OMB Control No. 0660-0039
Expiration Date: 6/30/2019

U.S. Department of Commerce State and Local Implementation Grant Program Close Out Report		2. Award or Grant Number:	53-10-S13053-0
		4. EIN:	91-6001095
1. Recipient Name	State of Washington Military Department	6. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY):	5/29/2018
3. Street Address	Building 20, Aviation Drive	7. Reporting Period End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	2/28/2018
5. City, State, Zip Code	Camp Murray, Washington 98430		

10a. Project/Grant Period			
Start Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	9/1/2013	10b. End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	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	44012	*Actual number of individuals reached via stakeholder meetings during the period of performance*
2	Individuals Sent to Broadband Conferences	174	*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)	2.75	*Actual number of state personnel FTEs who began supporting SLIGP activities during the period of performance (may be a decimal)*
4	Contracts Executed	8	*Actual number of contracts executed during the period of performance*
5	Governance Meetings	34	*Actual number of governance, subcommittee, or working group meetings held during the period of performance*
6	Education and Outreach Materials Distributed	853479	*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 quarter. A combination of social media sources include: Twitter, Facebook, YouTube, Vimeo, and GovDelivery(Granicus). Websites include: Onenet.wa.gov and shotsfired.onenet.wa.gov. Each social media and website has an analytics report that is pulled monthly for number of hits.*
7	Subrecipient Agreements Executed	1	*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	

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)

Washington OneNet significantly improved the overall emergency communications ecosystem through outreach and educational efforts delivered to stakeholders. While statewide emergency communications remain siloed and often unfunded, there is greater understanding of shared goals and interoperability. OneNet's collaborative approach through stakeholder, technical, and operational workshops, consisting of responder organizations at all levels, helped to avoid the failures of previous federal grant efforts which are remembered as heavy-handed and unsuccessful. Local and tribal responder agencies and governments acknowledged the collaborative statewide effort to include them in the interoperability discussion ultimately improving emergency communications overall. Through outreach, the program identified other user groups that play a significant public safety role. Those entities and the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians (an association of 56 tribal nations and including all of Washington's 29 federally recognized tribes) were added to state statue as voting members of the State Interoperability Executive Committee (SIEC) during Washington's 2016 legislative session. Governance was also improved through the process. The Washington SIEC is an unfunded activity. That organization also realized a positive effect from the efforts of the program. Members played a significant role in sponsoring activities for OneNet's participation. SIEC members also participated in the production of OneNet's first video "Bringing FirstNet to Washington." Their participation and marketing of the video led to the success of the FirstNet educational campaign. In general, the addition of members to the SIEC and the discussion related to the development and deployment of the Nationwide Public Safety Broadband Network (NPSBN) significantly increased the ability of the SIEC to put in place the structure and practices that will lead to long-term sustainability. An important element of Washington's success was the ability to produce video segments that highlight the challenges of communication during emergency events. The program used production as an engagement tool and the release of the videos as a "call to action" for participation in the NPSBN effort. The program also used the films to demonstrate the communication needs of responders to state, local, and tribal elected officials. The ability to tell the story of responder communication in a personal way provided lawmakers with a deeper understanding of the challenges faced in the field.

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.

Through the SLIGP performance period Washington OneNet identified several priority areas for future investment. The Washington emergency communication ecosystem is challenged by a lack of state funding. The Statewide Interoperability Coordinator (SWIC), the SIEC, and the State Point of Contact are all unfunded or under-funded positions/activities, yet they are critical for Washington's long-term interoperability goals. While there have been significant improvements in demonstrating the need for investment, funding continues to be a challenge. Without sustainable funding, many of the accomplishments over the last fours years will be lost. Fundamentally, interoperability in Washington will struggle without funding. A baseline effort to educate lawmakers of the importance of the activities is the most critical piece for our long-terms efforts. Second, is the ability to critically assess our shared investments. Collaboration between stakeholders representing urban/rural, east/west Washington, and large/small agencies is critical. The SIEC has no authority over local and tribal stakeholders, so collaboration is key to proactively addressing the needs and challenges of statewide interoperability. The program will continue to build upon the work that was started with the SLIGP outreach and educational activities to further develop statewide relationships that enhance collaboration.

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

Washington's data collection effort culminated in a final report to FirstNet in 2015. OneNet collaborated with the Washington State University's (WSU) Division of Governmental Studies to develop three surveys. Survey one was directed to state and local government responder agencies. After consultation with tribes, WSU and OneNet developed two surveys for tribes, one for tribal government and another directed to tribal responders. The surveys were conducted in a scientific manner and individual agency responses were confidential. The confidential nature of the tribal survey was particularly important as tribes were hesitant to share their data with a state agency. Through the outreach process OneNet learned that tribes were willing to participate in a confidential data collection effort if they have data. An obstacle to data collection is that tribes often do not maintain data and cannot share. Therefore, WSU now serves as the data warehouse so a reporting tribe will have access to its information at anytime in the future.

Please describe in detail any data collection activities you plan to continue beyond the SLIGP period of performance.

If additional funding can be identified, the program would like to continue developing statistics for return on investment for public safety products and services. Some statewide agency/responder identification data collection (Number of firefighters and types of incidents) efforts were suspended (unfunded) during the successive poor economic forecasts in Washington State. OneNet would like to collect the data and serve as the clearinghouse for information from multiple entities. The program would also like to track the use of wireless broadband services, rates, and devices being used by responders in the state. This will aid in the development of best practices at the state, tribal, and regional level.

Lessons Learned: Please share any lessons learned or best practices that your organization implemented during your SLIGP project. The most significant best practice implemented by our organization was the production of videos that told the story of emergency communications in the field. The video production allowed for the engagement of responders while in the field and provided the opportunity to develop trusted relationships and exchange information about what the NPSBN should look like in Washington. The videos have also allowed for the engagement of elected officials and the public by understanding the needs of responders and the benefits of the NPSBN.

Part C: Staffing

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

Name	FTE%	Project(s) Assigned	Change
Senior Program Manager (SPOC)	100%	Provides oversight and management of all SLIGP project activities. Keynotes at events.	No change
Project Manager	100%	Convenes meeting of advisor work groups and technical workgroups. Speaks at stakeholder meetings. Writes reports.	No change
Program Manager/Outreach consultant	0%	Develops Outreach Strategy, designs outreach materials, manages subcontracts with local & non-profit organizations to conduct phase 1 & 2 activities, speaks at stakeholder associations, meetings, and conferences.	No change
Program Administrator	50%	Coordinates staff travel and meeting logistics, processes agency/grant required documentation.	No change
SWIC	0%	Coordinates updates to the SCIP and outreach to existing LMR network managers.	No change
Grants Program Specialist	25%	Project accounting and reporting	No change
Consulting Engineer	0%	Position was not filled in Phase 2	No change

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/Subject.)	RFP/RFQ Issued (Y/N)	Total Federal Funds Allocated	Total Matching Funds Allocated
OCIO/WaTech	All Grant Related Activities	Subrecipient	N	$1,464,337.25	$669,113.00
WSU-DGSS	Outreach and Education, Phase 2 Data Collection	Vendor	N	$508,000.00	
PNWER	Outreach and Education	Vendor	N	$175,000.00	
ESRI	Phase II Data collection, Coverage Mapping Tool	Vendor	N	$42,468.00	
SAAG - Ken Boley	Legal Support	Vendor	N	$67,200.00	
Andrea Alexander	Outreach and Education - Tribes	Vendor	N	$45,000.00	
Jim Pryor	Outreach and Education	Vendor	N	$45,000.00	
John DeFeo	Outreach and Education	Vendor	N	$45,000.00	
SAIC	Outreach, Education, Analysis, assistance with Governor's Decision.	Vendor	N	$65,000.00	

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	$44,370.00	$0.00	$44,370.00	$39,171.47		$39,171.47
b. Personnel Fringe Benefits	$13,311.00	$0.00	$13,311.00	$14,185.37		$14,185.37
c. Travel	$25,800.00	$0.00	$25,800.00	$7,697.87		$7,697.87
d. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00		$0.00
e. Materials/Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00		$0.00
f. Subcontracts Total	$2,559,110.00	$669,113.00	$3,228,223.00	$2,457,005.25	$669,113.00	$3,126,118.25
g. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00		$0.00
Indirect	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00		$0.00
h. Total Costs	$2,642,591.00	$669,113.00	$3,311,704.00	$2,518,059.96	$669,113.00	$3,187,172.96
i. % of Total	80%	20%	100%	79%	21%	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?	*1) The use of funds to develop and improve the SIEC. 2) The ability to "tell the story" of emergency communications in Washington State 3) Improve collaboration at all levels of the emergency communications ecosystem. 4) Successfully engage tribes in long-term interoperability. Challenges: the ability to interact with stakeholders was sometimes challenged by the grant's restrictions on sponsoring events/activities even though the state's rules allow it.*
Were SLIGP funds helpful in planning for your FirstNet consultation?	Strongly Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	*SLIGP funding enabled WA State to bring all interested parties together to collaborate on the state's coverage, technical & operational needs. Washington OneNet overall had tremendous success planning for initial consultation. However, the State Plan consultation was more challenging: there was significant concern regarding funding to sponsor stakeholder events; the timeframe and confidentiality restricted the willingness of the public safety community to attend briefings; and the FirstNet and AT&T terms of use caused enough concern with public agencies/participants that they elected not to attend consultations.*
Were SLIGP funds helpful in informing your stakeholders about FirstNet?	Strongly Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	*SLIGP funding was the only financial source supporting the dissemination of FirstNet information to stakeholders. Without SLIGP funding, the FirstNet communication initiatives would not have been possible. No challenges were identified.*
Were SLIGP funds helpful in developing a governance structure for broadband in your state?	Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	*SLIGP funds were/are critical to developing a governance structure. While the state SIEC existed in statute, a lack of funding/staff prevented the SIEC from full development. SLIGP funds provided staffing to fully engage members of the community and strengthen the organization. However, a lot of work remains to revive and revitalize the organization so that it more fully meets the needs of public safety.*
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?	*The ability for staff to attend broadband conferences significantly improved staff understanding of the technology, network design, and provided the opportunity to engage with other states on best practices. The ability to learn from other states is important to the long-term success of the NPSBN. No challenges were identified.*
Were SLIGP funds helpful in updating your Statewide Communications Interoperability Plan?	Strongly Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	*Washington State's SCIP document had not be revised or updated since 2008. As an unfunded activity, there were no resources or staffing to contribute to this document. SLIGP provided the opportunity for a large statewide effort to engage the community and to provide comprehensive changes to the SCIP. Without SLIGP funding, the SCIP is again languishing. Staff resources have been reassigned and there is no funding to engage with stakeholders for updates.*
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?	*SLIGP funds were used to plan and schedule stakeholder forums across the state. With the ability for stakeholders to review the state plan via the state plan portal, the SLIGP funded forums were the only opportunity for most stakeholders to review the plan and provide their recommendations to the Governor. Timing and the State Plan terms of use were major obstacles to stakeholder engagement. Additionally, the Governor asked for all the stakeholders to have the opportunity to provide feedback on the plan (as they were promised throughout the process). The FirstNet and AT&T confidentially requirement and the limit to the number of authorized reviewers challenged the Governor's ability to get feedback from stakeholders.*
Were SLIGP funds helpful in conducting FirstNet determined data collection?	Strongly Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	*SLIGP funds were used to develop three surveys. Two were specifically designed for tribes: 1=tribal leaders, 1=tribal responders. The only challenge was timing. This effort required an unexpected level of 1:1 outreach. Had time permitted, we would have improved the response rate through personal reminders.*

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)	253-512-7041
Name of Authorized Certifying Official, Title of Authorized Certifying Official		
Signature of Authorized Certifying Official:	Email Address:	john.ufford@mil.wa.gov
Sign here	Date:	5/29/2018