

**Before the
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS & INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION**

In the Matter of:)	
)	
Development of the State and Local)	Docket No. 120509050-1050-01
Implementation Grant Program for the)	RIN 0660-XC001
Nationwide Public Safety Broadband Network)	
)	

**COMMENTS OF THE NORTH CENTRAL REGIONAL
BROADBAND DATA CONSORTIUM
(COLORADO)**

Kissinger & Fellman, P.C.
Kenneth S. Fellman
3773 Cherry Creek North Drive, Suite 900
Denver, Colorado 80209
Telephone: (303) 320-6100
Facsimile: (303) 327-8601
kfellman@kandf.com

June 15, 2012

**Before the
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS & INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION**

In the Matter of:)	
)	
Development of the State and Local)	Docket No. 120509050-1050-01
Implementation Grant Program for the)	RIN 0660-XC001
Nationwide Public Safety Broadband Network)	
)	

**COMMENTS OF THE NORTH CENTRAL REGIONAL
BROADBAND DATA CONSORTIUM
(COLORADO)**

These Comments are filed by the North Central Regional Broadband Data Consortium (“NCRBDC”), in response to the Request for Information (“RFI”) released May 16, 2012, in the above-entitled proceeding.

I. Background on NCRBDC

The North Central Region Broadband Data Consortium is a subcommittee of the combined North Central Region’s (“NCR”) Communicators Committee and the Denver Urban Areas Security Initiative’s (“UASI”) Communications Committees. The NCR is one of the nine all-hazards regions in Colorado and consists of almost 200 municipalities, special districts, and other governmental or quasi-governmental public safety entities within 10 counties.¹ The State of Colorado also is a member and participant. NCRBDC comprises a service population exceeding 62% of the general population of the State of Colorado.

The NCRBDC is a governance board formed to study the implementation of 700 MHz broadband in the ten county North Central Region of Colorado. Responsibilities include

¹ The Colorado Counties of Adams, Arapahoe, Boulder, Broomfield, Clear Creek, Denver, Douglas, Elbert, Gilpin and Jefferson. See Exhibit A, for list of jurisdictions within these counties.

identifying requirements for, and developing a preliminary regional design for the public safety communications system to include the balance of the ten county regions. NCRBDC is also responsible for identifying preliminary costs and resources for public safety communications system implementation and long-term system sustainability.

II. Response to RFI

The RFI requests feedback relating to a variety of issues related to process and grant structure. NCRBDC will address NTIA's questions under the headings listed in the RFI.

A. The Consultation Process

Paragraph 1 of the RFI asks what steps States should take to prepare to consult with FirstNet regarding several areas, including: (i) construction of a core network and any radio access network build-out; (ii) placement of towers; (iii) coverage areas of the network, whether at the regional, State, tribal, or local level; (iv) adequacy of hardening, security, reliability, and resiliency requirements; (v) assignment of priority to local users; (vi) assignment of priority and selection of entities seeking access to or use of the nationwide public safety interoperable broadband network; and (vii) training needs of local users.² NCRBDC believes that States should begin to immediately conduct surveys and data gathering to obtain necessary information, including infrastructure availability, lists of interested local governments and regional governmental and quasi-governmental entities that wish to participate in network planning, deployment and operation. States can catalogue which State and local projects can contribute to LTE, including: 4G studies, fiber installation, etc.

States can additionally conduct surveys or perform needs assessments to identify

² Request for Information, 77 Fed. Reg. 28,857, 28,858 ¶ 1 (May 16, 2012) ("RFI").

information that includes, but is not necessarily limited to, Data Systems Inventory, Regional Communications Backhaul Inventory, Interoperable Data Network Design Requirements, Technology Standard Requirements, IP Connectivity and Internet Access, Network Security Requirements, Integration with established BTOP Recipient Network Systems (Evolved Packet Core), inclusive “core” technologies, Network Operations Center, Roaming, Handover to other Networks, Devices, System Performance Requirements (on a per county basis) to include, Coverage Objectives, Throughput Objectives, and Service Level Requirements, Subscribers, Capacity, Reliability, System Constraints, Site Constraints, Backhaul Constraints, Budget Constraints, Scalability, Network Architecture, Redundancy and Reliability, System Capacity and Interference Analysis, Backhaul, Integration with All Hazards Regions’ Systems, Maintenance and Servicing, Traffic Monitoring, Site Construction Requirements, Internet Connectivity, Required LTE Core Network Enhancements, Needed Backhaul, Spares, Capital Expenditure Estimate, Operation Expenditures, Operations Personnel, Training and Technical Support, Technology Refresh, Subscriber Devices, Roaming, Operational Expenditures Estimates, Cost Benefit Analysis, Private vs. Commercial Modeling, and Implementation Support Services.

There are other activities that States should coordinate in support of public safety broadband implementation. These include developing population data based on geography, detailing coverage needs along major roadways – including rural areas, detailing in-building coverage requirements for first responders, defining class of service needs such as classification of data types 3G versus 4G and defining grades of service requirements for urban versus rural areas. The States should identify the service priority given to each group of network users from

first responders to supporting agencies, highest to lowest priority. States should be encouraged to rely upon the significant expertise and information in regional organizations like the NCRBDC.

All of these activities should be covered by the State and Local Implementation grant program.

B. State Certification

Paragraph 2 of the RFI asks a number of questions about State certification in applications for grant funds.³ Regarding the single contact in each State, and whether it might be an individual or government body, NCRBDC recommends that in the planning process, this individual or government body should be designated by the governor as each State has different organizational and legal structures, and therefore, the contact individual or entity will vary from state to state. Regarding who should serve on the governmental body, again we recommend that it be left to the State's discretion. The examples used in Paragraph 2(b) of the RFI (public partners, private partners, technical experts, Chief Information Officers, SWIC, finance officials, or legal experts) are all appropriate and therefore potential participants.

Regarding the issue of how States' plans should involve the local entities in the State and Local Implementation grant program,⁴ NCRBDC believes that each State should conduct a coordinated needs assessment in their planning process, and that local entities must be involved as equal participants in that process. Regarding involvement of tribal entities, this should be done through the involvement with each State Interoperability Executive Council (SIEC). Each SIEC is inclusive of all of the all-hazards regions communications committees – including tribal.

³ *Id.* at ¶ 2(a-h).

⁴ *Id.* at ¶ 2(c).

With respect to the requirements to be included in the grant program to ensure that local and tribal public safety entities are able to participate in the planning process,⁵ NCRBDC recommends that NTIA follow the DHS grant processes.⁶ There is no need to reinvent the wheel.

In response to the question of how the State and Local Implementation grant program should ensure that all public safety disciplines (e.g., police, sheriffs, fire, and EMS) have input into the State consultation process,⁷ NCRBDC suggests that SIEC is inclusive of all the all-hazards regions communications committees – including tribal. Each SIEC should be the state’s “regional” consulting entity. They, either through the SWIC, or through whoever is appointed by the governor as the LTE primary point of contact, must be active in representing and coordinating regional and tribal requirements and articulating them to the State for consideration and project development. Likewise, when considering how the State and Local Implementation grant program defines regional (e.g., interstate or intrastate) and how it might be structured to facilitate regional participation through the States,⁸ NCRBDC recommends that if NTIA follows existing DHS procedures for grants and utilizes the SIEC for organizational needs, these issues will be appropriately addressed.

With regard to how States should plan to involve the Federal users and entities located within their States in the grant program,⁹ NCRBDC recommends that FirstNet, or a selected vendor, must consult with DHS/OEC to identify federal requirements. Due to the sheer volume of federal agencies and their competing needs within the States, FirstNet should be required to

⁵ *Id.* at ¶ 2(e).

⁶ For more information about the DHS grant program, see <http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/hsgp/>.

⁷ RFI, *supra* note 2, at 28,858 ¶ 2(f).

⁸ *Id.* at ¶ 2(g).

⁹ *Id.* at ¶ 2(h).

identify a federal spokesperson within each State with authority for coordinating the federal position for grant program issues.

C. Communications with FirstNet For Development of RFPs

NTIA correctly notes that States will need time and funding to collect necessary information before they are ready to consult with FirstNet.¹⁰ The State and Local Implementation grant program should authorize States to hire consultants/transition administrators as soon as possible. Further, the grant program should reimburse all direct costs incurred by State, regional, local and tribal governments that are associated with the project.

Regarding NTIA's question about the need for consistent standards and processes in connection with gathering information,¹¹ NCRBDC suggests that there does not need to be a single process or standard. Different States have different established policies, procedures and technical/organizational structures already in place. Regarding the time period for States to perform the necessary activities under the grant program to gather the information to consult with FirstNet,¹² NCRBDC suggest that most activities should be completed within 24 months. The implementation assistance to aid the build out within the State would be dependent upon the FirstNet deployment schedule.

D. Existing Public Safety Governance and Planning Authorities

NTIA asks about the current role of existing governance structures like SWIC and SIEC in the planning and development of wireless public safety broadband networks.¹³ Currently the SWIC and SIEC are in the process of getting up to speed and are defining the issues to be

¹⁰ *Id.* at ¶ 3.

¹¹ *Id.* at ¶ 3(b).

¹² *Id.* at ¶ 3(c).

¹³ *Id.* at ¶ 4(a).

addressed. In Colorado, the State's Office of Information Technology is taking the lead for the planning phase. The final decision/single point of contact person or agency is, at present, to be determined. Colorado is exploring: (a) utilizing the current state IT organization; (b) creating a new state organization specific to LTE; or (c) utilizing SIEC and the SWIC. Regarding beginning to plan for the implementation of the nationwide public safety broadband network, SWIC held an initial educational meeting in May 2012 that was coordinated through DHS/OEC.

These existing governance structures can be used for the Nationwide Public Safety Broadband Network (NPSBN), although expertise and education is needed to transition from Land Mobile Radio to data based broadband technologies. That evolutionary path is still to be determined.

Regarding NTIA's question about the role of the Statewide Communications Interoperability Plans (SCIPs) in a State's planning efforts for the nationwide public safety broadband network,¹⁴ NCRBDC suggests that the role should be to evolve, plan, and document for public safety needs for interoperability; including defining grade of service, prioritization, identifying secondary users, and others authorized to use the network. Through the SCIPs, states will need to incorporate the NPSBN into its interoperability framework and further define statewide and regional/individual agency applications, and broader, generalized national applications.

In order to update the SCIPs to include broadband, States need to begin with the education of SWIC and SIEC Boards. This is the first step in getting the planning process off the ground. This education should be followed by conceptual planning, a needs assessment, and/or

¹⁴ *Id.* at ¶ 4(d).

issues identification, which must be communicated to and commented upon by all interested State, local and tribal parties.

Regarding NTIA's questions about grant eligibility for the costs to change or evolve existing governance and Statewide Plans¹⁵ and the maintenance of those existing governance bodies,¹⁶ NCRBDC suggests that yes, both categories of work should be eligible for grant funding.

E. Leveraging Existing Infrastructure

Local jurisdictions need control of their assets (for public safety LTE, not commercial use). There needs to be a development of a "model" lease agreement accepted by participants to address the use of State, local, tribal and regional infrastructure, whether such use is by FirstNet or its chosen vendor(s). It cannot be understated as to how important it is that local and regional entities be involved in the development of the lease agreement. Local and regional entities will not readily cede control over local and regional assets. Rather, local and regional entities need to maintain control over both the communications network assets and the real estate on their public safety communications sites for future use after LTE implementation. An inventory of all assets that are available for the network can be compiled on a common database, either within a region or within a State for potential LTE interest and use. Finally on this issue, a standard cost or reimbursement model for access and use of infrastructure needs to be developed for budgeting considerations. Again, local and regional entities *must* be given a leading role in this process.

NTIA asks how States and local jurisdictions should plan to use and/or determine the suitability of their existing infrastructure and equipment for integration into the public safety

¹⁵ *Id.* at 28,859 ¶ 4(f).

¹⁶ *Id.* at ¶ 4(g).

broadband network.¹⁷ First, we need to receive “requirements” from FirstNet to determine if we have suitable infrastructure and associated resources available. Intermodulation risks will need to be identified and studies will eventually be required for potential sites. Structural loading studies may be needed. All of these activities should be covered by funding from the grants.

Regarding available State technical resources to assist with deployment of the nationwide public safety broadband network, and pending “scope” of project efforts,¹⁸ there are state level resources and links to all-hazards committees (at the local level) with internal resources capable and available, such as radio personnel, IT personnel, facilities and test equipment, infrastructure, tools, networking equipment to link into a future LTE network. Mechanisms are already in place to assist with the deployment of the nationwide public safety broadband network including Land Mobile Radio and IT personnel among numerous State and local agencies.

Regarding inclusion of utilities or other interested third parties in planning activities,¹⁹ this should begin with the planning phase, followed by including utilities and other interested third parties in the data collection processes. Information should be obtained to determine the suitability and availability of their infrastructure. State open records laws will need to be examined to ensure that provision of sensitive and proprietary information that may be provided by utilities in this process remains out of general public circulation. Utilities and interested third parties would need to perform the same needs and capabilities assessments as local, regional, and tribal governmental agencies.

NTIA should encourage, but not mandate, planning for the formation and use of

¹⁷ *Id.* at ¶ 5(a).

¹⁸ *Id.* at ¶ 5(b).

¹⁹ *Id.* at ¶ 5(c).

public/private partnerships in the deployment of the nationwide public safety broadband network.²⁰ For example, NTIA can encourage wireless providers, infrastructure owners, ISPs, construction contractors, educational institutions, utilities, etc. in the planning process to facilitate the possibility of partnerships. State laws will need to be reviewed for potential legal hurdles that may exist in some States that could make these kinds of partnerships difficult. The formation of effective public/private partnerships can be rewarded through grant and/or network deployment incentives.

NTIA notes that Section 6206(b)(1)(B) of the Act directs FirstNet to issue open, transparent, and competitive requests for proposals (RFPs) to private sector entities for the purposes of building, operating, and maintaining the network.²¹ It is critical that State and local infrastructure gets appropriately incorporated into this model. The States can plan for this integration, by starting with establishment of a local database.

States could serve as clearinghouses or one-stop shops where entities bidding to build and operate portions of the FirstNet network can obtain access to resources such as towers and backhaul networks.²² In connection with the establishment of these clearinghouses NCRBDC recommends that FirstNet, or its vendor(s), define needs in terms of “what” specific data they want, and “how” they will go about getting it. On a State and local level, NCRBDC is willing to assist, but not be primarily responsible for this work, which we see as essentially the vendor’s responsibility. NCRBDC also believes that the implementation assistance and work undertaken in connection with the establishment of a clearinghouse should be an eligible cost of the grant

²⁰ *Id.* at ¶ 5(d).

²¹ *Id.* at ¶ 6.

²² *Id.* at ¶ 6(b).

program.

F. State and Local Implementation Grant Activities

NTIA asks about what elements of existing grant programs should be utilized for the State and Local Implementation grant program.²³ NCRBDC recommends that NTIA structures the process for the State and Local Implementation grant program similar to the DHS grant process.²⁴

Regarding the type of activities that should be allowable under the State and Local Implementation grant program,²⁵ NCRBDC suggests that planning, inventory, needs assessment, governance organization, project implementation, training and education are all activities that should be allowable for grant funding. The costs that should be eligible for funding should include all costs directly associated with national broadband public safety network, inclusive of management and administration activities. NCRBDC also believes that data gathering on current broadband and mobile data infrastructure should most definitely be considered an allowable cost.

Regarding NTIA's questions related to new positions at the State, local, or tribal level that may be needed to support the work to plan for the nationwide public safety broadband network,²⁶ NCRBDC believes that the grant should be available to fund these new positions for a specific term of three years. After that time, State, local, and tribal agencies should take responsibility for compensating these personnel as full-time employees, similar to the process with the COPS grant program.

²³ *Id.* at ¶ 7.

²⁴ *See* note 6, *supra*.

²⁵ RFI, *supra*, note 2 at ¶ 8.

²⁶ *Id.* at ¶ 9(b).

When NTIA considers prioritizing grants for activities that ensure coverage in rural as well as urban areas,²⁷ it should base its priorities on the defined needs by each State. Major highways in rural areas must be considered a priority. NTIA should also consider prioritizing special use (areas of tourism or service population) requirements that are seasonal.

NTIA also asks about best practices used in other telecommunications or public safety grant programs.²⁸ The all hazards regional organizational model in Colorado involves rural, urban and suburban area input and participation opportunities.²⁹

In looking at outcomes for the State and Local Implementation grant program,³⁰ it is important to start with a plan and data collection for analysis. NCRBDC is concerned that NTIA is asking about State, local and tribal delivery of outcomes without defining what specifically needs to be reported. In preparing this information, NTIA might consider obtaining information on the jurisdictions involved, the needs of the States, and subsequently provide States a list of what the milestones and objective measures should be addressed and then determine reporting frequency (monthly, quarterly, etc.). With that information, entities like NCRBDC can build a reporting format.

A grant administrator (i.e. SWIC, state Office of Information Technology, other) should be empowered to collect this information. NCRBDC suggests that the format for periodic reports be in Word. While NCRBDC is not aware of data that already exists, new data,

²⁷ *Id.* at ¶ 10.

²⁸ *Id.* at ¶ 11.

²⁹ By Executive Order in July 2003, Governor Bill Owens designated seven All-Hazards Emergency Management Regions within the State. In addition to the North Central Region (“NCR”) comprised of our ten counties identified in footnote 1, Colorado’s All Hazards Regions coordinate all-hazards planning, training, and exercise efforts. Additionally, formation of the regions has initiated a standardization of equipment and a more efficient use of available limited funding and resources. The NCR is responsible for managing the State Homeland Security Grant Program, the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program and the Citizen Corps Grant Program.

³⁰ RFI, *supra* note 2, at 28,859 ¶ 13.

particularly lists of interoperability opportunities could be gathered as part of the program.

States should definitely be encouraged to utilize tools and support available from Federal programs such as those developed by OEC.³¹ Other programs or tools that should be considered include Communication Assets Survey and Mapping (“CASM”) or Computer Assisted Pre-Coordination Resource and Database System (“CAPRAD”) Models.³² These tools may need to be augmented to incorporate the NPSBN performance requirement on a location level. In addition, FirstNet could “certify” a standardized coverage mapping tool.

While NTIA specifically directed to States regarding a preferred methodology for NTIA to use to distribute the grant funds available under the State and Local Implementation grant program,³³ NCRBDC recommends that a DHS grant program model would be the most appropriate method to target all regions and localities in each state interested in the public safety broadband network. NTIA should not use population as the sole consideration for allocating the grant funds, but should give some consideration to the land area and critical infrastructure within each State.

Regarding other appropriate targeted allocation methods, NCRBDC suggests (1) waiver recipient location where work in is already in progress; (2) previous broadband efforts/studies

³¹ *Id.* at ¶ 14.

³² The CASM tool is a standardized collection method for emergency response agencies to store and visually display data about their public safety communications assets and how those assets are used. CASM provides a single repository for information about land mobile radio systems, methods of interoperability and how emergency responders use them; a means to display the data; and tools to analyze the data and visualize interoperability gaps in accordance with the SAFECOM Interoperability Continuum framework. The CAPRAD system is a nationwide database for public safety professionals to coordinate the use of and application for frequencies in the 700-MHz band. Because the band is limited and the demand is growing in many parts of the country for spectrum utilization, coordination and cooperation are necessary for the benefit of public safety. CAPRAD is separated into three functional segments: an allocation segment that provides for the pre-allocation of the spectrum by region, an application segment which provides interactive and coordinated application for frequencies using the FCC Form 601, and an administrative/reporting segment that provides specialized access for administrative functions.

³³ RFI, *supra* note 2, at 28,859 ¶ 15.

underway or completed; (3) existing infrastructure identified for early availability; and (4) existing public safety networks in use for local or regional interoperability.³⁴ We also prefer that distribution of grant funds in the new program not be phased, due to the potential of increasing the length of the grant project's efforts and the inherent future risk of changing funding priorities. In addition, phasing will likely result in a longer nationwide build out and implementation period.

G. State Funding and Performance Requirements

NTIA asks what role, if any, should the States' Chief Information Officer (CIO) or Chief Technology Officer (CTO) play in the State and Local Implementation grant program and the required consultations with FirstNet and how will these different positions interact and work with public safety officials under the State and Local Implementation grant program?³⁵

Ultimately, this is a state by state decision. At a minimum, NCRBDC recommends that States use regional entities like ours as technology advisors for the statewide efforts. It is important to note that States need to encourage the use of existing personnel and departments that have current working relationships with local and regional entities.

With respect to the match required for grant qualification,³⁶ NCRBDC recommends that State and local personnel assigned, in-kind resources provided, and associated project costs incurred be considered as part of the match. When considering public interest factors to NTIA consider in connection with waivers of the matching requirement,³⁷ NCRBDC does not believe that any waivers should be granted, unless NTIA is prepared to waive match requirements for all

³⁴ *Id.* at ¶ 15(a-c).

³⁵ *Id.* at ¶ 16.

³⁶ *Id.* at ¶ 17.

³⁷ *Id.* at ¶ 18.

applicants. We would rather see a NTIA take the broadest possible view on considering in kind contributions, existing personnel and the like included in the kinds of activities that are valued as part of the match.

III. Other Issues and Conclusion

NCRBDC suggests that we need a model and/or scope of what may be FirstNet's technical requirements for guidance and initial decision making. Is the implementation of the public safety network to be a "Raytheon" model, where a company builds the network for someone else to manage and maintain, or an "AT&T" type for profit model where a wireless or other provider makes this a ongoing and costly (for public safety) business venture? FirstNet and NTIA need to clearly address this issue in the very near future, so that entities like NCRBDC can adjust cost-benefit projections accordingly.

Other issues that NTIA should consider include the following:

- (1) Local governments require funding for planning and training. The NTIA must not ignore local and regional entities by focusing solely on States. NTIA must ensure that funds given to States for distribution are fairly allocated to local and regional entities.
- (2) Funding should be based on the need for and complexity of public safety planning, not the physical size of the state or region.
- (3) All use of local assets must include appropriate contractual protections for the local government and reasonable compensation.
- (4) The planning process must enable localities to specify their performance requirements and key areas for coverage, including the locations where high bandwidth

will be required for operational purposes (such as EOCs and data centers where large databases are stored for use by first responders in the field).

The North Central Region Broadband Data Consortium appreciates the opportunity to make these Comments in response to the RFI, and looks forward to participating with NTIA in the future as this process moves forward.

Respectfully submitted,

**THE NORTH CENTRAL REGIONAL
BROADBAND DATA CONSORTIUM**

Kissinger & Fellman, P.C.

By: *s/ Kenneth S. Fellman*
Kenneth S. Fellman
3773 Cherry Creek North Drive, Suite 900
Denver, Colorado 80209
Telephone: (303) 320-6100
Facsimile: (303) 327-8601
kfellman@kandf.com

Agency Name	Agency Type	County	Level of Govt	
Action Care Ambulance	EMS	Private	Private	unknown@actioncare.com
AIR Life - Denver (HealthONE)	EMS			jana.williams@healthonecares.com
American Medical Response - Boulder County	EMS			robert.beyer@amr.net
American Medical Response - Metro Denver	EMS			jmc1mdems@aol.com
Boulder County Paramedics	EMS	Boulder	Local	rtgenov@aol.com
Byers Rescue Squad	EMS	Arapahoe	Local	E-mail
Capital City Ambulance	EMS			
Clear Creek Emergency Medical Services	EMS	Clear Creek	Local	
Columbine Ambulance Service	EMS			
Deer Trail Rescue Squad	EMS			
Denver Health Paramedic Division	EMS			
Flight for Life Colorado	EMS			
Gilpin Ambulance	EMS	Gilpin	Local	
Highland Rescue Team Ambulance Service	EMS			
Northglenn Ambulance, Inc.	EMS			
Platte Valley Ambulance Service	EMS			
Pridemark Paramedic Services - Boulder County	EMS	Private	Private	
Pridemark Paramedic Services - Jefferson County	EMS	Private	Private	
Rocky Mountain Ambulance Service	EMS			
Rural/Metro Ambulance	EMS			
Special Events Emergency Rescue	EMS			
Stadium Medical	EMS			
Western Ambulance	EMS			
Agate Fire Department	Fire			lrector@prairienetworks.com
Allenspark Fire Protection District	Fire			cscabins@aol.com
Arvada Fire Protection District	Fire	Jefferson County	Local	jon.greer@arvadafire.com
Aurora Fire Department	Fire	Arapahoe	Local	
Bennett Fire Protection District	Fire	Arapahoe	Local	ecumley941@aol.com
Big Sandy Fire Protection District	Fire			jhillmann@simlafire.org
Black Hawk Fire Department	Fire	Gilpin	Local	rnorris@cityofblackhawk.org
Boulder Emergency Squad	Fire	Boulder	Local	
Boulder Fire-Rescue	Fire	Boulder	Local	donnerl@ci.boulder.co.us
Boulder Mountain Fire Authority	Fire	Boulder	Local	chief@bouldermountainfire.org
Boulder Rural Fire Protection District	Fire	Boulder	Local	bruce.mygatt@brfd.org
Buckley Air Force Base Fire Protection	Fire	Federal	Federal	dennis.hoke@buckley.af.mil
Byers Volunteer Fire Department	Fire	Arapahoe	Local	jwhitedjk@aol.com
Castle Rock Fire and Rescue Department	Fire	Douglas	Local	amorales@crgov.com

Central City Fire Department	Fire	Gilpin	Local	gary@hostworks.net
Cherryvale Fire Protection District	Fire			
City of Englewood, Fire Division	Fire	Arapahoe	Local	
Clear Creek Fire Authority	Fire	Clear Creek	Local	kb@clearcreekfire.com
Coal Creek Canyon Fire Department	Fire			cccfd@aol.com
Colorado Refining Company Fire Department	Fire			jerry.bennett@valero.com
Colorado Sierra Fire Department	Fire			coloradoserriafire@yahoo.com
Cunningham Fire Protection District	Fire	Arapahoe	Local	jrhodes@cfpd.org
Deer Trail Fire Protection District	Fire			
Denver Fire Department	Fire	Denver	Local	james.sestrich@denvergov.org
Edgewater Fire Department	Fire	Jefferson	Local	edgewaterfiredept@comcast.net
Eisenhower Tunnel - CDOT	Fire	State	State	john.wilson@dot.state.co.us
Elbert Fire Protection District	Fire	Elbert	Local	chief@elbertfire.com
Elizabeth Fire Protection District	Fire	Elbert	Local	tjs@elizabethfire.com
Elk Creek Fire Protection District	Fire	Jefferson	Local	bdolan@elkcreekfire.org
Evergreen Volunteer Fire Department	Fire	Jefferson	Local	gdejong@evergreenfirerescue.com
Fairmount Fire Protection District	Fire			dangell@fairmountfire.org
Federal Heights Fire Department	Fire			amarsh@ci.federal-heights.co.us
Foothills Fire Protection District, John Kilpatrick	Fire			jkilpatrick@foothillsfire.org
Four Mile Fire Department	Fire			bldmtnlidge@netzero.com
Franktown Fire Protection District	Fire			FFPD80@aol.com
Genesee Fire Rescue	Fire	Jefferson	Local	smefford@comcast.net
Glendale Fire Department	Fire	Arapahoe	Local	
Gold Hill Fire Protection District	Fire			cfinn@mho.net
Golden Fire Department	Fire	Jefferson	Local	jbales@cityofgolden.net
Golden Gate Fire Protection District	Fire			ksorvig@earthlink.net
High Country Fire Protection District	Fire			HCFPDChief@msn.com
Hygiene Fire Protection District	Fire			xbar7@msn.com
Indian Hills Fire/Rescue	Fire			chief@indianhillsfirerescue.org
Indian Peaks Fire Protection District	Fire			
Inter-Canyon Fire/Rescue	Fire			bill.lucatuorto@yahoo.com
Jackson 105 Fire Protection District	Fire			keegan3701@msn.com
Jamestown Volunteer Fire Department	Fire			jamestownvolunteerfiredept@yahoo.com
Kiowa Fire Protection District	Fire	Elbert	Local	kiowafiredepartment@comcast.net
Lafayette Fire Department	Fire	Boulder	Local	gerrym@cityoflafayette.com
Lakeside Fire Department	Fire			rgordani@ci.aurora.co.us
Larkspur Fire Protection District	Fire			jbumgarner@larkspurfire.org
Lefthand Fire Protection District	Fire			Communication@lefthandfire.org
Littleton Fire Rescue	Fire	Arapahoe	Local	jmullin@littletongov.org
Lockheed Martin Space Systems Company - Plant Protection De Fire	Fire			darrell.t.root@lmco.com

Longmont Fire Department	Fire			mike.butler@ci.longmont.co.us	
Louisville Fire Protection District	Fire			tparker@louisvillefire.com	
Lyons Fire Protection District	Fire			lyonsfpd@greenspeedisp.net	
Mountain View Fire Protection District	Fire	Jefferson	Local	mlawley@mvpfd.org	
Nederland Fire Protection District	Fire			chief@nfpd.org	
North Central Fire Protection District	Fire			RMM1266@cs.com	
North Fork Fire Protection District	Fire			nffpd@hotmail.com	
North Metro Fire Rescue District	Fire	Adams	Local	jbruce@northmetrofire.org	
North Washington Fire Protection District	Fire	Adams	Local	jnotary@nwfd.org	
Parker Fire Protection District	Fire	Douglas	Local		
Pleasant View Fire Department	Fire			cmalmgren.pvfire@comcast.net	
Rattlesnake Fire Protection District	Fire			rsc51@myedl.com	
Rocky Mountain Fire District	Fire		Local	mike@rockymountainfire.org	Michael To 303-494-3735
Sable-Altura Fire Department	Fire	Adams	Local	chiefcampagnola@sablealturafire.org	
Sheridan Fire Department	Fire	Arapahoe	Local	mvasquez@sheridangov.org	
Skyline Fire Protection District	Fire			scollins@skylinefire.org	
South Adams County Fire District	Fire	Adams	Local	rlapenna@sacfd.org	Ronald LaPenna
South Metro Fire Rescue	Fire	Arapahoe	Local	d.qualman@southmetro.org	
Southwest Adams County Fire Protection District	Fire	Adams	Local	gditolla@swacfire.com	
Strasburg Fire Protection District	Fire			obarj1@aol.com	
Sugar Loaf Fire Department	Fire			chief@slfpd.org	
Suncor Energy USA Fire Department	Fire	Private	Private	wbarnett@suncor.com	
Sunshine Fire Protection District	Fire			honeymen@stanfordalumni.org	
Thornton Fire Department	Fire	Adams	Local	john.staley@cityofthornton.net	John Staley
West Douglas County Fire Protection District	Fire	Douglas	Local	fireman134@juno.com	
West Metro Fire Rescue	Fire	Jefferson	Local	dmcbee@westmetrofire.org	
Westminster Fire Department	Fire	Adams	Local	jcloud@cityofwestminster.us	
Wheat Ridge Fire Protection District	Fire	Jefferson	Local	dsaba@wrfire.org	
Adams County Sheriff	Sheriff	Adams	Local	SheriffDarr@adcogov.org	
Arapahoe Community College DPS	Police	Arapahoe	Local	dennis.goodwin@arapahoe.edu	
Arapahoe County Sheriff	Sheriff	Arapahoe	Local	grobenson@co.arapahoeco.us	
Arvada Police Department	Police	Jefferson	Local	don@arvada.org	
Auraria Police & Security	Police	State	State	mackeyj@ahec.edu	
Aurora Police Department	Police	Arapahoe	Local	doates@auroragov.org	
Berthoud Police Department	Police			gjohnson@berthoud.org	
Blackhawk Police Department	Police	Gilpin	Local	scole@cityofblackhawk.org	
Boulder County Sheriff	Sheriff	Boulder	Local	jpelle@bouldercounty.org	
Boulder Police Department	Police	Boulder	Local	becknerm@bouldercolorado.gov	
Brighton Police Department	Police	Adams	Local	cblackhurst@brightonco.gov	

Broomfield Police Department	Police	Broomfield	Local	tdeland@broomfield.org
Castle Rock Police Department	Police	Douglas	Local	jcauley@CRgov.com
Central City Police Department	Police	Gilpin	Local	pdchief@centralcitycolorado.us
Cherry Hills Village Police Department	Police	Arapahoe	Local	mtovrea@cherryhillsvillage.com (effective 4/20/12)
Clear Creek County Sheriff	Police	Clear Creek	Local	dkrueger@clearcreeksheriff.us
Columbine Vally Police Department	Police			bcottrell@columbinevalley.org
Commerce City Police Department	Police	Adams	Local	csaunier@c3gov.com
Denver County Sheriff	Sheriff	Denver	Local	gary.wilson@denvergov.org
Denver Police Department	Police	Denver	Local	robert.white@denvergov.org
Douglas County Sheriff	Sheriff	Douglas	Local	dweaver@douglas.co.us
Edgewater Police Department	Police	Jefferson	Local	mheller@edgewaterpd.com
Elbert County Sheriff	Sheriff	Elbert	Local	shayne.heap@elbertcounty-co.gov
Elizabeth Police Department	Police	Elbert	Local	mphibbs@ci.elizabeth.co.us
Empire Police Department	Police			policechief@empire-co.gov
Englewood Department of Safety Services	Police	Arapahoe	Local	jcollins@englewoodgov.org
Federal Heights Police Department	Police			lackier@fedheights.org
Georgetown Police Department	Police	Clear Creek	Local	gtownpd@earthlink.net
Gilpin County Sheriff	Sheriff	Gilpin	Local	bhartman@co.gilpin.co.us
Glendale Police Department	Police	Arapahoe	Local	vross@glendale.co.us
Golden Police Department	Police	Jefferson	Local	bkilpatrick@cityofgolden.net
Greenwood Village Police Department	Police	Arapahoe	Local	jjackson@greenwoodvillage.com
Idaho Springs Police Department	Police	Clear Creek	Local	policechief@idahospingsco.com
Jefferson County Sheriff	Sheriff	Jefferson	Local	tmink@jeffco.us
Kiowa Police Department	Police	Elbert	Local	mike.butler@ci.longmont.co.us
Lafayette Police Department	Police			rickb@cityoflafayette.com
Lakeside Police Department	Police	Jefferson	Local	bgordanier@town.lakeside.co.us
Lakewood Police Department	Police	Jefferson	Local	kevpal@lakewoodco.org
Littleton Police Department	Police	Arapahoe	Local	lpdhc@littletongov.org
Lone Tree Police Department	Police	Douglas	Local	steve.hasler@cityoflonetree.com
Longmont Police Department	Police	Boulder	Local	mike.butler@ci.longmont.co.us
Louisville Police Department	Police	Boulder	Local	bruceg@louisvilleco.gov
Morrison Police Department	Police			chief@police.town.morrison.co.us
Mountain View Police Department	Police	Jefferson	Local	mtoth@tomv.org
Nederland Police Department	Police			jakea@nederlandco.org
Northglenn Police Department	Police	Adams	Local	jmay@northglenn.org
Parker Police Department	Police	Douglas	Local	dking@ci.parker.co.us
Sheridan Police Department	Police	Arapahoe	Local	mcampbell@sheridangov.org
Simla Police Department	Police		Local	jleach@pcbroadband.net
Thornton Police Department	Police	Adams	Local	randy.nelson@cityofthornton.net
UC Boulder Police Department	Police	Boulder	Local	

UCHSC - Police Department
Westminster Police Department
Wheat Ridge Police Department

Police
Police
Police

State
Adams

State
Local

lbirk@cityofwestminster.us
dbrennan@ci.wheatridge.co.us

Coroners/Medical Examinors

James Hibbard
Michael Doberson
Thomas Faure
Don Allen
Amy Martin
Wesley Riber
Sandy Graeff
Zane Laubhan
Katherine Loughrey-Stemp

Coroner
Coroner
Coroner
Coroner
Medical Examiner
Coroner
Coroner
Coroner
Coroner
Coroner

Adams
Arapahoe
Boulder
Clear Creek
Denver
Douglas
Elbert
Gilpin
Jefferson

Local
Local
Local
Local
Local
Local
Local
Local
Local
Local

jhibbard@co.adams.co.us
m Doberson@co.arapahoe.co.us
tfaure@bouldercounty.org
don@historicalidahospings.com
amy.martin@denvergov.org
wriber@douglas.co.us
mbssbs1@msn.com
coroner@co.gilpin.co.us
klstemp@jeffco.us

Health Officials

Richard Vogt
Christopher Urbina, Director

Aaron Kissler
Jeff Zayach
Debra Oldenettel
Amy Martin

Public Health
Public Health
Public Health
Public Health
Public Health

Tri-County
Denver
Jeffco
Clear Creek
Boulder
Broomfield

rvogt@tchd.org
chris.urbina@dhha.org

akissler@co.clear-creek.co.us
jzayach@bouldercounty.org
doldenettel@broomfield.org

Other Stakeholders

Peter Wier
James Davis, FBI
Steve Garcia
Sam McGhee
Jeremy Casey

peter.weir@cdps.state.co.us
james.davis3@ic.fbi.gov
steve.garcia@cdps.state.co.us
smcghee@auroragov.org
jeremy.casey@usss.dhs.gov