

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424		Version 02	
* 1. Type of Submission: <input type="checkbox"/> Preapplication <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application <input type="checkbox"/> Changed/Corrected Application		* 2. Type of Application: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Continuation <input type="checkbox"/> Revision	* If Revision, select appropriate letter(s): <input type="text"/> * Other (Specify): <input type="text"/>
* 3. Date Received: Completed by Grants.gov upon submission.	4. Applicant Identifier: CCR # 59JA8		
5a. Federal Entity Identifier: <input type="text"/>	* 5b. Federal Award Identifier: <input type="text"/>		
State Use Only:			
6. Date Received by State: <input type="text"/>	7. State Application Identifier: <input type="text"/>		
8. APPLICANT INFORMATION:			
* a. Legal Name: Colorado Department of Public Safety, Div Homeland Security			
* b. Employer/Taxpayer Identification Number (EIN/TIN): 840644741	* c. Organizational DUNS: 828955315		
d. Address:			
* Street1:	9195 East Mineral Avenue Suite 200		
Street2:	Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management		
* City:	Centennial		
County:	Arapahoe		
* State:	CO: Colorado		
Province:	<input type="text"/>		
* Country:	USA: UNITED STATES		
* Zip / Postal Code:	80112		
e. Organizational Unit:			
Department Name: Colorad Dept of Public Safety	Division Name: Division of Homeland Security		
f. Name and contact information of person to be contacted on matters involving this application:			
Prefix: Mr.	* First Name: Ezzie	<input type="text"/>	
Middle Name:	<input type="text"/>		
* Last Name: Michaels	<input type="text"/>		
Suffix:	<input type="text"/>		
Title:	Grants Administration Program Manager		
Organizational Affiliation: N/A			
* Telephone Number: 720.852.6607	Fax Number: 720.852.6768		
* Email: ezzie.michaels@state.co.us			

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

Version 02

16. Congressional Districts Of:

* a. Applicant

* b. Program/Project

Attach an additional list of Program/Project Congressional Districts if needed.

17. Proposed Project:

* a. Start Date:

* b. End Date:

18. Estimated Funding (\$):

* a. Federal	<input type="text" value="2,500,989.00"/>
* b. Applicant	<input type="text" value="0.00"/>
* c. State	<input type="text" value="625,247.00"/>
* d. Local	<input type="text" value="0.00"/>
* e. Other	<input type="text" value="0.00"/>
* f. Program Income	<input type="text" value="0.00"/>
* g. TOTAL	<input type="text" value="3,126,236.00"/>

* 19. Is Application Subject to Review By State Under Executive Order 12372 Process?

- a. This application was made available to the State under the Executive Order 12372 Process for review on
- b. Program is subject to E.O. 12372 but has not been selected by the State for review.
- c. Program is not covered by E.O. 12372.

* 20. Is the Applicant Delinquent On Any Federal Debt? (If "Yes", provide explanation.)

Yes No

21. *By signing this application, I certify (1) to the statements contained in the list of certifications** and (2) that the statements herein are true, complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I also provide the required assurances** and agree to comply with any resulting terms if I accept an award. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or claims may subject me to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties. (U.S. Code, Title 218, Section 1001)

** I AGREE

** The list of certifications and assurances, or an internet site where you may obtain this list, is contained in the announcement or agency specific instructions.

Authorized Representative:

Prefix: * First Name:
Middle Name:
* Last Name:
Suffix:

* Title:

* Telephone Number: Fax Number:

* Email: *Ezzie Michael*

* Signature of Authorized Representative: * Date Signed:

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

Version 02

9. Type of Applicant 1: Select Applicant Type:

A: State Government

Type of Applicant 2: Select Applicant Type:

Type of Applicant 3: Select Applicant Type:

* Other (specify):

*** 10. Name of Federal Agency:**

National Telecommunications and Information Admini

11. Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number:

11.549

CFDA Title:

State and Local Implementation Grant Program

*** 12. Funding Opportunity Number:**

2013-NTIA-SLIGP-01

* Title:

State and Local Implementation Grant Program (SLIGP)

13. Competition Identification Number:

2013-NTIA-SLIGP-01

Title:

14. Areas Affected by Project (Cities, Counties, States, etc.):

The state, local, and tribal governments within the State of Colorado.

*** 15. Descriptive Title of Applicant's Project:**

Planning for the establishment of a nationwide public safety broadband network in cooperation with local and tribal governments within the State of Colorado.

Attach supporting documents as specified in agency instructions.

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

Version 02

*** Applicant Federal Debt Delinquency Explanation**

The following field should contain an explanation if the Applicant organization is delinquent on any Federal Debt. Maximum number of characters that can be entered is 4,000. Try and avoid extra spaces and carriage returns to maximize the availability of space.

A large, empty rectangular box intended for the applicant to provide an explanation of any federal debt delinquency. The box is currently blank.

State of Colorado
State and Local Implementation Grant Program (SLIGP)
Supplemental Application Narrative

1. Existing Governance Body

a. Describe the organizational structure and membership of the existing Statewide Interoperability Governing Body (SIGB), or its equivalent, that is responsible for public safety communications in the State.

The Colorado Statewide Interoperability Executive Council (SIEC) was created by the Governor of Colorado through Executive Order B 005 09, and signed on September 17, 2009. SIEC membership is defined in the Executive Order and consists of up to seventeen members from all areas of the state. Membership includes:

- One member from each of the nine Colorado All Hazards Emergency Management regions. A map of these regions has been included with the application.
- One member representing both of the tribal nations located in Colorado
- Two members representing Colorado state agencies with interest and expertise in interoperable communications (currently being filled by one member of the Colorado State Patrol Communications Division and one member of the Colorado Department of Transportation)
- One member representing the Rocky Mountain Harris Users Group (Enhanced Digital Access Communication System-EDACS)
- Up to three additional members with expertise and interest in interoperable communications
- One member representing the Governor's Office of Information Technology (OIT) that serves at the agency responsible for the statewide public safety radio network

In addition to the SIEC, Colorado has recently created the Homeland Security Advisory Council (HSAC) that has similar representation to the SIEC but expands membership to include counties, cities, and other stakeholders in public safety. We anticipate utilizing this group as well as a means to broaden the reach of our efforts. The primary difference is that the SIEC is focused on public safety communications and its membership is weighted towards technical and operational expertise. The HSAC is more of an advisory and oversight group focused on general public safety efforts. Its membership is more inclusive of municipal, county and other perspectives. There is some overlap of participation on these two groups but no formal or mandated cooperation. It is our intention, as part of this process to determine if there is potential for these groups to work together as part of the process to provide both high-level and technical oversight.

b. Describe the SIGB's authority to make decisions regarding public safety communications and how these decisions are implemented.

Executive Order B 005 09 defines the mission, and charges the SIEC as the responsible body to:

- Provide policy level direction and promote efficient and effective use of resources for matters related to public safety communications interoperability
- Develop a statewide vision for interoperable communications
- Promote established standards for public safety communications as established by the Chief Information Officer, Governor's Office of Information Technology
- Promote cooperation among local, tribal, state, and federal public safety agencies, as well as NGOs in the business of providing public safety in addressing statewide radio interoperability needs in Colorado
- Review priorities set by State and Local Homeland Security initiative and those set forth in the SCIP for statewide interoperability needs
- Assist public safety entities in the development of projects, plans, policies, standards, priorities, guidelines and training for radio interoperability
- Coordinate with other communications oversight groups to ensure adequate wireless spectrum to accommodate all users
- Research statewide interoperable communications best practices of other states and municipalities
- Provide recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature, when appropriate, concerning issues related to statewide interoperable radio communications for public safety in Colorado. These recommendations are to include, but not be limited to the SAFECOM lanes for governance, standard operating procedures, technology, training and exercise, planning and funding

The SIEC meets quarterly to review and discuss matters pertaining to statewide interoperability and all issues relevant to statewide public safety communications. The statewide representation of the SIEC serves as the vehicle for delivering recommendations of the council to all areas of the state.

c. Describe how the State will leverage its existing SIGB, or its equivalent, to coordinate the implementation of the Public Safety Broadband Network (PSBN) in the State.

The State is aware of the technical and operational expertise the SIEC can provide toward the implementation of the PSBN. The current group has traditionally been focused on operational and technical issues and has an excellent skill set. Several members of the SIEC are currently serving on the steering committee to aide in the planning and facilitation of the SLIGP application process. It is fully expected that the SIEC will actively participate in

all matters related to the implementation of the PSBN and be integrated into whatever governing body is developed.

d. How does the State plan to expand its existing SIGB to include representatives with an understanding of wireless broadband and Long Term Evolution (LTE) technology in order to facilitate its consultations with FirstNet?

The SIEC has already begun this process by having the Adams County pilot project provide consistent updates and educational discussions on the project. Additionally, OIT has continued these efforts from a statewide perspective. The SIEC, as a full body, will be engaged in the development of a broadened committee of representatives into the planning and governance process. This expanded body will provide the proper public safety representation to facilitate consultations with FirstNet. Since this group was the lead entity in creating our SCIP we anticipate they will be crucial in updating the SCIP to include broadband. This is one area where we anticipate the potential of outside assistance to be needed by also bringing in third-party experts who can help with technology issues.

e. Does the State currently dedicate sufficient financial resources to adequately support the SIGB? Does the State intend to invest funds received from SLIGP to financially support the SIGB? If so, provide the amount the State expects to request and describe the SIGB functions that these funds will support.

The SIEC has historically been funded through the IECGP. Those funds expire on May 31, 2013. The State does not currently have plans to dedicate sufficient financial resources in support of the SIGB (SIEC.)

We intend that the additional staffing resources requested as part of the SLIGP will also be able to dedicate time and effort to support the overall efforts of the current SIGB in a comprehensive way. Additionally, we anticipate utilizing some SLIGP travel expenses to support additional and expanded travel.

We are aware that the SLIGP funds can only be used for activities related to broadband and intend to track activities to support this requirement.

2. Statewide Communications Interoperability Plan (SCIP)

a. Are there existing strategic goals and initiatives in your SCIP focused on public safety wireless broadband? If so, what are they?

There are no existing strategic goals and initiatives in the SCIP focused on public safety wireless broadband.

b. Describe how the State has engaged local governments and tribal nations, if applicable, in public safety broadband planning activities that have been completed to date.

The current SIEC group has been continually updated by the Adams County Communications Center on the progress of their Pilot Project. As part of these updates discussion have taken place on how the project will affect the entire state. Additionally, OIT has been updating local governments through their Local Technology Planning Teams (LTPT), which are focused on expanding commercial broadband efforts. OIT has also spoken with the association of local government CIO's, the Colorado Rural Utilities Association and specific local governments. OIT has also engaged the official tribal affairs liaison regarding this issue.

c. Does the State intend to use SLIGP funding to support efforts to update the SCIP by adding public safety wireless broadband strategic goals and initiatives? If so, provide the amount the State expects to request and describe the activities that these funds will support.

The State does intend to use funding from the SLIGP program to update the SCIP. We have not identified a specific amount; rather, we anticipate the personnel resources requested will assist in the SCIP update process. Additionally, we anticipate some of the meeting and travel expenses to be used during the SCIP update process.

3. State-level Involvement

a. What is the status of the Statewide Interoperability Coordinator (SWIC) for your State? Does this person work full-time in the SWIC capacity? How will this person be involved with SLIGP?

Currently the SWIC position is not a dedicated, full-time position. The duties of the SWIC are being performed by the Public Safety Communications Network Program Manager on a part-time basis and the SWIC is currently responsible for coordinating the SIEC. Moving forward, the state intends to request funding from SLIGP to fund a full-time dedicated SWIC position. It is the intention of the state that this individual will continue to coordinate the SIEC as well as become the day-to-day coordinator of the SLIGP activities.

b. How will the State's Chief Information Officer/Chief Technology Officer be involved with SLIGP and with activities related to the implementation of the nationwide public safety broadband network?

As with any large, state level technology project, it is important to have the CIO involved from a technical perspective as early as possible. While we believe the public safety community should drive the business case for the PSBN, it is crucial

that the technical aspects of the project are fully understood and integrated into the process as they will affect the final implementation. Essentially we see this as a joint venture between public safety and information technology. Given this approach, we see multiple roles for the CIO as the project progresses into operation.

1. **SLIGP Project:** During the initial phases of the planning and implementation grant, the CIO's role will be focused on developing the coordination and collaboration necessary for long term success. Once the proper governance structure has been developed and implemented we anticipate the CIO will work to educate the business users on the LTE technology and how it will affect both the short-term and long-term communications of public safety in order to develop a comprehensive communications strategy. As part of this education, the CIO will work with FirstNet to ensure any proposed system architecture and standards are in-line with those developed by the CIO for all statewide systems. We feel this is a crucial role as the implementation of the PSBN in Colorado must integrate into the existing State technical standards. The CIO will also provide the Governor and other leaders' advice from a technical perspective as major decision points arise.
2. **Ongoing Support/Management:** In general, we see the CIO as a key resource in a collaborative effort whose primary task is to ensure all users have sound technical guidance and any proposed network meets accepted standards for current and future business needs. We believe the CIO and their office can provide quality advice, guidance and assistance to the project.

c. What other State-level organizations or agencies will be involved with SLIGP?

The primary state agencies to be involved with SLIGP will be the Colorado Department of Public Safety (CDPS) and the Governor's Office of Information Technology (OIT). Working in partnership, these agencies will ensure the SLIGP efforts will meet its goals. With the chief executives of both organizations being cabinet level positions we are confident they will ensure the Governor is well informed and integrated into the overall process. In addition to these agencies the state will rely on the SIEC and the HSAC to facilitate statewide coordination.

d. What are the specific staffing resources the State requires to effectively implement the consultation process with the First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet) and perform the requirements of SLIGP? If the application requests funding for additional staffing, provide the amount the State expects to request and describe the positions these funds will support.

The State is requesting staffing resources to successfully implement the SLIGP efforts. Specifically, we are requesting funds for a full-time SWIC, an outreach manager dedicated to this project and administrative support for all those involved with this process. We anticipate the SWIC will become the day-to-day coordinator for the SLIGP process with the project manager being responsible for traveling throughout the state and performing the one-on-one education and outreach. The administrative support will be for not only the two positions requested but for local and regional entities as well as they engage in planning and coordination through their jurisdictions. The total cost for this staffing, including benefits is \$825,000. The breakdown for these positions is in the detailed budget.

e. How is the State engaging private industry and secondary users (e.g., utilities)?

As part of the state's ongoing efforts to increase commercial broadband coverage and capacity OIT has created working relationships with all major broadband carriers, both wired and wireless. Colorado has a collaborative broadband "Roundtable" that brings together local community leaders, broadband users (Education, Healthcare, Public Safety) with the broadband carriers to discuss major issues. We intend to, and have already used these relationships to begin discussing the FirstNet project. Through these efforts we have also engaged many secondary users such as rural utility cooperatives. OIT recently spoke to the Colorado Rural Utilities Association and discussed the FirstNet process. We have even begun discussion acquiring GIS based maps of existing infrastructure that could be used for the PSBN.

We intend to hold an official "kick-off" meeting with all private companies, utilities, cooperatives, etc. to introduce Colorado's efforts and will include them in the planning efforts.

4. Coordination with Local Government Jurisdictions

a. Describe the local government jurisdictional structure (e.g., municipalities, cities, counties, townships, parishes) located within the boundaries of the State, Commonwealth, Territory, or District applying for a grant. How many of these local jurisdictions exist within the State's boundaries?

Colorado is a Home Rule state with 64 unique county governments and 271 independent municipal governments. The concept of local control permeates through all collaborations between the state and local governments, especially public safety. Additionally, numerous Colorado fire agencies utilize the Special District model that often spans multiple municipal and/or county governments. Currently these groups participate in the HSAC through their representative organizations (Colorado Counties Incorporated, Colorado Municipal League, Special Districts Association). We intend to focus our efforts of interaction

through these representative entities but also plan to engage them directly through the proposed staff and outreach efforts of SLIGP.

b. Describe how your State will involve these local jurisdictions to ensure there is adequate representation of their interests in the FirstNet consultation and in the planning and governance for SLIGP.

The various local jurisdictional entities each have an organization that represents their interests. They are:

- Colorado Counties Incorporated (CCI): Counties
- Colorado Municipal League (CML): Municipalities
- Special District Association of Colorado (SDAC): Special Districts

In addition, the Colorado Department of Local Affairs (DOLA) is a state agency specifically designated to help local governments with planning and collaboration between local governments. DOLA has divided the state into 14 planning regions and has a dedicated resource for each region to help coordinate local government planning. We intend to integrate these resources and relationships into the SLIGP process to ensure we also have direct communication with local governments.

c. Describe past methods the State has used to successfully coordinate state-wide projects or activities with local government jurisdictions.

A very practical example of statewide, multi agency collaboration is the development of the statewide Digital Trunked Radio System (DTRS). As one of the first states to have true statewide interoperability for LMR, Colorado brought together local and state jurisdictions as well as regional consortiums to develop the system together.

In addition, Colorado has a developed history of mutual aid, especially among fire agencies. With wildfires prevalent and more times than not spanning jurisdictional boundaries the state has been forced to develop agreements and response plans that cross multiple disciplines and jurisdictions.

Recently, Colorado also developed a statewide implementation of the Coplink Records Analysis system for law enforcement. This effort saw law enforcement agencies ranging from large-urban to remote rural districts develop a sustainable, multi-node system that integrates all participating agencies.

d. What have been some of the State's primary challenges when engaging with local jurisdictions? What are some of the strategies that the State will employ to overcome these challenges during implementation of SLIGP?

The primary challenge with any home rule state is the varying objectives, perspectives and laws that exist within the individual jurisdictions. Additionally, Colorado's unique terrain creates natural differences in needs across the state. What's required for public safety in the City and County of Denver is quite different from the town of Durango. These countervailing needs and approaches often make it challenging to find common solutions.

In order to overcome these challenges we will:

- Work to develop a statewide approach that allows for specific variations within local entities
- Ensure communication lines are established from the beginning
- Integrate the varying needs into the governance model from the beginning. Often these needs are "shoehorned" into existing models that don't really work.

An example of this has been the recent effort by OIT to expand commercial broadband throughout the state. While we are working on a statewide strategy and approach we are simultaneously working with local communities to identify their unique needs. As we develop the statewide approach we provide the local jurisdictions the leeway to implement their specific solutions as part of the statewide approach.

5. Regional Coordination

a. Does your State have intrastate regional committees that are involved with public safety communications? If so, please describe their organizational structure and membership and how they provide input to the SIGB.

Colorado's history of local control has forced local agencies to develop many regional structures. Some of the key structures are:

- **All Hazard Regions:** In order to coordinate and implement Department of Homeland Security (DHS) initiatives after 9/11 Colorado designated 9 All Hazard Regions to facilitate and coordinate these efforts. The regions (map included) are geo-politically based and have been utilized since their inception as a key regional coordination point. These regions are effective as they are managed by the local public safety entities themselves. Each of these regions has existing representation on the SIGB and will be relied upon to help coordinate the planning efforts.
- **Consolidated Communications Network of Colorado (CCNC):** A non-profit organization, CCNC has been the primary mechanism for the development of the current statewide Digital Trunked Radio System (DTRS). This voluntary group has representation from all regions of the state, all public safety disciplines and all levels of government. While this group will continue

- to focus on the LMR system, its structure, participants and achievements will be utilized during the planning process.
- **Regional Emergency Medical and Trauma Advisory Council (RETAC):** Colorado has 11 Regional Emergency Medical and Trauma Advisory Councils (RETACs) authorized by statute to provide a coordinated approach to emergency medical and trauma care in Colorado. Each RETAC consists of five or more counties that participate through a local advisory council, which has the responsibility for creating a regional implementation plan for delivery of emergency medical and trauma care. Each RETAC has a coordinator who provides support and services to the board and member counties.
 - **Department of Local Affairs (DOLA) Regional Planning Groups:** DOLA is a state agency dedicated to assisting local governments with regionalized planning and coordination on a variety of public issues. From sewer line development to broadband planning DOLA has a history of helping local governments plan regionally and ensure that the local entities voices are heard. We will utilize these existing relationships and mechanisms to ensure local governments are directly engaged independently of the public safety organizations. We will also rely on the experience of their planning and coordination efforts to use as examples in this process.

b. Describe any interstate regional bodies in which your State participates that are involved with public safety communications in the State.

With regard to LTE, as one of the Pilot Projects, the Adams County Communications Center has been very involved in the Early Builders Advisory Group, the BTOP Awards Recipients and has had many regional conversations with the State of New Mexico, Arizona and Wyoming. ADCOM has kept the state up to speed on these conversations.

Colorado has also been actively involved with FirstNet efforts through the National Governor's Association (NGA) and the National Association of State Chief Information Officers (NASCIO).

Additionally, Colorado currently works closely with several of our bordering States in an effort to achieve interstate interoperability some of these efforts include:

- Yuma County, CO – Kansas/Nebraska interoperability efforts (8TAC92 at Wray)
- WY/CO Interop link: Shared talk groups through a consolette radio swap
- Nebraska Emergency Management Region 21: Bordering Nebraska public safety agencies have portable radios on the Colorado Statewide Digital Trunked Radio System for direct interoperability with Logan County, Colorado public safety agencies.
- New Mexico: Interoperability between the Colorado State Patrol and the New Mexico State Police is currently achieved through VLAW31

and an exchange of VHF portable radios using a shared VHF frequency.

c. How does the State plan to engage and leverage these existing regional coordination efforts in the nationwide public safety broadband network planning?

Colorado plans to rely heavily on the identified region bodies during the SLIGP process. From a public safety perspective, we anticipate the All Hazards regions becoming a central point of coordination. The existing relationships and structures will allow information to flow from the “bottom-up” in such a way that it can be managed and refined by the time it reaches the statewide efforts. As mentioned, the existing DOLA infrastructure as a long track record of engaging local governments directly and these relationships will be relied upon for engagement from these perspectives.

d. Please identify, if applicable, any other state, territory, or regional entity with which the State collaborated or coordinated in the development and preparation of this application and describe the nature of that collaboration or coordination.

In order to facilitate and coordinate this application the following state, local and tribal entities were invited to participate in a “Steering Committee”.

- Colorado Department of Public Safety
- Governor’s Office of Information Technology: Includes current SWIC
- Adams County Communications Center (ADCOM 911): BTOP Pilot Project
- North-Central All Hazards Region –Through City and County of Denver
- Southeast All Hazards Region – Through Otero County Sheriff
- San Luis All Hazards Region – Through Communications Coordinator
- Southern Ute and Ute Mountain Ute Tribes

This group met on several occasions beginning in early March to discuss and reach consensus on key decision points of the application and approaches to the ongoing SLIGP efforts. The group was chosen to both represent a variety of areas (urban and rural) as well as those individuals who had previous experience with statewide efforts and/or the current Public Safety LTE efforts.

6. Tribal Nations

a. How many federally recognized tribes are located within the State boundaries? (If the answer is zero, please skip to question #7.) Information on federally recognized tribes may be located at the Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs website:

<http://www.bia.gov/WhoWeAre/BIA/OIS/TribalGovernmentServices/TribalDirectory/index.htm>

Colorado has two federally recognized tribes, the Southern Ute and the Ute Mountain Ute tribes.

b. Describe how the State will involve the tribal nations to ensure there is adequate representation of their interests in the FirstNet consultation and in the planning/governance for the grant program. Does the State have a process for consulting with the tribes located within State boundaries? If so, please provide a description of that process.

Both tribes currently have representation on both the SIEC and the HSAC and will continue to be engaged through these mechanisms. Additionally, the state has an official tribal affairs liaison through the Lt. Governor's Office that has been engaged on this process and will continue to be utilized.

c. Describe past methods the State has used to successfully coordinate with tribal nations.

All coordination goes through the established tribal affairs liaison in the Lt. Governor's office.

d. Are there tribal representatives who regularly attend your SIGB meetings? If so, please identify the tribes represented.

As mentioned, both tribes have representation on current public safety governance organizations. To date, there has been no participation.

e. What have been some of the State's primary challenges when engaging with tribal nations? What are some of the strategies that the State will employ to overcome these challenges during implementation of SLIGP?

To date, the biggest challenge has been the lack of participation by the tribes in the existing governance structures. In order to overcome this, the state hopes to engage directly with the tribal affairs liaison and potentially present directly to tribal councils.

7. Rural Coverage

a. Please classify your local jurisdictions into rural and non-rural areas and identify the criteria used in making these rural and non-rural determinations.

Based on the included map you will see that a vast majority of Colorado's area is rural. While no detailed maps currently exists that show a combination of all individual jurisdictions we hope to create such a resources as part of the SLIGP process. Based on the parameters from the map and data we can say that a large majority of public safety jurisdictions are also rural. We believe it is

important to note than in instances where rural is broken down further into rural and remote that a significant portion of Colorado is considered remote.

The definition used to discern rural and urban is taken from the Census Bureau and is:

“The Census Bureau defines urbanized areas and urbanized clusters as:
Urbanized Areas (UAs) – consists of densely developed territory that contains 50,000 or more people.
Urbanized Clusters: (UCs) – cluster consists of densely developed territory that has at least 2,500 people but few than 50,000 people”

b. Please describe the coverage area and availability of broadband service and LTE technology in the rural areas of the State as defined in response to 7.a.

We have included a map of mobile coverage throughout the state for reference. In this case, we considered broadband as download speeds at least 3 Mbps and upload speeds of 1.5 Mbps. As you will see in the map the rural and remote areas of Colorado have little to no current commercial broadband coverage.

c. Please describe how the State plans to prioritize the grant activities to ensure coverage in, and participation by, rural areas. Please include specific plans, milestones, and metrics to demonstrate how you will achieve these requirements.

With approximately 86% of Colorado’s population living in only 1.5% of its land, essentially the entire state of Colorado is rural. Of the All Hazard regions previously mentioned, 8 out of the 9 constitute rural areas. By focusing our outreach efforts through these regions we will naturally ensure that rural coverage is taken into account. Additionally, through our proposed survey we will be able to track the rural vs. urban counties is taken into account.

We will also classify each first responding entity during this process as urban, rural or remote. We will set a goal that we receive a significant number (80-90%) of responses of rural organizations.

Our current statewide LMR system has significant assets in the rural parts of the state. By beginning any propagation analysis from these assets, we can quickly gauge initial coverage. The state has previously used, and we may potentially use third-party software to do “drive-tests” on various devices that track current private carrier coverage. Together, this analysis will guide us in our process to ensure rural coverage is a priority.

Through our SIEC and the SLIGP steering committee we have already made significant efforts to reach out to rural areas. With over 1/3 of its total land owned by the federal government Colorado will require significant partnerships from the Federal agencies that oversee this land.

8. Existing Infrastructure

a. What, if any, databases exist that collect data on government-owned wireless and/or communications infrastructure for the state, local, and/or tribal governments?

Currently no singular database exists to track government owned communication infrastructure. With Colorado's local control structure each local government is responsible for their assets. From a state perspective there is no singular source that spans state agencies. We have recently identified this shortcoming and acquired the resources necessary to develop a solution. We intend to create a singular, geo-spatial database that will allow the state (and hopefully) local governments to identify all broadband assets in a common fashion.

b. If these databases exist, what is the process for updating them and how often do these updates occur?

The processes and procedures associated with the upcoming database will be identified in the upcoming project.

9. Existing Government-Owned Networks

a. Describe how you plan to identify any hardening, security, reliability, or resiliency requirements that are currently required for existing government-owned networks within the State, including those networks at the local and tribal governments.

As part of the SLIGP process we intend to request that all local, state and tribal governments provide standard languages used for these requirements with commercial carriers. The state currently has a contract for a state-wide broadband network that can be utilized as well. Once we have received the language we intend to analyze the various requirements for consistencies/discrepancies and use that analysis as a baseline for determining final requirements for the SLIGP process.

Additionally, we intend to use the existing requirements from the ADCOM 911 Pilot Project. With these requirements already negotiated into a Public Safety LTE project it should provide an excellent benchmark for our efforts.

b. Describe how you plan to identify any existing contractual requirements regarding hardening, security, reliability, or resiliency for commercial carriers providing wireless data services within the State, including those at the local and tribal governments.

This process will be similar to the one described in the previous question. Additionally, we will use requirements in current Colorado Bureau of Investigations (CBI) and Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) as we anticipate these agencies to have strict requirements.

10. Network Users

a. Describe how you plan to identify the potential users of the nationwide public safety broadband network within the State, including at the local and tribal governments.

We intend to create a survey for each municipal, county, tribal and state governmental entity that will ask them to identify every public safety entity within their jurisdictions. This will include Law Enforcement, Fire, EMS, PSAP and Emergency Management Office. We will use these survey results to work with regional public safety entities to verify the potential users. Based on feedback from FirstNet and the NTIA we hope to include questions regarding secondary users in the survey as well.

Our initial vision is that we will use the proposed web-portal as the primary deliver mechanism for the survey. As part of our engagement process we will have the aforementioned entities fill out the on-line survey that will compile all of the raw data. We will then extract the data and analyze the results based on key parameters (urban, rural, county, municipal, tribal, etc) in order to create the overall profile.

11. Education and Outreach

a. Describe how you plan to educate and train multi-discipline, public safety and other government users of the nationwide public safety broadband network at your State, local, and tribal levels.

One of the first events we intend to hold is a statewide summit for all potential stakeholders. This event will focus on bringing the entire state up to speed on the efforts behind the PSBN and the current environment.

After the initial summit has taken place we will develop a standardized training packet that will then be distributed to all stakeholders. This will be followed up by regional meetings using the aforementioned groups (All Hazards, CML, CCI, etc.) to further engage participants. For each of these groups we will identify a singular point-of-contact that will interact with the project staff to continue engagement throughout the life of the project.

The outreach plan will have 3 primary focus points

1. **Assembling all stakeholders from a region:** This will be done local elected official, representative bodies and existing relationships.

2. **Providing historical overview and local impact:** We intend to use similar background information as the proposed summit but focus on a more inclusive group in that region. We will use this opportunity to begin identifying the key issues for that region that need to be addressed in an overall plan. For example:
 - a. What are the primary public safety concerns in the region (i.e. wildfire, search and rescue, federal prisons in the area)
 - b. What existing relationships exist
 - c. What is the current communications footprint
3. **Supporting the process of needs assessment and key issue identification:** Once we have educated the local regions and identified their key concerns we will facilitate the discussions that generate a regional feedback.

Through our experience with the LTPT's we determined that the best way to accomplish these goals is through direct, face-to-face meetings and support. This is why we intend to fund a full time outreach manager. Once we have identified and organized the key stakeholders in each region we will spend significant time traveling to that region to coordinate meetings and discussions.

Similar to our community broadband efforts, we anticipate developing a standard report that when completed will give us a uniform review of each region.

12. Memorandum of Agreements

a. Describe any specific obstacles, laws, and/or legal issues that will likely impede your ability to participate fully in the nationwide public safety broadband network or in SLIGP.

While Colorado fully expects to be able to participate in the PSBN there are two key challenges that will need to be addressed.

1. **Home Rule (local control) Structure:** The structure of Colorado will require that we have any participating agency that wants to provide assets agree to the general Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that will need to be created. As there are 64 unique counties and 271 municipalities, this will take some effort. We intend to convene a representative body of county, municipal, state and tribal attorneys to identify the key elements of the various laws to focus on and address. Additionally, we will use the Colorado Municipal League (CML) and Colorado Counties Inc. (CCI) to organize their constituents and propose solutions to specific issues.
2. **State Law:** Currently there is a state statute (Senate Bill 05-152) that prohibits local governments from entering into partnerships with private companies for broadband services. This bill is similar to other bills across the country that is designed to prevent municipalities from offering commercial

broadband service to their residents. As part of other broadband activities in the state we have already had various stakeholders in this law engage and discuss alternatives and are confident we will be able to identify the necessary changes for this effort.

13. Tools

a. What are some of the software tools that the State has used and could apply to the planning and data collection activities associated with this program?

- As part of the State Broadband Initiative (SBI) efforts the State has developed a robust mapping and GIS staff and expertise. It is our intention to utilize these resources to help in the data collection activities.
- As part of the identified asset inventory project the state expects to identify and acquire software to manage and store the information. We anticipate utilizing this software as well.
- The State currently has several wireless propagation tools that it uses for a variety of efforts. These too are anticipated to be utilized during the SLIGP process.

b. Is the State aware of additional tools that could be useful for implementing allowable grant activities?

One of the goals for the SLIGP process is the development of an interactive web-based information portal to help facilitate information flow between all stakeholders involved. We intend to design and implement this tool as soon as possible and have it become the primary clearinghouse for information related to the project.

14. Phase Two Funding

a. Describe the activities that you expect to undertake with the Phase 2 funding when it is made available to the State, Territory, or District.

We expect that the Phase 2 activities will be focused on gathering and analyzing data in order to determine the ideal implementation within our state. Identification of all usable assets will be a primary goal. Once these assets are identified we intend to classify these assets into categories that identify their potential value (i.e. Highly Valuable to Not Usable).

Once we have identified the assets we hope to perform initial coverage analysis to see what the coverage footprint looks like based on the available assets. This will hopefully begin to identify the specific needs of various areas (urban vs. rural, mountains vs. plains, etc.) and help facilitate the RFP process for the state.

15. Other

There were no consultants used for this application.

BUDGET INFORMATION - Non-Construction Programs

OMB Number: 4040-0006
Expiration Date: 06/30/2014

SECTION A - BUDGET SUMMARY

Grant Program Function or Activity (a)	Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number (b)	Estimated Unobligated Funds		New or Revised Budget		
		Federal (c)	Non-Federal (d)	Federal (e)	Non-Federal (f)	Total (g)
1. State and Local Implementation Grant Program	11.549	\$	\$	\$ 2,500,989.00	\$ 625,247.00	\$ 3,126,236.00
2.						
3.						
4.						
5. Totals		\$	\$	\$ 2,500,989.00	\$ 625,247.00	\$ 3,126,236.00

SECTION B - BUDGET CATEGORIES

6. Object Class Categories	GRANT PROGRAM, FUNCTION OR ACTIVITY				Total (5)
	(1) State and Local Implementation Grant Program - Federal Share	(2) State and Local Implementation Grant Program - Non-Federal Share	(3)	(4)	
a. Personnel	\$ 504,338.00	\$ 126,085.00	\$	\$	\$ 630,423.00
b. Fringe Benefits	126,085.00	31,521.00			157,606.00
c. Travel	304,064.00	76,016.00			380,080.00
d. Equipment					
e. Supplies	91,444.00	22,861.00			114,305.00
f. Contractual	256,800.00	66,700.00			333,500.00
g. Construction	0.00	0.00			
h. Other	1,208,258.00	302,064.00			1,510,322.00
i. Total Direct Charges (sum of 6a-6h)	2,500,989.00	625,247.00			\$ 3,126,236.00
j. Indirect Charges	0.00	0.00			\$
k. TOTALS (sum of 6i and 6j)	\$ 2,500,989.00	\$ 625,247.00	\$	\$	\$ 3,126,236.00
7. Program Income	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$	\$	\$

Authorized for Local Reproduction

Standard Form 424A (Rev. 7-97)
Prescribed by OMB (Circular A -102) Page 1A

SECTION C - NON-FEDERAL RESOURCES					
(a) Grant Program	(b) Applicant	(c) State	(d) Other Sources	(e) TOTALS	
8. State and Local Implementation Grant Program	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ 625,247.00	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ 625,247.00	
9. <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
10. <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
11. <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
12. TOTAL (sum of lines 8-11)	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ 625,247.00	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ 625,247.00	
SECTION D - FORECASTED CASH NEEDS					
	Total for 1st Year	1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	4th Quarter
13. Federal	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>
14. Non-Federal	\$ <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
15. TOTAL (sum of lines 13 and 14)	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>
SECTION E - BUDGET ESTIMATES OF FEDERAL FUNDS NEEDED FOR BALANCE OF THE PROJECT					
(a) Grant Program	FUTURE FUNDING PERIODS (YEARS)				
	(b) First	(c) Second	(d) Third	(e) Fourth	
16. SLIGP	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	
17. State Matching Funds -NON FEDERAL FUNDS	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
18. 1022497*.8	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
19. <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
20. TOTAL (sum of lines 16 - 19)	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	
SECTION F - OTHER BUDGET INFORMATION					
21. Direct Charges: <input type="text" value="3,126,236.00"/>		22. Indirect Charges: <input type="text" value="0.00"/>			
23. Remarks: <input type="text" value="revision date 6-3-2013"/>					

State of Colorado SLIGP Detailed Budget Spreadsheet

Category	Detailed Description of Budget (for full grant period)			Breakdown of Costs	
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Federal	Non-Federal
a. Personnel					
SWIC The SWIC will spend 50% of the time on SLIGP grant activities for 3 years. The SWIC's annual salary is \$92,774. \$92,774 x 50% = \$46,387	3 years	\$46,387	\$139,161	\$111,329	\$27,832
Outreach Coordinator (OC) One outreach coordinator will spend 100% of the time on SLIGP grant activities for 3 years. The OC's annual salary is \$73,243. \$73,243 x 100% = \$73,243	3 years	\$73,243	\$219,729	\$175,783	\$43,946
Grant Support Grant Program Manager will spend 20% of their time on the project for 3 years. Annual salary is \$75,000. \$75,000 x 19.8% = \$14,885	3 years	\$14,885	\$44,655	\$35,724	\$8,931
Grant Support Grant Analyst will spend 20% of their time on the project for 3 years. Annual salary is \$70,000. \$70,000 x 19.8% = \$13,894	3 years	\$13,894	\$41,682	\$33,346	\$8,336
Grant Support Grant Accountant) will spend 20% of their time on the project for 3 years. Annual salary is \$65,000. \$65,000 x 19.8% = \$12,904	3 years	\$12,904	\$38,712	\$30,970	\$7,742
Administrative Support One Administrator will spend 100% of the time on SLIGP grant activities for 3 years. The Administrator's annual salary is \$48,828. \$48,828 x 100% = \$48,828	3 years	\$48,828	\$146,484	\$117,187	\$29,297
Total Personnel			\$630,423	\$504,338	\$126,085
b. Benefits					
SWIC Benefits are calculated at 25% of salary, for the portion of time spent on SLIGP activities	\$139,161	25%	\$34,790	\$27,832	\$6,958
Outreach Coordinator Benefits are calculated at 25% of salary, for the portion of time spent on SLIGP activities	\$219,729	25%	\$54,932	\$43,946	\$10,986
Grant Support -Grant Manager Benefits are calculated at 25% of salary, for the portion of time spent on SLIGP activities	\$44,655	25%	\$11,164	\$8,931	\$2,233
Grant Support -Grant Analyst Benefits are calculated at 25% of salary, for the portion of time spent on SLIGP activities	\$41,682	25%	\$10,421	\$8,336	\$2,084
Grant Support -Grant Accountant Benefits are calculated at 25% of salary, for the portion of time spent on SLIGP activities	\$38,712	25%	\$9,678	\$7,742	\$1,936
Administrative Support Benefits are calculated at 25% of salary, for the portion of time spent on SLIGP activities	\$146,484	25%	\$36,621	\$29,297	\$7,324
Total Benefits			\$157,606	\$126,085	\$31,521
c. Travel					
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Federal	Non-Federal

Mileage for Working Group Meetings and Regional Planning Meetings 12 individuals traveling 220 miles roundtrip for 30 meetings at State Mileage rate of \$.50	79,200 miles	\$0.50	\$39,600	\$31,680	\$7,920
Travel to attend national, state, and local meetings. 10 individuals will attend 20 meetings. Airfare is estimated at \$400/ticket.; hotel is estimated at \$150/night for 3 nights; per diem is estimated at \$70/day for 3 days, for a total trip \$1,060/trip Note: does not included pre award expenses associated with May 2013 FirstNet	200 trips	\$1,060.00	\$212,000.00	\$169,600	\$42,400
Statewide Summits: we will sponsor two statewide summits dedicated to the SLIGP process. 220 attendees per meeting with an avg cost \$292 per person.	440	\$292	\$128,480	\$102,784	\$25,696
Total Travel			\$380,080	\$304,064	\$76,016
d. Equipment	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Federal	Non-Federal
N/A	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Total Equipment			\$0	\$0	\$0
e. Supplies	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Federal	Non-Federal
Training Materials: Costs based on estimates of 2000 individuals trained at a cost of \$45 per individual. This is estimated over the life of the project.	multiple	\$95,205	\$95,205	\$76,164	\$19,041
Computers	3	\$1,500	\$4,500	\$3,600	\$900
Office Furniture (Desks, Printers, etc.)	3	\$2,000	\$6,000	\$4,800	\$1,200
General Office Supplies \$100/month	36	\$100	\$3,600	\$2,880	\$720
Miscellaneous Supplies	1	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$4,000	\$1,000
Total Supplies			\$114,305	\$91,444	\$22,861
f. Contractual	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Federal	Non-Federal
MOU Efforts: Costs determine by taking approximately 1,740 combined hours for municipal, county and state attorneys at \$150/hour	1740	\$150	\$261,000	\$208,800	\$52,200
Website development: Costs based on estimates of similar website needs. Initial site, \$40,000 then approx. 260 hours at \$125/hour	Varried	\$72,500	\$72,500	\$58,000	\$14,500
Total Contractual			\$ 333,500	\$266,800	\$66,700
g. Construction	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Federal	Non-Federal
N/A			\$0		
Total Construction				\$0	\$0
h. Other	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Federal	Non-Federal
Phase II data collection	phase II	\$1,342,722	\$1,342,722	\$1,074,178	\$268,544
Statewide Summits venue rental: we will sponsor two statewide summits dedicated to the SLIGP process.	2	\$2,800	\$5,600	\$4,460	\$1,120
Meeting Attendance/Other Task Time 9 All Hazard Regions, 400 Hours per region @ \$45/hour	3600	\$45	\$162,000	\$129,600	\$32,400
Total other			\$1,510,322	\$1,208,258	\$302,064
Total Direct Charges			\$3,126,236	\$2,500,989	\$625,247
i. Indirect Costs	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Federal	Non-Federal
N/A					
Total Indirect			\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTALS			\$3,126,236	\$2,500,989	\$625,247

State of Colorado
SLIGP Budget Detailed Narrative

The purpose of this document is to provide a detailed description of costs associated with the SLIGP application. The costs have been broken down into the federally recognized cost categories associated with the Form 424. The costs are reflected as the total costs for both phases. The Detailed Budget spreadsheet has the specific line-items costs. Note that all match (non-federal) contributions will be cash. The State will cover the matching funds from two sources, both of these will be cash:

1. The Governor's Office of Information Technology has secured \$225,000 in funding from the Colorado Performance Assurance Plan Fund, which was created and is managed by the state Public Utilities Commission for the purpose of advancing telecommunications in Colorado.
2. The remaining amount of the match (\$400,247) will come from the Colorado Department of Public Safety through the Highway Users Tax Fund (HUTF), which is funded through a variety of local and state taxes and surcharges. All matching funds provided for in the State of Colorado's SLIGP application are from State or Local government sources.

1. Personnel	Federal:	\$504,338
	Non-Federal:	\$126,085
	Total Cost:	\$630,423

- a. **SWIC Position:** We anticipate that the broadband related activities will take up 50% of the SWIC's duties and therefore are requesting the proportionate share of the SWIC salary based on the previously advertised salary (at the high-end). We anticipate the SWIC individual will become the day-to-day coordinator for the planning, education and outreach activities under the program.
- b. **Outreach Manger:** The Outreach Manager position would be responsible for a majority of the day-to-day interaction with all stakeholders. We anticipate this individual spending a significant amount of their time traveling throughout the state for localized meetings and planning sessions.
- c. **Admin Support:** We anticipate this individual to be responsible for day-to-day administrative duties for the SWIC and Outreach Manager as well as offering support to local and regional groups. We are unsure at this time if we would utilize existing personnel or look to add resources.
- d. **Grant Support:** In order to properly fulfill all oversight and reporting

requirements of the grant we intend to allocate resources to this project. The Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management (DHSEM), the fiscal agent for the grant has existing staff positions that has experience managing grants so this cost will go towards covering those existing expenses. These expenses will be divided between a Grant Program Manager, Grant Analysis and Grant Accountant.

2. Fringe Benefits	Federal:	\$126,085
	Non-Federal:	\$31,521
	Total Cost:	\$157,606

The fringe benefits are calculated using a standard 25% cost multiplier from base salaries for the positions described above. As stated, the salaries indicated represent a maximum salary and therefore the costs for fringe benefits may be less based on the final salary.

3. Travel	Federal:	\$304,064
	Non-Federal:	\$76,016
	Total Cost:	\$380,080

- a. **Mileage for working group meetings:** We anticipate a significant amount of mileage/vehicle expenses traveling throughout the state. Due to the large geographic area of the state and the terrain some areas have significant distance. In order to minimize these expenses we will encourage regional meetings as well as video/audio conferencing technology. We anticipated a total of 12 individuals traveling for an average of 220 miles for 30 meetings at the rate of \$.50 per mile.

We will also look into developing a mechanism for local agencies to be reimbursed for their travel time for specific meetings.

- b. **Additional travel for state, local, regional and national meetings:** With the significant time to reach certain areas of the state overnight stays are often required. We additionally anticipate airfare expenses and per-diems. All lodging expenses will be based on state government rates when possible. These expenses are estimated on 10 individuals and 20 trips. Note, this includes the initial regional meetings.
- Airfare: \$400 per ticket
 - Hotel: \$150 per night with an average of 3 nights
 - Per diem: \$70 day for 3 days
- c. **Statewide Summits:** In order to expedite the education and outreach process we intend to sponsor up to two statewide summits dedicated to the SLIGP process, FirstNet and the NPSBN. We intend to invite every local government, regional entity and other interested stakeholders. We

anticipate having to cover travel costs (mileage, lodging, per diem) for some agencies for the event. The first summit will be focused on educating stakeholders on the history of the project both nationally and within Colorado and creating the necessary knowledge baseline. Once the initial consultation with FirstNet has taken place and Phase II has been authorized we may have a second summit to outline the goals and objectives of those efforts and establish an initial plan. Initial estimates are for 220 attendees per meeting at an average cost of \$292 per person.

4. Equipment Total Cost: \$0

At this point we have not identified costs for this category

5. Supplies Federal: \$91,444
Non-Federal: \$22,861
Total Cost: \$114,305

- a. **Education/Training:** Part of the supplies costs will be for the physical materials associated with the education and outreach program. We anticipate costs for printing and production as we distribute information and utilize documents and materials in the planning process. With 64 counties (and sheriff's departments), 256 municipalities, approximately 150 municipal police departments and over 150 fire districts we anticipate holding a number of training and education sessions. We anticipate holding at least 100 training/education sessions with anywhere from 10 to 25 individuals at each session. Estimating at 20 individuals and 100 meetings equates to a (rough) per-person costs of \$45.
- b. **Computers:** We anticipate each individual hired needing a laptop computer.
- c. **Office Furniture:** This includes desks, printers and other office furniture needed for the positions hired.
- d. **General Supplies:** These costs will be allocated for general office supplies used during the process.
- e. **Miscellaneous Supplies:** This is to cover unforeseen supplies that may come up.

6. Contractual	Federal:	\$266,800
	Non-Federal:	\$66,700
	Total Cost:	\$333,500

- a. **MOU Efforts:** In order to develop the desired single Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for all statewide stakeholders we anticipate significant resources from all levels of government will be required. The funds identified here will be dedicated to cover the personnel expenses for the municipal, county, special district and state agencies to develop the MOU. We anticipate most of these expenses will be related to the efforts of county and city attorneys as well as the Attorney General's office. Estimates are based on 1,660 total hours at \$150 per hour.
- b. **Informational Website Development:** One of the primary communication, education and outreach mechanisms we intend to use is a comprehensive information portal dedicated to this project. At this time we do not believe we have the resources in-house to develop this and feel outsourcing this element could be the quickest, most cost effective way to create it. The costs are based on the initial estimate received from a third-party website developer for an interactive website being developed for another initiative that has similar functionality and content to the web-portal envisioned for this project. Additionally, the hourly quote is also based on the conversations with the developers.

7. Construction	Total Cost:	\$0
-----------------	--------------------	------------

Per the SLIGP guidance there will be no construction related expenses for this project.

8. Other	Federal:	\$1,208,258
	Non-Federal:	\$302,064
	Total Cost:	\$1,510,322

- a. **Phase 2/Data Collection:** Per guidance from the NTIA this category represents the amount of funds to be used for phase 2 activities to be determined after consultations with FirstNet.
- b. **Statewide Summit:** These costs represent facility rental fees for the statewide summits that are planned. We anticipate each summit being one full day.
- c. **Meeting Attendance Time:** We anticipate reimbursing local entities for the time necessary for their employees to travel to various planning meetings. To attend these meetings, local entities must backfill the individuals attending the meetings (police officers, fire firefighters, and communication experts). Backfilling will ensure that the right individuals attend the meetings. The value of the personnel time is based on an

average hourly rate (not including fringe benefits).

Matching Funds

For this project the State will cover the matching funds from two sources, both of these will be cash:

3. The Governor's Office of Information Technology has secured \$225,000 in funding from the Colorado Performance Assurance Plan Fund, which was created and is managed by the state Public Utilities Commission for the purpose of advancing telecommunications in Colorado.
4. The remaining amount of the match (\$400,247) will come from the Colorado Department of Public Safety through the Highway Users Tax Fund (HUTF), which is funded through a variety of local and state taxes and surcharges. All matching funds provided for in the State of Colorado's SLIGP application are from State or Local government sources.

ASSURANCES - NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0040), Washington, DC 20503.

PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY.

NOTE: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the awarding agency. Further, certain Federal awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project cost) to ensure proper planning, management and completion of the project described in this application.
2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States and, if appropriate, the State, through any authorized representative, access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the award; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.
3. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.
4. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.
5. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards for merit systems for programs funded under one of the 19 statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM's Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).
6. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§1681-1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. §794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) §§523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§290 dd-3 and 290 ee- 3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. §§3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and, (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.
7. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal or federally-assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.
8. Will comply, as applicable, with provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.

9. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. §§276a to 276a-7), the Copeland Act (40 U.S.C. §276c and 18 U.S.C. §874), and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. §§327-333), regarding labor standards for federally-assisted construction subagreements.
10. Will comply, if applicable, with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is \$10,000 or more.
11. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §§1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clean Air) Implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended (P.L. 93-523); and, (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (P.L. 93-205).
12. Will comply with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. §§1271 et seq.) related to protecting components or potential components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.
13. Will assist the awarding agency in assuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. §470), EO 11593 (identification and protection of historic properties), and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. §§469a-1 et seq.).
14. Will comply with P.L. 93-348 regarding the protection of human subjects involved in research, development, and related activities supported by this award of assistance.
15. Will comply with the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-544, as amended, 7 U.S.C. §§2131 et seq.) pertaining to the care, handling, and treatment of warm blooded animals held for research, teaching, or other activities supported by this award of assistance.
16. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. §§4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead-based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.
17. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 and OMB Circular No. A-133, "Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations."
18. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations, and policies governing this program.
19. Will comply with the requirements of Section 106(g) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000, as amended (22 U.S.C. 7104) which prohibits grant award recipients or a sub-recipient from (1) Engaging in severe forms of trafficking in persons during the period of time that the award is in effect (2) Procuring a commercial sex act during the period of time that the award is in effect or (3) Using forced labor in the performance of the award or subawards under the award.

<p>* SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL</p> <p>ezzie michaels</p>	<p>* TITLE</p> <p>Grants Administration Program Manager</p>
<p>* APPLICANT ORGANIZATION</p> <p>Colorado Department of Public Safety, Div Homeland Security</p>	<p>* DATE SUBMITTED</p> <p>03/19/2013</p>

Standard Form 424B (Rev. 7-97) Back

Applicants should also review the instructions for certification included in the regulations before completing this form. Signature on this form provides for compliance with certification requirements under 15 CFR Part 28, 'New Restrictions on Lobbying.' The certifications shall be treated as a material representation of fact upon which reliance will be placed when the Department of Commerce determines to award the covered transaction, grant, or cooperative agreement.

LOBBYING

As required by Section 1352, Title 31 of the U.S. Code, and implemented at 15 CFR Part 28, for persons entering into a grant, cooperative agreement or contract over \$100,000 or a loan or loan guarantee over \$150,000 as defined at 15 CFR Part 28, Sections 28.105 and 28.110, the applicant certifies that to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

(1) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

(2) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a member of Congress in connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, 'Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying,' in accordance with its instructions.

(3) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grants, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure occurring on or before October 23, 1996, and of not less than \$11,000 and not more than \$110,000 for each such failure occurring after October 23, 1996.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I hereby certify that the applicant will comply with the above applicable certification.

*** NAME OF APPLICANT**

Colorado Department of Public Safety, Div Homeland Security

*** AWARD NUMBER***** PROJECT NAME**

State of Colorado SLIGP

Prefix:

Mr.

*** First Name:**

Ezzie

Middle Name:*** Last Name:**

Michaels

Suffix:

*** Title:** Grants Administration Program Manager

*** SIGNATURE:**

ezzie michaels

*** DATE:**

03/19/2013

STATE OF COLORADO

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

136 State Capitol
Denver, Colorado 80203
Phone (303) 866-2471
Fax (303) 866-2003



John W. Hickenlooper
Governor

March 18, 2013

Mr. Lawrence E. Strickling
Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information
National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA)
1401 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20230

Dear Assistant Secretary Strickling:

The purpose of this letter is to fulfill the requirements outlined in both the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 and the NTIA's State and Local Implementation Grant Program (SLIGP) to designate the point of contact for interaction related to the First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet) and the development of the National Public Safety Broadband Network (NPSBN).

While we understand the NTIA's desire to have a single interaction point with the State, we believe it is best to engage both the Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management (DHSEM) within the Colorado Department of Public Safety (CDPS) and the Governor's Office of Information Technology (OIT). DHSEM will serve as the fiscal agent for the program and receive the SLIGP funds while the Governor's Office of Information Technology will serve as the single Point of Contact (POC) for the First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet) as it relates to the planning and implementation of the NPSBN in Colorado. Specifically, Brian Shepherd, Broadband Program Manager at OIT will be the POC. Mr. Shepherd's contact information is (Brian.Shepherd@state.co.us, 303-764-7826)

These two state agencies (CDPS and OIT) have been in close contact and have worked together to prepare the SLIGP application. The agencies have a history of joint collaboration on public safety projects and we are confident that together and in collaboration with relevant stakeholders that they will not only achieve the desired goals of the program, but also ensure the prudent use of taxpayer dollars.

To be clear on the roles, DHSEM will manage all grant funds and review the financial expenditures of the grant while OIT will interact with FirstNet to plan and coordinate implementation of the NPSBN within the state. At such time that an appropriate statewide governing body has been identified and established, we would like to reserve the option to change the POC based on their recommendation.

We hope that this will be the first step to building a productive relationship with NTIA and FirstNet in an effort to ensure the needs of first responders in Colorado are met and the safety of the public.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "John W. Hickenlooper". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "J".

John W. Hickenlooper
Governor

State of Colorado
State and Local Government Implementation Program (SLIGP)
Project Feasibility

The State of Colorado is pleased to provide this application for the SLIGP program and believes our overall approach for this project combined with the knowledge, experience and existing collaborative structures within the state will ensure a successful planning process and implementation of the Public Safety Broadband Network (PSBN).

Our approach to the SLIGP process can be broken down into three key tasks:

1. **Education and Outreach:** We need to reach as many people as possible and bring them up to speed on what has occurred both at a national level and within our state. Our initial efforts will focus on these efforts and include a statewide FirstNet Summit which all local government entities and first responder organizations will be invited to attend. We will continue these efforts through existing regional and statewide interest groups to ensure we reach everyone necessary. We want to create a baseline of knowledge that will allow the entire state to move forward.
2. **Establish a governing body:** Once we have established our knowledge baseline we will focus on identifying and establishing a governing body for the overall project. While there are several existing governing bodies we want to ensure we address the specific needs and stakeholders that are unique to this endeavor.
3. **Plan and collaborate at a local, regional and state level:** Once we have accomplished the first two goals our focus will turn to planning for the implementation of the PSBN.

Colorado's Experience

As a home-rule state Colorado has a long history of collaboration between levels of governments. We have a number of organization and structures in place that are specifically designed to foster collaboration between jurisdictions.

One example of such collaboration is the Colorado Digital Trunked Radio System (DTRS). After 9/11, Colorado was one of the first states in the nation to have a fully statewide, interoperable Land Mobile Radio System. This was achieved through collaboration between municipal, county, regional and state entities. The past and ongoing interaction of these groups has provided us valuable lessons on what to do as

well as what not to do as we approach the PSBN. We feel this experience will be invaluable during the SLIGP efforts. Specifically some of the key lessons learned are:

- Sustainability must be built-in from the beginning
- Strong Intergovernmental Agreements (IGA) or Memorandum's of Understanding (MOU) are critical
- Developing a system that addresses all the various needs (urban vs. rural, in-building vs. mountainous terrain, etc.) is extremely challenging
- Understanding the specific local geo-political needs is crucial

We intend to use these lessons learned as a foundation for the governance of the system and the outreach and education. We will encapsulate these into any mission or charter that is developed for the governing body and develop all outreach efforts with these in mind. We intend to engage the local governments in addition to the public safety entities to ensure their perspectives are integrated into the model.

Additionally, Colorado has the unique experience of being one of the original seven BTOP funded Pilot Projects. While the current pilot project is focused on a single county (Adams County) the Adams County Communications Center has been engaged in efforts to educate and expand the system from the beginning. One of the members from the original pilot project team (Brian Shepherd) is now a member of the State's Governor's Office of Information Technology and will be the initial Point of Contact for FirstNet. We feel this combined early experience with public safety and LTE will be invaluable and provide Colorado unique opportunities.

As part of the SLIGP process we intend to hire additional personnel resources to carry out the required tasks. We believe these resources will be critical to the success of not only the SLIGP efforts but the overall project. We intend to use funds from the SLIGP for the following staff:

- **SWIC Coordinator:** As the state currently does not have a full-time SWIC we feel it is crucial to fill this role. We envision the SWIC becoming the day-to-day coordinator and planner for the SLIGP process. We will also look to this position to start working with public safety agencies to start charting a course of eventual transition to a single network.
- **Outreach Manager:** The outreach manager will primarily be responsible for much of the face-to-face outreach, education and planning. We anticipate this individual will spend a lot of time traveling the state and interacting with various agencies and organizations.

- **Administrative Support:** As with any project there will be a need for administrative support during the process. We expect this resource to support not only the other two positions but the local, tribal and other organizations during this effort.

In summary, we believe Colorado has the proper approach and with the assistance of the SLIGP funds, the proper staffing to carry out the overarching goals of the SLIGP process. With our focus on education, outreach, collaboration and planning we are confident the PSBN will be a success in Colorado.