Utah SWIC/SPOC spent .20 percent of his time on SLIGP2 allowable activities during the grant period.   11.5 Utah executed 1 contract during the SLIGP2 grant period. This contract was scheduled to end at the original SLIGP2 period of performance end date of 2/28/2020. With the extension of the SLIGP2 end date to 3/31/2020, Utah exercised a contract extension to extend the SAIC contract to match the SLIGP2 period of performance end date of 3/31/2020.   1) Utah contracted with Sciectific Applications International Corp. (SAIC) to assist SPOC with FirstNet/AT&T requested outreach, develop draft materials for workshops, FirstNet in Utah website support, assist with crowd sourcing, drive testing and coverage gap analysis. Because Utah chose to put it's main focus on the three workshops, we did not complete the crowd sourcing and drive testing activities that were planned.

11.8 Throughout the SLIGP2 grant period, Utah took the opprtunity during several workshops that were held, to identify potential Public Safety Users. AT&T and FirstNet were present at all of these workshops and were able to connect with stakeholders that attended the workshops. Following the workshops, other stakeholders reached out to the Utah SPOC expressing interest in learning more abouth the NPSBN. The SPOC connected these stakeholders with FirstNet and AT&T for further information.   11.11 FirstNet/AT&T asked Utah for a list of additional new site builds, Utah SPOC worked with Utah stakeholders to indentify areas with coverage gaps where potential new sites would cover underserved areas in Utah. From this, a list of 10 additional potential newsite builds were given to FirstNet/AT&T, 9 of which AT&T added to the new sites to be built in Utah. Utah developed a draft coverage validation survey which was intended for use in crowdsourcing to determine if drive testing after an IOC completion would be neccessary however, this was not completed because we chose to focus first on the stakeholder workshops that were held.

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 last quarter of the grant period the Utah SPOC worked with FirstNet, AT&T and SAIC to complete planning for and execute a data sharing workshop, which was held on March 12th. Utah SPOC Gordy Coles, FirstNet Region 8 Senior Advisor, Tracey Murdock, FirstNet Board Member, Paul Patrick and AT&T Solution Consultant, Shae Cook all presented at the Workshop. Jacque Waring-Miller Director-FirstNet Field Operations Midwest Region moderated the user panel discussion. Utah coordinated with the DHS S&T prior to the workshop to utilize their Information Sharing Assesemet Tool (ISAT) which is a survey tool DHS developed to help agencies determine their data sharing capabilities and gaps. Utah worked with DHS S&T to develop a survey specfic to Utah stakeholders. 61 agencies participated in the survey. Most agencies indicated in the survey that intra-agency data sharing was sufficient but, indicated that data sharing external to the agency needed to be addressed. The results of the survey were used in the workshop to lead the discussion on how their agencies could develop data sharing policies that would bridge the gap in sharing mission critical data during an incident that required multi-agency, multi-jurisdictional and or multi-discipline response. From this, Utah developed the Public Safety Data Sharing Recommendations and Best Practices document which is availble to download on the FirstNet in Utah website. Worked with SAIC to maintain and update the FirstNet in Utah website which included adding highlights from the data sharing workshop and adding the Public Safety Data Sharing Recommendations and Best Practices document to the FNIU website for download. Requested and received a SLIGP2 grant period of perofrmance end date modification which changed our grant period end date to March 31st, 2020. Utah exercised a contract extension to extend the contract with SAIC from 2/28/2020 to 3/31/2020 to match the grant period of performance end date. Prepared the Q9 and SLIGP2 closeout report.

11d. Please share any lessons learned or best practices that your organization implemented during your SLIGP 2.0 project.
As we engaged with stakeholders in Utah, we learned that many were uninformed about the NPSBN and its intended purpose as a mission critical data/broadband resource. One of the issues we faced was a misunderstanding by decision makers, that the NPSBN was replacing the LMR system. We were able to correct this misperception as we met through our stake holder events and through other discussions. Going forward we believe that continued education on the capabilities that the NPSBN brings to stakeholders is imperative to their understanding of the role of the NPSBN as a supplemental resource to their mission critical LMR voice systems. Utah conducted three successful stakeholder events where personnel from all diciplines, police, fire, and EMS, were in attendance. Each of these events included a panel made up of NPSBN users who realted their expreiences, both positive and negative, with respect to their use of the NPSBN. We discovered five key areas that stakeholders expressed were of high importance to them when it comes to broadband services. The key areas, in order of importance are: 1-Coverage and Capacity, 2-Voice Communications, 3-Secure Information Exchange, 4-User Exprience, 5-Situaltional Awareness. As is indicated in these five key areas, stakeholders main concern for not adopting the NPSBN for their broadband service, is the percieved lack of AT&T coverage in the areas their agencies operate in. The final and most beneficial workshop held was the data sharing workshop, out of which we developed the Public Safety Data Sharing Recommendations and Best Practices document which was developed to help agencies create data sharing policies for sharing mission critical data and move them farther to the right of the SAFECOM Interoperability Continuum.

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
Statewide Interoperability Coordinator(SWIC)	20%	Oversee SLIGP2 Activities

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
Scientific Applications International Corp thru Knowledge Services Contract	SLIGP2 support, assist with FirstNet/AT&T requested outreach and education,website support, assist with drive testing and coverage gap analysis	Vendor	y	y	3/1/2018	3/31/2020	405,852.53	

Total Funds Allocated to Contracts							$405,852.53	$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	$196,345.00	$59,162.00	$255,507.00		$35,347.62	$35,347.62
b. Personnel Fringe Benefits	$94,050.00	$28,338.00	$122,388.00		$15,396.45	$15,396.45
c. Travel	$29,200.00		$29,200.00			$0.00
d. Equipment	$0.00		$0.00	$0.00		$0.00
e. Materials/Supplies	$3,405.00		$3,405.00	$0.00		$0.00
f. Contractual	$377,000.00		$377,000.00	$405,852.53		$405,852.53
g. Other		$7,955.00	$7,955.00	$0.00	$13,540.82	$13,540.82
h. Indirect		$79,545.00	$79,545.00		$40,585.25	$40,585.25
i. Total Costs	$700,000.00	$175,000.00	$875,000.00	$405,852.53	$104,870.14	$510,722.67
j. Proportionality Percent	80%	20%	100%	79%	21%	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.	4-Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	Without SLIGP2 funds stake holder engagements would not have been possible.

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.	4-Agree	**What do you plan to accomplish after the period of performance?**	We will continue to work with Utah stakeholders through the Public Safety and PSAP Advisory Committees, which are part of UCA's governance body, as questions/interest arises. We will also continue to assist FirstNet/AT&T in their efforts to further educate Utah stake holders about the NPSBN.
15c. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in informing my stakeholders about FirstNet.	4-Agree	**What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?**	SLIGP2 funds helped us plan and execute FirstNet requested stake holders events which gave FirstNet and AT&T a forum to meet with Utah stakeholders to further educate them and answer their questions about the NPSBN. The workshops also provided a forum where agencies could hear actual use cases from a panel of users that have adopted the NPSBN. This proved to be a successful way to educate and identify potential users about how the NPSBN

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?**	Utah's broadband governance was maintained and engaged through UCA's governing body. SLIGP2 funds were not used to maintain a broadband governance structure in Utah.
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?**	SLIGP2.0 funds made it possible to attend broadband conferences that helped keep the SPOC educated on the capabilities of the NPSBN. The information gathered was very useful in answering questions from potential NPSBN users. SLIGP2 grant funding helped us procure a contract with the consultants that helped us in the planning and execution of the FirstNet requested workshops. Challenges encoutered - While we felt the participation level in each of the workshops was consistent with what other states were experiencing. We found it difficult to get stakeholders to commit to attending the workshops. Some that signed up did not attend. However, there were several who attended that didn't sign up.

15f. Overall, SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in preparing for FirstNet.	4-Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	Without SLIGP2 funding we would not have been able to hold the workshops. The workshops were by far the the most engaging and most helpful in identifying potential users of the NPSBN.

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:	801-840-4200
David A. Edmunds			
16b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official:		16d. Email Address:	dedmunds@uca911.org
David A. Edmunds	dotloop verified 06/22/20 5:34 PM MDT 0MLJ-CPAC-UHQW-QSMP	16e. Date:	6/10/2020

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