

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

Agriculture Wildlife and Rural Affairs	
County	Prowers
1. Legislative Issue	Landfill Regulations Background: CDPHE Regulations on Small Landfills
Proposed Solution	40,000 or less landfills be regulated by local health and environment agencies
Fiscal Impact	None
Potential Proponents / Opponents	Attorney General, CDPHE, Governor, or anyone that will listen
*Risk/ Difficulties	
**County Commissioner Importance	
***CCI Time Commitment	
County's Priority Ranking	1
County	Alamosa
2. Legislative Issue	Concerning Landfills Closed by the County Background: Alamosa County closed landfills 20+ years ago. The CO Dept. Public Health has not done any follow up and now wants to enforce monitoring wells, etc. EPA has a statute of limitations of 5 years.
Proposed	Introduce a bill to modify Title 13: The Statute of

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

Solution	Limitations or under the administration action so the Dept. can change its rules or regulations of waste facilities. Language would be something like, “If the Dept. of Public Health does not seek any action within 5 years from the time the facility enters post-closure care, then the landfill is deemed closed by the State and no further action shall be taken by the State.” We want the language to be retroactive so that closed landfills cannot be subject to ongoing whims of the Dept.
Fiscal Impact	
Potential Proponents / Opponents	Dept. of Public Health Solid Waste
*Risk/ Difficulties	
**County Commissioner Importance	
***CCI Time Commitment	
County’s Priority Ranking	2
General Government	
County	San Miguel
3. Legislative Issue	<p>Expand emergency services funding to encourage climate resiliency planning and mitigation</p> <p>Background: Impacts from climate change are and will continue to increase impacts on counties most</p>

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

	notably emergency services and public health, if we understand what might be coming we could work towards mitigation and preparation.
Proposed Solution	Working on it.
Fiscal Impact	Unknown
Potential Proponents / Opponents	Exploring ideas
*Risk/ Difficulties	
**County Commissioner Importance	
***CCI Time Commitment	
County's Priority Ranking	2
County	Summit
4. Legislative Issue	<p>Notice to Extinguish Campfires</p> <p>Background: C.R.S. 30-15-201 requires each county in the state to erect notices printed in large letters on suitable signboards stating that campfires must not be left unattended and must be totally extinguished before breaking or leaving camp. Violators are subject to a fifty-dollar fine. The erection of such notices shall be at the expense of each county, and at least twenty notices shall be posted. This is an antiquated statute and an unfunded mandate.</p>

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

Proposed Solution	Repeal C.R.S. 30-15-201 or amend it to require some alternative form of notice or messaging regarding campfires.
Fiscal Impact	Cost savings to counties
Potential Proponents / Opponents	No opponents known
*Risk/ Difficulties	
**County Commissioner Importance	
***CCI Time Commitment	
County's Priority Ranking	1
County	
	Grand / San Miguel
5. Legislative Issue	<p>Health Care Premiums at Ridiculously High Levels for Some Rural Counties</p> <p>Background: In many rural Colorado Counties, health care premiums can be two or three times as high as health care premiums in urban areas in our state. Some basic reasons are 1) increased distance to a hospital, 2) life expectancy (rural citizens live longer on average than urban citizens, incurring expensive health care conditions late in life), and pool size (the smaller the number of participants, the more expensive the premium).</p>
Proposed	Any legislative remedy that lowers health care

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

<p>Solution</p>	<p>premiums without reducing coverage would be welcome. One preferred method would be similar to a 2016 Bill that would have designated the entire State of Colorado as a single health care district / zone. Health insurance providers could use whatever actuary tables they wish to determine the statewide health insurance premium rate – but everyone pays the same rate statewide independent of where you live. The result would be most urban areas paying a higher rate, and the rural areas paying a lower rate. Because urban areas have a higher population, the per person health care premium rate increase would be relative small, while the lower population rural areas would typically see a significant large reduction in their premiums.</p> <p>Another less attractive solution would entail some sort of subsidy to help certain qualifying citizens to get a portion of their health insurance paid for by the state. This is less appealing than simply treating the state as a single zone because this solution uses tax dollars to help a limited subset of the population. HB 17-1225 is an example of a recent Bill that tried to reduce health insurance premiums through a subsidy.</p>
<p>Fiscal Impact</p>	<p>This should have zero fiscal impact to the state or county budgets. Our preferred proposal (one statewide health insurance district) is a legislative policy regulation on the health insurers statewide. No tax dollars would be used for this new policy. In fact, the relatively small health insurance premiums for urban residents will most likely go unnoticed, but the hundreds of dollars saved per month by rural citizens will result in economic stimulus, and improve the State fiscal situation.</p>
<p>Potential</p>	<p>Opposition would come from citizens and</p>

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

Proponents / Opponents	commissioners in urban areas. The health insurance industry would probably object.
*Risk/ Difficulties	
**County Commissioner Importance	
***CCI Time Commitment	
County's Priority Ranking	1
County	Alamosa
6. Legislative Issue	<p>Inmates in the County Jail Lose Medicaid Coverage When They are Booked into the Facility.</p> <p>Background: The County has to pay the medical bills on inmates in their custody. The County has to provide a “standard of care”. The inmates come into the jail with STD’s, Aids, high blood pressure, diabetes, lung issues, pregnant, etc. We would like to use restricted and unrestricted funding in the Dept. of Public Health to pay for the medical needs of the inmates.</p>
Proposed Solution	CRS 25-1-502 Essential Public Health Service, we would like a definition of “community” to include those individuals confined to the county jail. CRS 25-1-511(3) may need wording to give the county the ability to use the restricted and unrestricted agency funds, and 25-1-501 “Declaration” needs amended to include individuals confined to the county jail.

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

Fiscal Impact	
Potential Proponents / Opponents	Dept. of Public Health, Dept. of Healthcare and Policy
*Risk/ Difficulties	
**County Commissioner Importance	
***CCI Time Commitment	
County's Priority Ranking	1
County	San Miguel
7. Legislative Issue	<p>Adequate Resources to Address Behavioral Health</p> <p>Background: We need to opportunity to treat mental health as part of our public health and human services programs.</p>
Proposed Solution	Waiting to hear the recommendations from the CCI team working on this language.
Fiscal Impact	Unknown
Potential Proponents / Opponents	No opponents and we have had conversations with neighboring counties who are looking for a solution on a more proactive approach to treating mental health.
*Risk/ Difficulties	

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

**County Commissioner Importance	
***CCI Time Commitment	
County's Priority Ranking	3
County	Weld
8. Legislative Issue	<p>Spending of Long Term TANF Reserves</p> <p>Background: If spending continues as is, insolvency is likely to occur within the next 5-10 years. With this in mind, we need more strategic planning with regards to our spending and the Long Term TANF reserves need to be a part of this plan. By making the works allocation committee report to the JBC each year regarding the planning of these reserves, counties get a say in the planning of the funding.</p>
Proposed Solution	<p>Require WAC to make recommendations to the JBC by Nov 15 of each year on the use of Long Term TANF reserves and the Colorado Works Program. Specifically, amend Section 26-2-721 by adding a new subsection (4) to read as follows:</p> <p>(4) Prior to November 15, 2018 and November 15 of each following year, the Works Allocation Committee shall submit to the Joint Budget Committee a plan for the spending of the Colorado long -term works reserves for the upcoming fiscal year.</p>
Fiscal Impact	There should not be a fiscal impact.
Potential	We have not yet spoken with proponents or

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

Proponents / Opponents	opponents about this proposal.
*Risk/ Difficulties	
**County Commissioner Importance	
***CCI Time Commitment	
County's Priority Ranking	
County	Weld
9. Legislative Issue	Adult Protection Services Allocation Committee for Funding to Counties
Proposed Solution	<p>Add the following to statute: Section 26-3.1-1___. Adult Protection Allocation Committee:</p> <p>(1) An Adult Protection allocations committee shall be convened by the state department as necessary in order to make advisory recommendations as described in this section.</p> <p>(2) The Adult Protection allocations committee shall consist of eleven members, eight of whom shall be appointed by a statewide association of counties and three of whom shall be appointed by the state department. Of the members appointed by the statewide association of counties, at least two members shall be from small or medium-sized counties, and at least three shall be from large</p>

counties. The appointing authorities shall consult with each other to ensure that the Adult Protection allocations committee is representative of the counties in the state. A representative from the county that has the greatest percentage of the state's adult protection caseload will automatically be appointed, which appointment shall be credited against the eight appointments allocated to the statewide association of counties.

(3) The adult protection allocations committee shall develop its own operating procedures.

(4) No later than January 15, 2019, the state department, with input from the adult protection allocations committee, shall make recommendations to the joint budget committee of the general assembly for a definition of what shall constitute administration and support functions and a method for identifying costs for such functions.

(5) The adult protection allocations committee shall develop a formula to allocate funding to counties from appropriate grant and other funding sources available to all counties.

(6) In the event that the state department and the adult protection allocations committee do not reach an agreement on the allocation formula on or before June 15 of any state fiscal year for the succeeding state fiscal year, the state department and the adult protection allocations committee shall submit alternatives to the joint budget committee of the general assembly from which such joint budget committee shall select an allocation formula before the beginning of such succeeding state fiscal year.

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

Fiscal Impact	None
Potential Proponents / Opponents	
*Risk/ Difficulties	
**County Commissioner Importance	
***CCI Time Commitment	
County's Priority Ranking	
County	Weld
10. Legislative Issue	Childcare Allocation Committees for Funding to Counties
Proposed Solution	<p>Add the following to statute:</p> <p>Section 26-2-8___. Child Care Allocation Committee:</p> <p>(1) A child care allocations committee shall be convened by the state department as necessary in order to make advisory recommendations as described in this article.</p> <p>(2) The child care allocations committee shall consist of eleven members, eight of whom shall be appointed by a statewide association of counties and three of whom shall be appointed by the state department. Of the members appointed by the statewide association of counties, at least two members shall be from small</p>

or medium-sized counties, and at least three shall be from large counties. The appointing authorities shall consult with each other to ensure that the child care allocations committee is representative of the counties in the state. A representative from the county that has the greatest percentage of the state's child care caseload will automatically be appointed, which appointment shall be credited against the eight appointments allocated to the statewide association of counties.

(3) The child care allocations committee shall develop its own operating procedures.

(4) No later than January 15, 2019, the state department, with input from the child care allocations committee, shall make recommendations to the joint budget committee of the general assembly for a definition of what shall constitute administration and support functions and a method for identifying costs for such functions.

(5) The child care allocations committee shall develop a formula to allocate funding to counties from appropriate grant and other funding sources available to all counties.

(6) In the event that the state department and the child care allocations committee do not reach an agreement on the allocation formula on or before June 15 of any state fiscal year for the succeeding state fiscal year, the state department and the child care allocations committee shall submit alternatives to the joint budget committee of the general assembly from which such joint budget committee shall select an allocation formula before the beginning of such

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

	succeeding state fiscal year.
Fiscal Impact	None
Potential Proponents / Opponents	
*Risk/ Difficulties	
**County Commissioner Importance	
***CCI Time Commitment	
County's Priority Ranking	
County	Weld
11. Legislative Issue	WAC to develop Allocation for Employment First Program
Proposed Solution	Amend Section 26-2-714 (c) by adding (VI) as follows: (VI) The works allocation committee shall develop a formula to allocate funding to counties for the employment first program implemented under the food stamp assistance.
Fiscal Impact	None
Potential Proponents / Opponents	
*Risk/	

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

Difficulties	
**County Commissioner Importance	
***CCI Time Commitment	
County's Priority Ranking	
County	Weld
12. Legislative Issue	<p>Flexibility with Adoption Money</p> <p>Background: Concern that State will take a larger role in adoption subsidy negotiations and require higher subsidies but use County Block money in those negotiations</p>
Proposed Solution	<p>Make it clear in statute that counties are in charge of negotiating adoption subsidies and if not, the state cannot use county block grant money to negotiate higher subsidies. Amend 26-7-102 to add something such as the following: (2) In most cases, the county which has custody of the child is the entity that negotiates the subsidy rates with the adoptive parents. If the department takes over a negotiation in any certain case, the department may not use county block grant money to increase a subsidy.</p>
Fiscal Impact	<p>Should not be an impact from legislation. It is clarifying current practice.</p>
Potential Proponents / Opponents	<p>We have not yet spoken with proponents or opponents about this proposal</p>

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

*Risk/ Difficulties	
**County Commissioner Importance	
***CCI Time Commitment	
County's Priority Ranking	
County	Weld
13. Legislative Issue	<p>Create a Designation That Allows the County to Assist Young Adults Who are Aging out of the System.</p> <p>Background: Need some sort of designation to assist kids who have been in our foster care system but have aged out because they are hitting very difficult times when they suddenly don't have support of the system</p>
Proposed Solution	Create a designation for a person who has recently aged out of the foster care system that allows the County to continue to assist them in certain areas.
Fiscal Impact	Unknown
Potential Proponents / Opponents	
*Risk/ Difficulties	
**County Commissioner	

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

Importance	
***CCI Time Commitment	
County's Priority Ranking	
Justice and Public Safety	
County	Fremont
14. Legislative Issue	Assistant District Attorney Salary Paid by the State
Proposed Solution	
Fiscal Impact	
Potential Proponents / Opponents	
*Risk/ Difficulties	
**County Commissioner Importance	
***CCI Time Commitment	
County's Priority Ranking	

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

County	Alamosa
15. Legislative Issue	<p>Unsentenced Inmates are not Able to Work Around the County.</p> <p>Background: Most of the inmates in the Alamosa County jail have not gone to trial. They may sit in the jail up to a year before the case is scheduled in court. We want to ask inmates if they want to volunteer and work for the County. This would be under the discretion of the Sheriff. We would like to expand the work beyond picking up trash along roads and highways. We would also like to change the language to include county facilities or county property. The issue is the statute prohibits working in municipalities. The courthouse and the county buildings are primarily in the municipality.</p>
Proposed Solution	CRS 17-26-107 (4). Any person (delete sentenced) (add) confined (delete shall) (add) may volunteer to work outside of the jail at the discretion of the Sheriff. The inmate would work at county facilities or on county property.
Fiscal Impact	None
Potential Proponents / Opponents	We have spoken with our Sheriff and he is ok with the idea.
*Risk/ Difficulties	
**County Commissioner Importance	
***CCI Time Commitment	

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

County's Priority Ranking	3
Land Use and Natural Resources	
County	Pitkin
16. Legislative Issue	<p>Water Compact Assurance Flows - Dedication of water rights not likely to be developed to satisfying state compact obligations while improving water quantity and quality in west slope streams.</p> <p>Background: Greater scrutiny is being paid to all water uses and conditional water rights holders are now required to submit diligence filings every six years. This results in both holders of the water right and opposers spending significant dollars preparing for the filing; and then repeating the same expenditure of funds every six years, often for water rights that are unproven or largely unused. Current water law only gives conditional rights holder two alternatives; pay the engineers and attorneys to demonstrate diligence in perfecting one's water rights every six years, or abandon those rights. Additionally, the Colorado Water Plan calls for maintaining the states natural environment by maintaining healthy rivers and streams. While communities plan and spend resources attempting to restore rivers and streams, it is being done while the 'cloud' of unperfected conditional water rights looms large</p>
Proposed Solution	Support legislation that would supplement the Colorado Water Plan that would create a new state water right for 'Colorado Compact Assurance Flows' which would allow the holder of West Slope

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

	<p>conditional water rights to voluntary convert conditional rights to a perfected right that is dedicated to helping Colorado assure its required delivery of water to the lower basin states.</p> <p><i>More detailed information attached in white paper.</i></p>
Fiscal Impact	None. However, tax credits or other enhancements may be used to stimulate use of the program.
Potential Proponents / Opponents	Opponents unknown at this time.
*Risk/ Difficulties	
**County Commissioner Importance	
***CCI Time Commitment	
County's Priority Ranking	
County's Priority Ranking	4
Public Lands	
County	Pitkin
17. Legislative Issue	<p>Funding for Aquatic Nuisance Species Inspection Program</p> <p>Background: During the 2017 Regular Session, HB17-1321 would have authorized Colorado Parks and Wildlife Commission to raise resident hunting</p>

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

	<p>and fishing license fees by up to 50% over time and provided a sustainable funding for fish and wildlife management. Although the legislation passed the House and there was bi-partisan support, the bill died in the Senate Finance Committee due to concerns regarding acquisitions and hunting and fishing license increases.</p> <p>However, the failure of the legislation also leaves Colorado water bodies at risk. The proposed legislation provided a permanent funding mechanism for the critical Aquatic Nuisance Species Program by creating a sticker fund to finance boat inspections.</p>
<p>Proposed Solution</p>	<p>As introduced in HB17-1321, require a person to purchase an aquatic nuisance species sticker to operate or use a vessel on the waters of the state or possess a vessel at a vessel staging area. The fees collected on the sale of aquatic nuisance species stickers are credited to the division of parks and wildlife aquatic nuisance species fund to help fund inspections of vessels and associated conveyances for the presence of aquatic nuisance species, decontamination of vessels or conveyances with the presence of aquatic nuisance species, lake monitoring for the presence of aquatic nuisance species, and outreach efforts.</p> <p>“In Colorado Revised Statutes, 33-13-103, amend (4); and add (6) as follows: 33-13-103. Numbering of vessels required - rules - definitions. (4) (a) Any person who violates subsection (1) of this section is guilty of a class petty offense and, upon conviction, shall be punished by a fine of fifty dollars EQUAL TO TWICE THE COST OF THE REGISTRATION FEE DESCRIBED IN</p>

SUBSECTION (1) OF THIS SECTION FOR THE TYPE OF VESSEL INVOLVED IN THE VIOLATION.

(b) ANY PERSON WHO VIOLATES SUBSECTION (6) OF THIS SECTION SHALL BE PUNISHED AS SET FORTH IN SECTION 33-10.5-105 (3).

(6) (a) COMMENCING ON JANUARY 1, 2018, IT IS UNLAWFUL FOR ANY PERSON TO OPERATE OR USE A VESSEL TEN FEET OR MORE IN LENGTH ON THE WATERS OF THIS STATE OR TO POSSESS A VESSEL AT A VESSEL STAGING AREA UNLESS AN AQUATIC NUISANCE SPECIES STICKER HAS BEEN ISSUED FOR THE VESSEL AND PLACED ON THE VESSEL.

7 (b) AN AQUATIC NUISANCE SPECIES STICKER ISSUED PURSUANT TO THIS SUBSECTION (6) REMAINS VALID FOR A PERIOD ENDING ON DECEMBER 31 OF THE YEAR OF ISSUANCE OF THE STICKER.

(c) (1) COMMENCING ON JANUARY 1, 2018, THE DIVISION MAY ISSUE THE FOLLOWING RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT AQUATIC NUISANCE SPECIES STICKERS FOR VESSELS TEN FEET OR MORE IN LENGTH AND SHALL COLLECT FEES FOR THE STICKERS IN THE FOLLOWING AMOUNTS:

TYPE OF VESSEL FEE

(A) RESIDENT, NONMOTORBOAT

\$15.00

(B) NONRESIDENT, NONMOTORBOAT

15.00

(C) RESIDENT, MOTORBOAT OR SAILBOAT

25.00

(D) NONRESIDENT, MOTORBOAT OR SAILBOAT

50.00

(II) THE STICKER FEES DESCRIBED IN SUBSECTION (6)(c)(I) OF THIS SECTION MAY, BY RULE, BE ADJUSTED BY AN AMOUNT UP TO THE TOTAL AMOUNT REFLECTED BY THE CHANGES MADE IN THE UNITED STATES BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS CONSUMER PRICE INDEX FOR THE DENVER-BOULDER-GREELEY CONSOLIDATED METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREA FOR ALL URBAN CONSUMERS AND ALL GOODS OR ITS SUCCESSOR INDEX AFTER THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS SUBSECTION (6)(c)(II). THE ADJUSTMENT IS NOT EFFECTIVE UNTIL THE COMMISSION NOTIFIES THE JOINT BUDGET COMMITTEE OF THE ADJUSTMENT. (d) ON OR BEFORE JANUARY 1, 2018, THE COMMISSION SHALL ESTABLISH BY RULE THE PRESCRIBED MANNER FOR DISPLAYING AN AQUATIC NUISANCE SPECIES STICKER ON A VESSEL. THE COMMISSION MAY DEVELOP AN APPLICATION FORM AND PROCESS THAT COMBINES THE APPLICATIONS FOR REGISTRATION PURSUANT TO SUBSECTION (1) OF THIS SECTION AND FOR AN AQUATIC NUISANCE SPECIES STICKER PURSUANT TO THIS SUBSECTION (6). 8 (e) ALL FEES COLLECTED PURSUANT TO THIS SUBSECTION (6) SHALL BE TRANSMITTED

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

	TO THE STATE TREASURER WHO SHALL CREDIT THE FEES TO THE DIVISION OF PARKS AND WILDLIFE AQUATIC NUISANCE SPECIES FUND CREATED IN SECTION 33-10.5-108 (1)(a)(I). 12 (f) AS USED IN THIS SUBSECTION (6): 13 (I) "AQUATIC NUISANCE SPECIES" HAS THE SAME MEANING AS SET FORTH IN SECTION 33-10.5-102 (1).
Fiscal Impact	Same as Legislative Council Fiscal Note regarding the Aquatic Nuisance Species Program
Potential Proponents / Opponents	Would expect similar proponents as HB17-1321. Removing the controversial elements of the prior legislation, would anticipate even more support.
*Risk/ Difficulties	
**County Commissioner Importance	
***CCI Time Commitment	
County's Priority Ranking	2
Taxation and Finance	
County	Ouray
18. Legislative Issue	<p>Forest Improvement Districts</p> <p>Background: Since the adoption of title 32, article 18 in 2007, no Forest Improvement Districts have been created in Colorado. The statute only allows for the levy of a sales tax. It does not contemplate the levy of</p>

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

	a property tax to fund this type of special district
Proposed Solution	Amend CRS 32-18-106 to specifically allow the powers of the Board of a Forest Improvement District to levy a property tax in addition to, or in the alternative of, its powers to levy a sales tax, subject to section 20 article X of the state constitution.
Fiscal Impact	Possible positive fiscal impact to the State, where less pressure would be put on the state to fund forest health where local funds have become available.
Potential Proponents / Opponents	State Forest Health Advisory Council has been polled on this question, and indicated this would be a good idea.
*Risk/ Difficulties	
**County Commissioner Importance	
***CCI Time Commitment	
County's Priority Ranking	2
County	Gunnison
19. Legislative Issue	<p>Allow Funds to be Utilized for Workforce Housing</p> <p>Background: Access to affordable and available workforce housing is a significant issue that is occurring in counties throughout Colorado. During discussions at the Spring CCI conference it was anecdotally observed that a majority of counties</p>

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

	<p>indicated that it was one of their top issues. With the population of Colorado expected to double in the next 25 years this is a problem that certainly will not go away and most likely will become more serious without pro-active measures being taken. Part of the challenge is the types of housing issues that each county faces, whether a rural, metropolitan or resort/ mountain community, are different and strategies to overcome the problem cannot be applied to all situations. Local and location specific solutions are often the most effective tool in overcoming the challenge. In many resort/ mountain communities the impact of tourism, while certainly an important element of local economies, is a significant driving force in creating the problem of lack of affordable and available housing for their workforces. In addition, the proliferation of Short Term Rentals also has exacerbated the challenges by eliminating what had traditionally been long term rentals utilized often by the local workforce. In an attempt to overcome this challenge many counties have either internally or through the use of Housing Authorities developed organizations and funding sources to either work independently or through private/ public partnerships to develop housing solutions to this problem. The funding sources to date have been limited to sales tax and/ or property tax. The Gunnison County Commissioners would like to propose potential legislation that would amend C.R.S. 30-11-1075 to allow its use not only for advertising and marketing of tourism but also as a mechanism to fund workforce housing either independently through the county or through a local Housing Authority.</p>
<p>Proposed Solution</p>	<p>Amend Colorado Revised Statute 30-11-107.5 to</p>

allow funds to be utilized for Workforce Housing

Currently Colorado Revised Statute 30-11-107.5 allows counties to levy a 2% lodging tax for the advertising and marketing of local tourism.

“(1) In accordance with the procedures set forth in this section, the board of county commissioners of each county, for the purpose of advertising and marketing local tourism, may levy a county lodging tax of not more than two percent on the purchase price paid or charged to persons for rooms or accommodations as included in the definition of “sale” in section 39-26-102(11), C.R.S.....

(3)(a) The board of county commissioners may, by resolution, approve a proposal for a county lodging tax; thereupon, such proposal for the county lodging tax shall be referred to the registered electors of the unincorporated areas and the municipalities subject to the lodging tax at a special election held for such purpose. Any such election may be combined with any other special election. On and after January 1, 1989, such tax may only be approved at a general election....

(4)(a) All revenue collected from such county lodging tax, except the amounts retained under subsection (2) of this section, shall be credited to a special fund designated as the county lodging tax tourism fund, hereby created. The fund shall be used only to advertise and market tourism in accordance with paragraphs (b) and (c) of this subsection...”

By including workforce housing as a use in Section 1 and 4 of this statute it would enable local counties or

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

	<p>housing authorities, should they choose to, <u>to ask their registered electors to approve a proposal for a county lodging tax, which includes short term rentals, to be utilized for advertising and marketing of local tourism as well as for funding workforce housing solutions.</u> It is important to note that this would not be a requirement of any local jurisdictions to enact but would rather be another option for counties and housing authorities to fund solutions for what may be one of the biggest challenges they face.</p>
Fiscal Impact	
Potential Proponents / Opponents	
*Risk/ Difficulties	
**County Commissioner Importance	
***CCI Time Commitment	
County's Priority Ranking	
Transportation and Telecommunications	
County	Hinsdale / Ouray /San Miguel
20. Legislative Issue	<p>Local Versus State Regulation of OHVs With Respect to Safety Requirements</p> <p>Background: Hinsdale County passed an ordinance this year that requires safety belts, eye protection,</p>

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

	helmets (for riders under 18), and other safety requirements for individuals operating OHVs on county roads. Hinsdale has now heard that they will have difficulty getting grants from the State Trails Program because their local regulations are not in alignment with state park rules - which require only working brakes, headlight/taillights, muffler and spark arrestor.
Proposed Solution	Seek clarifying legislation that amends the statute (similar to CRS 33-14.5-110) to say that local governments that have adopted ordinances or resolutions establishing safety requirements for OHVs are <u>not</u> inconsistent with any state rule or statute. The legislation MUST be enabling in nature and not in any way create additional statewide requirements for OHV usage.
Fiscal Impact	Positive Local Fiscal Impact and Neutral Fiscal Impact to State. Changing the law would make counties eligible for grant dollars from the Division of Parks and Wildlife.
Potential Proponents / Opponents	No opponents immediately apparent, although COHVCO has been making some noise subsequent to the passage of the Hinsdale County ordinance.
*Risk/ Difficulties	
**County Commissioner Importance	
***CCI Time Commitment	
County's Priority Ranking	1

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

Counties	San Miguel/Larimer
21. Legislative Issue	<p>Lack of Access to Abundant, Redundant, Affordable, Reliable Broadband in Rural Areas</p> <p>Background: In several recent legislative sessions, broadband legislation has originated outside of CCI/Mountain Connect stakeholders that would be very detrimental to rural broadband enhancement efforts and further expand the “broadband divide”.</p>
Proposed Solution	<p>A group of diverse rural broadband stakeholders has been meeting to develop balanced and effective legislation to provide meaningful authorities and policies that will result in broadband deployment in rural areas in Colorado. Solutions being considered include:</p> <p>Fixing the High-Cost/Broadband Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Make Internet Service Providers (ISPs) established AFTER 2014 eligible grant applicants ▪ Eliminate “right of first refusal” for incumbent providers ▪ If “right of first refusal” cannot be eliminated, require that those incumbent providers taking over a grant must provide equal or better service/speeds with the same pricing and in the same time frame ▪ Amend the definitions for glass versus copper ▪ Make it impossible for grantees to accept CAF II funding for the same project (no “double dipping”)

- Amend the “competition test” in statute to effectuate additional moneys moving from the HCF to the Broadband Fund (as set forth in the draft legislation that Sen. Coram was considering late last session)
- Make it clear that areas that have been “released” by incumbents during CAF II determinations are eligible for assistance in the grant program (and no “right of first refusal” is possible by an incumbent)
- The Broadband Deployment Board (group that makes the programmatic grants) should consider alternative strategies for allocating broadband funds, including targeting dollars at areas where a gap analysis has revealed a need

Better Coordination Between Local and State Agencies

Establish an “open access” policy for state agencies that are building/installing broadband infrastructure that would allow local governments to coordinate with them and piggyback on their efforts. Where possible, reduce multiple state and regional communications circuit duplication and promote the utilization of local and state circuit aggregation.

Examples:

- State circuit with Century Link for Department of Motor Vehicles
- State wide circuit for Community College administrative network
- Laying of fiber in conduits along CDOT rights-of-way

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional and state circuits for courts <p>Changes to the law regarding easements Amend state statute to allow for a change in use of pre-existing fiber optic lines (usually switching the fiber to a commercial use) without having to first get permission from the property owner.</p>
Fiscal Impact	<p>Legislation that results in broadband infrastructure in rural areas will have very positive fiscal impacts for local governments, citizens and businesses.</p> <p>Depending on the actual legislation and if there is state partnership funding, it may or may not have a state fiscal impact. Lack of broadband is concentrating 80% of Colorado’s jobs in the Front Range urban areas and causing negative economic impacts, challenges for diversifying and recovering rural economies, inadequate infrastructure for tele-health, education, public safety, and other local government services.</p>
Potential Proponents / Opponents	<p>Big telecom may be an opponent but goal is to craft balanced legislation that will be positive for County’s and incumbent providers.</p>
*Risk/ Difficulties	
**County Commissioner Importance	
***CCI Time Commitment	
County’s Priority Ranking	1

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

County	Pitkin
22. Legislative Issue	<p>Ballot Referral for a Statewide Transportation Funding that includes new fiscal resources for maintenance, improvements and transit and wildlife infrastructure.</p> <p>Background: HB17-1242 would have infused new fiscal resources into the statewide transportation system. The current transportation needs (local and statewide) cannot be met within the existing State Budget without severely impacting resources to counties, such as possibly severance dollars. The measure had bipartisan support, passed the House, support of CCI and would have passed the Senate. It was killed in Senate Finance. Seek a ballot measure similar to the 2017 failed effort to be referred to 2018 ballot measure for a robust transportation funding mechanism integrating resources for transit as well as wildlife safety infrastructure.</p>
Proposed Solution	<u>HB17-1242</u>
Fiscal Impact	Same as Legislative Council Fiscal Note for HB17-1242
Potential Proponents / Opponents	Would expect similar proponents as HB17-1242. Opponents as anticipated to create transportation funding mechanism within existing state budget.
*Risk/ Difficulties	
**County Commissioner Importance	
***CCI Time	

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

Commitment	
County's Priority Ranking	1
County	Ouray
23. Legislative Issue	<p>Cell Phone Use While Operating Motor Vehicle / Distracted Driving</p> <p>Background: We are observing an increasing number of deaths on rural highways due to center-line cross over. While Colorado State Patrol includes mandatory reporting regarding suspected causes of either 1) Alcohol/Drugs or 2) Excessive Speed, the report blotter does not include reporting of suspected cause of accident due to distracted driving.</p>
Proposed Solution	<p>Increasing data gathering due to suspected causes of center-line crossover fatalities will help determine whether more severe penalties for distracted driving should be imposed. Current fines imposed by CRS 42-4-239 limit the fine amount to \$50. This section was introduced in 2005, and last amended in 2009. Penalty is only a Class A penalty under CRS 42-4-17-1. Due to the increasing use of cell phones, And the increasing number of accidents possibly caused by this use, we suggest that the penalty be changed to a Class 1 Penalty under 42-4-1701.</p>
Fiscal Impact	Possible positive fiscal impact to State due to possible increased penalties assessed for violations
Potential Proponents / Opponents	Likely additional proponents are Coroners for both Ouray and neighboring counties.

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

*Risk/ Difficulties	
**County Commissioner Importance	
***CCI Time Commitment	
County's Priority Ranking	1
County	Summit
24. Legislative Issue	<p>Ability to change the Statutory Speed Limits</p> <p>Background: In the state of Colorado vehicular speed limits are established in the Colorado Revised Statutes (CR.S. 42-4-I 10 I). Of specific interest is the speed limit for residential areas which is set at 30 miles per hour. County staff often hear from residents that they believe that a safe and appropriate speed limit for residential neighborhoods is 25 miles per hour, thus there is a conflict between the statutes and the desire of citizens.</p>
Proposed Solution	Amend the statute to enable counties to set residential area speed limits at 25 miles per hour without the need for conducting a traffic investigation or speed survey.
Fiscal Impact	No impact anticipated.
Potential Proponents / Opponents	It is possible that there could be some pushback from traffic engineers.
*Risk/	

CCI 2018 PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

Difficulties	
**County Commissioner Importance	
***CCI Time Commitment	
County's Priority Ranking	2