



Master Table 2026 Legislative Priority Proposals

Updated: 9/26/25

GENERAL GOVERNMENT	2
JUSTICE & PUBLIC SAFETY	19
TOURISM, RESORTS, & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	39
TAXATION & FINANCE	46
HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES	67
LAND USE & NATURAL RESOURCES	81
AGRICULTURE, WILDLIFE, & RURAL AFFAIRS.....	94

General Government

Election Signature Verification Process	
Prowers County	
Preferred Contact:	dwilson@prowerscounty.net
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	None.
Who is your subject matter expert?	Don Wilson, Prowers County Administrator, 719-336-8025, dwilson@prowerscounty.net
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	Allow rural counties to have a bipartisan team of election judges to review ballot signatures in Tier 1 level since we do not have an automated verification device.
Areas of Impact:	Functionality of county programs or services; General community advancement
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	Statute and rulemaking.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	Allow for a Bipartisan team of elections judges in Tier 1 that don't have the automated signature verification equipment. This option would provide smaller counties with trust, transparency and accountability in accepting ballot signatures.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	Allow a team of Bipartisan election judges to verify signatures in a mail ballot election (HB25-1089).
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	N/A
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	No position was taken by CCI.
What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	Rural County Clerk & Recorder's.

What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	Secretary of State's Office and larger counties with signature verification equipment
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	Rep Richardson ran HB25-1089 last year.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county? Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	Smaller counties may have to budget for one additional judge if they choose to use this process and some may already have funds accounted for.
What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? <i>Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.</i>	Per fiscal note of HB25-1089 no financial impact.
Staff Feedback	<u>Risk / Difficulty:</u> High – Based on last year, the likelihood that this bill will pass in an election year is low. Moreover, House Democratic leadership instructed the caucus to not sign on as cosponsors to last year’s effort. Rep Paschal, who initially agreed to sponsor the bill last year, has informed staff that she will not be a sponsor this year. <u>Time Commitment:</u> High – If this proposal does move forward, this will require engagement with House and Senate Leadership, as well as securing bipartisan sponsors. Furthermore, amendments were made to last year’s version that created an unfunded mandate for all counties. These amendments were made at the request of County Clerks and SOS and brought them to a neutral position.

Permitting Counties to Publish Legal Notices in Nonperiodical Newspapers When Newspapers with Periodical Permits are Unavailable in a Subject County	
Eagle County (Commissioner Tom Boyd)	
Preferred Contact:	tom.boyd@eaglecounty.us
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	N/A
Who is your subject matter expert?	Beth Oliver, County Attorney, Eagle County. (970) 328-8685. Beth.Oliver@eaglecounty.us Matt Peterson, Senior Assistant County Attorney, Eagle County. (970) 328-8685. Matt.peterson@eaglecounty.us Laura Hartman, Senior Policy Analyst, Eagle County. (970) 328-8613. laura.hartman@eaglecounty.us
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	A county generally has to publish legal notices in a newspaper that: (1) has an office in the county; (2) is in general circulation in the county; (3) has been published within the county for a certain amount of time; and (4) has a periodicals permit issued by the U.S. Postal Service. See C.R.S. § 24-70-103 and C.R.S. § 24-70-102 (“No publication, no matter how frequently published, shall be considered a legal publication unless it has been admitted to the United States mails with periodicals mailing privileges”). If there is not a newspaper that meets all of these requirements, the county must publish legal notices in a newspaper within an adjacent county that has: (1) general circulation in all or part of the subject county; (2) publication within the subject county for a certain amount of time; and (3) a periodicals permit issued by the U.S. Postal Service. See C.R.S. § 24-70-103(3). In sum, state law dictates that a county must first publish legal notices in a newspaper located in the county that distributes in the county and has a periodicals permit. If a county cannot identify a newspaper that meets these requirements, the county must publish its legal notices in a newspaper from an adjacent county that distributes within the subject county and has a periodicals permit. The law does not further define legal publication requirements should the county not have a newspaper within the county or within an adjacent county that has a periodicals permit. Accordingly, it is unclear whether a county that does not have a newspaper with a periodicals permit in its own jurisdiction or in an adjacent county can meet legal notice requirements.

Areas of Impact:	Day-to-day operations. In addition, if a county lacked a newspaper meeting the periodicals privilege requirement, and there was no such newspaper in an adjacent county, the subject county could not comply with the statute as currently written and its public notices may be inadequate under state law.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	Statutory requirements that do not further the practical goal of providing notice to the widest possible audience. Increasingly, local papers do not possess periodicals privileges, limiting where counties can publish legal notices. Often, counties are prevented from publishing in newspapers with the most circulation in their jurisdiction because those newspapers do not have periodicals privileges or counties pay duplicative fees to publish in both the paper of general circulation, and a second paper with periodicals privileges which may only have circulation in a small area of the county. Counties may also be required to publish legal notice in a newspaper based in an adjacent county that may have substantially less distribution than another newspaper within the county that lacks a periodicals permit.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	C.R.S. § 24-70-103(4) provides an exception for municipalities. If there is no paper in a municipality that meets the periodicals requirement, the municipality can publish legal notices in another paper of general circulation. C.R.S. § 24-70-103(4) should be amended to include counties so that a county may also publish legal notices in a paper of general circulation within the county when there is no newspaper published within the county with a periodicals permit. Including counties in the exception created for municipalities would also require deletion of C.R.S. § 24-70-103(3) because if that subsection were to remain, the statutory structure would require counties to publish legal notice in a newspaper with a periodicals permit in an adjacent county before counties could rely on the exception identified in C.R.S. § 24-70-103(4) solely because a newspaper in an adjacent county has a periodicals permit. This statutory structure would lead to absurd results in that the order of precedence for legal publication would be as follows: (1) publication in a newspaper with a periodicals permit within the county; (2) publication in a newspaper with a periodicals permit in an adjacent county; (3) publication in a newspaper of general circulation without a periodicals permit within the county. Public policy favors publication of legal notice within the subject jurisdiction and the correct order of precedence should be: (1) publication in a newspaper with a periodicals permit within the county; (2) publication in a newspaper of general circulation without a periodicals permit within the county. It would then be necessary to create an exception allowing counties with no newspapers within their jurisdiction to publish notices in an adjacent county in the same order of precedence. Alternatively, the periodicals permit requirement in C.R.S. § 24-70-102 could be removed altogether, or the statute could be completely rewritten

	in order to authorize publication of legal notices electronically on county websites similar to recent changes made to notice provisions contained within the Colorado Open Meetings law.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	Amend C.R.S. § 24-70-103(3) and (4) as follows: “(3) If in any county in this state no newspaper has been published for the prescribed period at the time when any such notice or advertisement is required to be published or if there is no newspaper published therein, such notice or advertisement may be published in any newspaper published in whole or in part in an adjoining county and having a general circulation in whole or in part in said county having no newspaper published therein. If there is no newspaper in any adjoining county that has been published for the prescribed period at the time when any such notice or advertisement is required to be published, a required notice or advertisement may be published in a newspaper having general circulation within the county. (4) Notwithstanding any other provision of this part 1, if no newspaper is published within the territorial boundaries of a <u>municipality OR COUNTY</u> that satisfies the requirements for a legal publication as specified in section 24-70-102, but a newspaper that provides local news and that would satisfy the requirements to be admitted to the United States mails with periodicals mailing privileges but for the absence of paid circulation is distributed within such territorial boundaries, the municipality <u>OR COUNTY</u> may publish any legal notice or advertisement required by law in such newspaper.” Such proposal would then need to add a subsection 4.5 authorizing counties without any newspaper within their jurisdiction to publish legal notices in a newspaper in an adjacent jurisdiction. Alternatively, C.R.S. § 24-70-102 could be amended as follows: “Every newspaper printed and published daily, or daily except Sundays and legal holidays, or on each of any five days in every week excepting legal holidays and including or excluding Sundays shall be considered and held to be a daily newspaper; every newspaper printed and published at regular intervals three times each week shall be considered and held to be a triweekly newspaper; every newspaper printed and published at regular intervals twice each week shall be considered and held to be a semiweekly newspaper; and every newspaper printed and published at regular intervals once each week shall be considered and held to be a weekly newspaper. No publication, no matter how frequently published, shall be

	considered a legal publication unless it has been admitted to the United States mails with periodicals mailing privileges.” Alternatively, the statute could be completely revised to authorize counties to publish legal notices electronically on their respective websites, similar to recent changes to the Colorado Open Meetings Law.
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	Because the problem originates in statute, it requires legislative amendment.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	To our knowledge this issue has not been elevated to CCI or another organization.
What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	It is anticipated that counties that lack a newspaper with periodicals privileges or that lack any newspaper within their jurisdiction would be supportive.
What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	Potentially, newspapers and the publishing industry would be opposed to providing more options to counties in choosing their papers for legal noticing because the publication of legal notices can be important revenue generators.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	No, we have not contacted legislators.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county? Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	For many years, Eagle County has double paid for legal notices. We have paid to publish in a small paper that serves just a corner of our county because it meets the periodicals requirement. We have also paid to publish in a newspaper of wide circulation that does not have periodicals privileges. The solution would likely halve our publishing costs.
What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties?	Other counties would face similar financial challenges and solutions. Newspapers could individually see increases or decreases in revenue from county noticing depending on local circumstances if the periodicals requirement were removed. If counties were granted the same carve out as

What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.	municipalities, the potential impacts on newspapers might be at a smaller scale. There would be no financial implications for the State.
Staff Feedback	<u>Risk / Difficulty:</u> Low – If the bill is written as the narrow exemption in the proposal, the Colorado Press Association is unlikely to oppose the bill. If the bill goes beyond this exemption, there will have to be more conversations with the Press Association to secure their neutrality. <u>Time Commitment:</u> Medium – Although sponsors need to be secured, and there will be a need for stakeholder engagement, there are few stakeholders that will be engaged in this policy (mainly CPA). Additionally, since there is already a section with a municipal exception, drafting should be relatively simple.

Protection for Elected Officials from Political Violence	
Arapahoe County (Commissioner Jessica Campbell)	
Preferred Contact:	jcampbell@arapahoe.gov
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	N/A
Who is your subject matter expert?	N/A
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	Violent threats and violence against elected officials have been on the rise for almost a decade. In part, this can be attributed to an increase in the violent language about opponents used by candidates for and holders of elected office. Such rhetoric and violence create a chilling effect in dissent, in the number of people willing to run for office, and ultimately the quality of our democracy.
Areas of Impact:	Government efficacy and elected officials' safety.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	Nonexistent statute.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	In recognition of the power and unique position of those who run for and hold elected office, the enhanced credence and deference given to their words, and the chilling effect violent outcomes from violent rhetoric have on our democracy, we propose Colorado deter such individuals from using language that threatens, supports, and/or encourages such behaviors by criminalizing the public communication of such violence. Specifically, we propose modifying existing statute to make it a criminal offense for candidates for, holders of, and former holders of elected office to publicly—be it printed, recorded, or in live public delivery—use language that threatens, supports, or encourages any form of violence against candidates for, holders of, and former holders of elected office.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	C.R.S § 1-13-726 Amendment: Revise title and add new section that states: "It is unlawful for candidates for, holders of, and former holders of elected office to publicly—be it printed, recorded, or in live public delivery—use language that threatens, supports, or encourages any form of violence against candidates for, holders of, and former holders of elected office for performing their official duties. Each such offense is a class 1 misdemeanor."
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation?	No. However, in Colorado elected officials can legally have their personal information redacted from certain public records to improve personal safety. For example, the Colorado Secretary of State temporarily shut

Has your county explored these alternatives?	down the state's campaign finance database in the wake of the Minnesota assassinations to better ensure legislator safety. Since then, 40-55 Colorado officials have submitted requests to have their personal information removed from the state database before it's turned back on.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	To our knowledge, neither CCI, nor other organizations have sought a solution to this problem.
What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	We think this is an issue that should have broad local elected official support (i.e. CML, SDA, CCAT). As well as support from democracy-centered, good-governance interest groups such as ACLU and the Bell Policy Center.
What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	Potentially, First Amendment rights groups.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	We have not.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county? Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	Language that threatens, supports, or encourages violence from elected officials toward other elected officials doesn't have any direct financial implications on Arapahoe County. Neither does making that language unlawful have any financial implications on Arapahoe County.
What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? <i>Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.</i>	Language that threatens, supports, or encourages violence from elected officials toward other elected officials doesn't have any direct financial implications on other impacted parties. Using HB22-1273 , making such language unlawful could result in increases in workloads for local governments and the Justice Department with minimal financial implications.

Staff Feedback	<u>Risk / Difficulty:</u> High – As proposed, I have concerns about this proposal for several reasons. It criminalizes speech by politicians based on content of that speech, which, in my view, will create First Amendment Issues. Colorado law also addresses this behavior in several ways: Menacing for placing someone in fear of imminent serious bodily injury; Stalking for credible threats and repeated contact; Harassment including electronic contacts in certain circumstances; Inciting a riot for urging a group to imminent riot; Retaliation against an elected official already exists as SB21-064; and Election-official protections and anti-doxxing from HB22-1273. Moreover, any bill that a) creates a new crime and/or b) increases penalties for existing crimes faces strict scrutiny by the current General Assembly. Most bills of this nature fail in the House. Overall, we can expect bipartisan resistance to this proposal and near-certain litigation if it is focused on conduct of elected officials. Some ways that we could modify the proposal and possibly avoid First Amendment Conflicts include: • Increase penalties of existing crimes when the offender is an elected official, former officeholder, or candidate, and the victim is an elected official, candidate, or their immediate family. (High difficulty) • Amend HB22-1273's framework to cover elected officials and candidates, not just election workers. Prohibit publishing personally identifying information with intent to threaten, coerce, or substantially impede official duties, and add a civil cause of action plus rapid injunctive relief. This would need very clear definitions (High difficulty) <u>Time Commitment:</u> High – We would need willing bill sponsors and a great deal of stakeholding. While there is a possible supportive coalition in local government associations (CML, SDA, CASE, CASB, Sheriffs, etc), there will be many organizations that might take issue, including the ACLU. If we want to create a new crime or increased penalties, we will need to engage CDAC, Public Defenders, Criminal Defense Bar, and others.
----------------	--

Electrical inspector flexibility for small local governments	
Clear Creek County (Commissioner George Marlin)	
Preferred Contact:	gmarlin@clearcreekcounty.us (also available by phone)
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	Clear Creek BOCC.
Who is your subject matter expert?	David Danielson, County Building Official. (303) 679-2360. ddanielson@clearcreekcounty.us
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	Statute currently requires all electrical inspectors to be licensed electricians. SB17-247 repealed 12-115-119 1aIB, which was made effective in 2023. That paragraph allowed persons who had been certified as residential electrical inspectors by a national certification authority to conduct electrical inspections on residential building of four units or less. While this change may be practical in larger jurisdictions with larger teams, it created significant barriers to creating a building department that can effectively serve people who want to build. In Clear Creek County, a building department with three people who can conduct inspections is enough to provide effective service to builders and homeowners. We are able to provide inspections five days a week and respond promptly to permit requests. However, we are not able to provide this service for electrical inspections without hiring a dedicated electrical inspector with an electrician's license. This would require a roughly 33% increase in our staffing cost. The state inspection system only guarantees electrical inspections twice a week. There are few private companies that provide inspection services and they also historically only provide inspections twice a week in Clear Creek where those contracts are in place. This mismatch in service availability reduces service levels, making construction in rural areas more difficult and costly. Further, it makes it more difficult to build a robust locally operated building department. Clear Creek County has been exploring offering building inspection services to the municipalities within the county. Our municipalities currently use a private provider for these services. While we are able to offer better services for most elements of inspection, the municipalities

	would have to revert to state electrical inspection in order to use us instead of a private company. The State Electrical Departments resources appear to be very limited, they do not have the ability to accommodate the unique needs of every jurisdiction they serve nor provide a collaborative working relationship with every building department. The department also lacks several key components of effective construction oversight such as such as: plan review, proper permitting procedures, an adequate permitting system which all jurisdictions can access for review of inspection record and clear and concise jurisdictional limits. These issues have created a gaps in oversight for local building officials. Many other states allow International Code Council certified inspectors to conduct inspections and people benefit from the flexibility that affords.
Areas of Impact:	Day-to-day operations of the county; Functionality of county programs or services; Power/Authority/Mandate of county government; General community advancement; Zoning; Environmental health.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	SB17-247 repealed 12-115-119 1a1B, which was made effective in 2023. That paragraph allowed persons who had been certified as residential electrical inspectors by a national certification authority to conduct electrical inspections on residential building of four units or less.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	Allow small and rural jurisdictions to conduct electrical inspections on some projects by a person that is certified through a national certification authority. Jurisdiction size could be defined by population or by the number of building permits or electrical permits issued. If the latter is pursued, that may allow for the best way to approximate which jurisdictions don't have the permitting volume to justify hiring a dedicated licensed electrician to conduct those inspections. Alternatively, a policy change could focus on housing density, allowing for better alignment between drive times and Most generally, a clear path forward for individuals to become electrical inspectors without the requisite working experience of those licensed in the trade will enable stronger, more effective and less costly local building departments in rural areas. There may be other changes that would help the process in larger jurisdictions without removing the requirement for licensed electricians in those jurisdictions that have shown it is practical to staff this role.

Please provide sample language for this solution.	Insert into statute: 12-23-115 (B). 12-115-119 (1)(a)(I)(b) Within jurisdictions which have populations of less than 75,000 people or jurisdictions with less than 1000 people per square mile, persons who have been certified as residential electrical inspectors by a national certification authority and who have furnished satisfactory evidence of at least two years' practical experience in the electrical inspection of residential dwellings.
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	There is not a private or public solution to this problem that does not involve a change to statute.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	No.
What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	Local government organizations such as CML, CAST and CCAT Colorado Chapter of the International Code Council, National Association of Home Builders Housing advocates.
What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers is an important stakeholder with significant concerns about any change to the status quo in statute. They supported the change in 2017. Engagement with this organization will be crucial to ensure that safety standards are not compromised associated with any change. Their expertise will provide significant value to the development of a policy that enables strong local building department oversight. The Colorado Department of Regulatory affairs may also have concerns about the proposal and its impact on their ability to finance electrical inspection services in those areas that don't provide them locally.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	Senator Pelton reached out to CCI and Clear Creek County to express concerns with how this change would impact the safety of newly constructed homes. Senator Pelton is an important stakeholder due to his knowledge of electrical systems, historic commitment to strong local government services and sensible approach to regulations.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county?	Problem: The existing limitations on who can inspect electrical systems increase labor costs by shrinking the number of eligible applicants. It also reduces the permit revenue that a building department can rely on when it does not have an adequate number of electrical permits to justify hiring a certified electrician.

Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	Solution: If small jurisdictions were able to conduct electrical inspections in an efficient manner while maintaining safety and better integrating plan review and inspections, we would be able to use the permit fees to offset the costs of building a more robust team of inspectors and a stronger building department overall.
What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? <i>Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.</i>	Builders, residents, property managers, and property owners realize higher costs associated with construction, repairs, and maintenance. The Department of Regulatory Affairs may see reduced permit revenue if this change enables more local inspections.
Staff Feedback	<u>Risk / Difficulty:</u> High – This bill will face bipartisan opposition. On one hand, some Republican members will be opposed for safety reasons. Senator Pelton has already indicated that he would fight this measure. On the other hand, labor groups will be staunchly opposed to this measure, as they pushed for the licensure requirement to be put into statute. I can expect this to be a huge fight, and the likelihood of passage is very low. <u>Time Commitment:</u> High – This will require difficult conversations with electricians, labor unions, and the Department of Regulatory Agencies. Sponsors also have to be secured.

Opt-in Provision for Frontier Colorado Counties to Use a Different CPI when Determining Elected Salary Increases	
Mineral County (Commissioner Ramona Weber)	
Preferred Contact:	comm.dist3@mincocolo.com
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	R. Scott Lamb, Mineral County Commissioner, Zeke Ward, Mineral County Commissioner, Dolores County, Hinsdale County
Who is your subject matter expert?	Janelle Kukuk, County Administrator, Mineral County, 719-658-2360, countyadmin@mincocolo.com
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	Slows the impact on County budgets of mandated increases in Elected Official salaries.
Areas of Impact:	Day-to-day operations of the county; Functionality of county programs or services; Power/Authority/Mandate of county government.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	Using a higher CPI adjustment than is realistic for frontier counties for the mandated increases, butts heads with the mandated tax revenue cap and threatens staff jobs and services provided.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	Allow Frontier Counties (definition used for these purposes is a population density of 10 people or less per square mile) to opt-in to use the Bureau of Labor Statistics West Mountain Region CPI instead of the Denver-Aurora-Lakewood CPI to calculate mandated increases to Elected Officials salaries. Supplemental Material: Counties by the Numbers .
Please provide sample language for this solution.	Amend C.R.S. 30-2-102 (2.3)(b) - ...shall adjust the amount of each annual salary in each category specified in paragraph (a) of this subsection (2.3) in accordance with the percentage change over the period in the US Dept of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, CPI for Denver-Boulder-Greeley, all items, all consumers or its successor index. Add: "Frontier Counties" (defined as less than 10 people per square mile based on Census Data) may opt-in to use US Dept of Labor, Bureau of Statistics, CPI for Mountain West Region, all items all consumers, or its successor index. Opt-in must be submitted at time of budget submission to the Department of Local Affairs. (Potentially Opt-in sunsets every 10 years and must be re-submitted when new Census data is released.) (First sunset would be 2030, subsequent sunsets would be in 10-year increments.)
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your c10-	Any solution to this problem will require state-level legislation. The only other option available is for a County to drop a category which is not always a popular option.

year explored these alternatives?	
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	In 2024 Dolores County submitted a similar proposal to mitigate the impact of the higher CPI.
What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	31 Frontier Counties (those with a population density of 10 people or less per square mile).
What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	The other 33 Counties. There are 10 Counties with a population density of 20 people or less per square mile that could/should be included in the opt-in opportunity.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	Senator Cleave Simpson and Representative Matthew Martinez have been contacted.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county? Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	The mandated increases with a CPI that does not reflect the economic condition of our County will be in direct conflict with the mandated tax revenue cap as early as 2026 and will for sure in 2027 and beyond. Doing quick calculations, the potential increase in taxes will be less than the potential increase in elected salaries in 2027 using the current CPI. The budget crisis that this creates will threaten employee morale, services and staff jobs. We have narrowly averted making service and staff cuts for the last two years. Currently wages/salaries in our General Fund budget make up 45% of the budget. The salaries of the eight elected officials make up 36% of our wage/salary budget in the General Fund, the wage budget for the other twenty-one staff members make up the other 64%. Mineral County has for several years given our employees a modest cost of living raise. These budget constraints will limit, if not eliminate this practice. The mandated increases in elected official salaries has often nearly doubled those increases for staff. The solution does not solve the problem, but it will slow the race to the cliff. We are hoping it will make budgeting more manageable and give us more time to make other adjustments to the budgets, i.e., shift some of the insurance burden or find less costly insurance, identify additional efficiencies in our everyday tasks, etc., to live in the unfunded world in which we live.

What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? <i>Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.</i>	The assumption is all Frontier Counties are suffering some of the same issues we are, to what degree we don't know. Conversely, the hope is that the other counties could experience the and benefit from easing up on the rate of increases as we would. We acknowledge that this change would/could increase the workload on DOLA but we believe it would be a minimal increase, i.e. processing opt-in paperwork and communicating with legislative council to identify the Counties who have opted in. If there is a sunset provision, there would be a repeat of this work every 10 years.
Staff Feedback	<u>Risk/Difficulty</u>: Low – If the bill is written in a narrow way, I think there will be very little resistance to this policy, especially if it is simply an option for Frontier counties. We would need to ensure that other county-wide officials would be supportive of a county using a lower CPI to calculate salaries. Another factor to consider, this bill will create a fiscal note, as there will be an FTE associated with the change. In such a tight budget year, I anticipate any bill that has a fiscal note to face challenges. <u>Time commitment</u>: Medium – This will require drafting, securing sponsors, and stakeholding, including creating a coalition to support the bill. CCI would also need to engage labor organizations to ensure they are neutral.

Justice & Public Safety

EMS Essential Services	
Yuma County (Commissioner Scott Weaver)	
Preferred Contact:	Phone: 970-630-7611
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	N/A
Who is your subject matter expert?	Rep. Dusty A. Johnson, District 63. (970)-370-1154. dustyforcolorado@gmail.com.
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	Currently, Emergency Medical Technicians (EMT) and EMS individuals are not qualified as “essential workers.”
Areas of Impact:	Day-to-day operations of the county; Functionality of county programs or services; General community advancement; Funding mechanisms.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	Outdated statute and funding shortfalls.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	Proposal is being developed.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	
What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	SEMTAC
What possible organization(s)	

would oppose your proposed solution?	
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	Rep. Dusty Johnson has agreed to run this bill and is gathering co-sponsors in both chambers.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county? Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	
What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? <i>Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.</i>	
Staff Feedback	<u>Risk / Difficulty:</u> Low - This bill is unlikely to draw significant (if any) opposition. <u>Time Commitment:</u> Low - Sponsors have already been identified for this bill and it is anticipated that a minimum amount of stakeholder sessions will be needed. Minimal time is needed to develop messaging to answer the question of “why” this bill is needed.

Rollback Immigration Policies	
El Paso County (Commissioner Carrie Geitner)	
Preferred Contact:	Phone
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	None.
Who is your subject matter expert?	Brandon Wilson, Government Affairs Advisor, El Paso County.
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	Local law enforcement agencies are currently restricted from partnering with federal immigration authorities. This creates critical gaps in intelligence sharing, enforcement coordination, and public safety efforts across the state. Individuals who may pose a threat to community security, including those with prior deportation orders or criminal records, can evade detection and remain in local communities. As a result, law enforcement is forced to operate with limited tools and incomplete information, undermining their capacity to protect residents and uphold the rule of law. Furthermore, this lack of coordination places additional strain on local resources, increases operational inefficiencies, and diminishes public trust.
Areas of Impact:	Day-to-day operations of the county; Functionality of county programs or services; Power/Authority/Mandate of county government; General community advancement.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	Over the past several years, Colorado has enacted a series of laws that significantly limit cooperation between local law enforcement and federal immigration authorities, effectively establishing the state as a sanctuary jurisdiction. Beginning with House Bill 19-1124, the state prohibited local law enforcement from arresting or detaining individuals solely based on ICE detainer requests. This was followed by Senate Bill 20-083, which barred immigration-related arrests at courthouses, and Senate Bill 21-131, which prohibited state employees from sharing personal data with immigration enforcement agencies. In 2025, the Colorado legislature passed Senate Bill 25-276, the most sweeping legislation to date, which banned local agencies, including law enforcement, schools, and hospitals from honoring ICE detainers, sharing personal information, or granting federal agents access to facilities without a judicial warrant.

What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	El Paso County is proposing legislation similar to Senate Bill 25-047 . This legislation would prohibit local governments in Colorado from adopting policies that restrict cooperation with federal immigration authorities. It would also permit local law enforcement to report individuals suspected—based on probable cause—of being unlawfully present in the U.S. to Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE).
Please provide sample language for this solution.	Please reference bill text from SB25-047 that talks about re-creating and re-enacting (with amendments) article 29 of title 29.
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	We have determined that the only way to achieve this policy goal is through the passage of state level legislation.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	During the 2025 session, Senate Bill 25-047 was introduced as a corrective measure to restore collaboration between local and federal agencies by allowing law enforcement to cooperate with ICE, share information, and honor detainer requests. Unfortunately, the bill was postponed indefinitely during its first committee hearing.
What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	Proponents could include county commissioners and other local officials, law enforcement agencies and sheriffs' associations, certain state lawmakers and policy advocates, victims' rights groups and public safety organizations, as well as members of the public.
What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	Opponents could include immigrant advocacy organizations such as the ACLU and Colorado Immigrant Rights Coalition, progressive lawmakers and local officials, and potentially civil liberties groups.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	El Paso County Rep. Jarvis Caldwell is very interested in either sponsoring or supporting this type of legislation.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county? Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	Allowing local law enforcement to partner with federal immigration authorities would reduce costs to counties by reducing the number of services that are being used by those who are in the country unlawfully. It would also allow dangerous individuals to be removed off the streets, which could disrupt criminal activities and make the community safer.

What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? <i>Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.</i>	The current restrictions on cooperation between local law enforcement and federal immigration authorities impose significant financial burdens on counties, state departments, and other stakeholders. Local governments face increased operational costs due to duplicated efforts, a lack of intelligence sharing, and limited enforcement tools, which strain public safety budgets and reduce efficiency. Additionally, counties must absorb the cost of services—such as emergency healthcare, housing, and public assistance—for undocumented individuals who remain in communities due to limited federal coordination. The state risks losing federal funding tied to law enforcement and public safety, while departments like the Colorado Department of Public Safety (CDPS), the Department of Human Services (CDHS), and the Department of Health Care Policy and Financing (HCPF) experience added pressure from increased service demands. The proposed legislative solution would restore the ability of local law enforcement to cooperate with federal immigration authorities, likely reducing costs by enabling the removal of individuals who pose a threat to public safety and decreasing reliance on local resources. It may also enhance access to federal funding and reduce the burden on state agencies.
Staff Feedback	<u>Risk / Difficulty:</u> High - Based on last year's votes, this bill faces nearly impossible odds for passage given the makeup of the General Assembly. Last session, SB25-276 (Protect Civil Rights Immigration Status) was supported by every member of the majority party except for one Senator. <u>Time Commitment:</u> Low - The bill language is straightforward, there will be no shortage of members of the minority party desiring to sponsor it, and a minimum number of stakeholder sessions will be needed to explain the bill and have interested parties make position decisions.

Massage Facility Background Check Clean-Up	
Larimer County (Commissioner Jody Shadduck-McNally)	
Preferred Contact:	shaddujl@co.larimer.co.us
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	N/A
Who is your subject matter expert?	Shane Atkinson, Legislative Coordinator; atkinsrs@larimer.org; 970-481-6741
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	Current law requires certain people associated with massage facilities to get a background check and further requires cities and counties to adopt a "process" to ensure the required background checks are completed. Cities and counties can but are not required to adopt licensing regulations for massage facilities, but regardless of if you have a licensing scheme in place, you are required to have a "process" to ensure the background checks are done. Most counties don't license businesses, including massage facilities. Some counties have decided that they want to regulate these businesses, but for most counties this creates a significant unfunded mandate.
Areas of Impact:	Day-to-day operations of the county; Functionality of county programs or services; Unfunded Mandate on Counties.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	HB24-1371 .
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	(1) Make this required "process" optional for counties to do. (2) Another potential approach is to have the state take this on since they already have a licensing scheme in place for massage therapists and other professions. They have the mechanisms in place to do this without putting the burden on counties, who will largely have to build the mechanism.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	Amend 30-15-401.4(1)(a)(IV)(B) by replacing the first word "Require" with "Authorize." Amend 30-15-401.4(3.5) by replacing "shall establish a process" in the first line with "may establish a process, in which case the process must be..."
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county	The passage of HB24-1371 created this requirement, state law would have to change in order to ease the burden.

explored these alternatives?	
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	Unsure, but there was discussion about this at the CCI Summer Conference.
What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	CML- Multiple municipalities have begun raising concerns about implementation. It sounds like CML may be seeking legislation that carves municipalities out, and fully places this burden on counties.
What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	Unsure.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	No.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county? Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	We have determined creating a licensing structure or alternative solution ensuring the background checks are completed will cost counties significant resources and staff time. There are no financial implications to the solution.
What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? <i>Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.</i>	If solution one is adopted, it will not have a cost to the state. If solution two is adopted, it might carry a minor fiscal note for the state, but at least they already have a mechanism in place.
Staff Feedback	<u>Risk / Difficulty</u> : High - This bill is challenging for three reasons. First, CCI championed the original law change in 2024 and there are counties that continue to support it today. Second, there is legislative fatigue about this

	issue since there was a clean-up bill run in the 2025 legislative session. Third, there are multiple levels of government (local, state, and federal) that must be on the same page on this issue. Additionally, the Colorado Municipal League is contemplating legislation to make portions of the existing law optional for home rule municipalities. <u>Time Commitment:</u> High - This bill requires a high level of engagement with legislators who will likely be skeptical of another clean-up bill, with municipalities to align priorities, and with the state Department of Public Safety and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to ensure the approach sought by this bill does not negatively impact counties that seek to implement the current law.
--	---

Criminal Penalties for the Sexual Exploitation of Children	
Douglas County (Commissioner Abe Laydon)	
Preferred Contact:	alaydon@douglas.co.us
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	TBD.
Who is your subject matter expert?	Jeff Garcia, County Attorney, Douglas County. (303)660-7357. jgarcia@douglas.co.us Zoe Laird, Senior Assistant County Attorney, Douglas County. (303)663-6211. zlaird@douglas.co.us.
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	Individuals sentenced for sexually assaulting or exploiting children are not required to serve time in jail.
Areas of Impact:	Power/Authority/Mandate of county government; General community advancement; Public Safety and safety of children.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	This problem arises from incomplete State criminal statutes.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	Amend State criminal statutes related to sexual exploitation of children to include sentencing guidance, which exists in other State criminal statutes.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	SECTION 1. In Colorado Revised Statutes, 18-3-405, add (3.5) as follows: 18-3-405. Sexual assault on a child. (3.5) IF A PERSON IS CONVICTED OF A CLASS 4 FELONY OF SEXUAL ASSAULT ON A CHILD PURSUANT TO SUBSECTION (1) OF THIS SECTION, THE COURT SHALL SENTENCE THE PERSON TO THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS FOR AN INDETERMINATE TERM OF INCARCERATION OF AT LEAST THE MINIMUM OF THE PRESUMPTIVE RANGE FOR A CLASS 4 FELONY, AS SET FORTH IN SECTION 18-1.3-401, AND UP TO A MAXIMUM OF THE PERSON'S NATURAL LIFE, AS SET FORTH IN SECTION 18-1.3-1004 (1)(a). SECTION 2. In Colorado Revised Statutes, 18-3-405.3, add (4.5) as follows: 18-3-405.3. Sexual assault on a child by one in a position of trust.

	(4.5)(a) IF A PERSON IS CONVICTED OF A CLASS 4 FELONY OF SEXUAL ASSAULT ON A CHILD BY ONE IN A POSITION OF TRUST PURSUANT TO SUBSECTIONS (1) AND (3) OF THIS SECTION, THE COURT SHALL SENTENCE THE PERSON TO THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS FOR AN INDETERMINATE TERM OF INCARCERATION OF AT LEAST THE MINIMUM OF THE PRESUMPTIVE RANGE FOR A CLASS 4 FELONY, AS SET FORTH IN SECTION 18-1.3-401, AND UP TO A MAXIMUM OF THE PERSON'S NATURAL LIFE, AS SET FORTH IN SECTION 18-1.3-1004 (1)(a). (b) IF A PERSON IS CONVICTED OF A CLASS 3 FELONY OF SEXUAL ASSAULT ON A CHILD BY ONE IN A POSITION OF TRUST PURSUANT TO SUBSECTION (2)(a) OF THIS SECTION, THE COURT SHALL SENTENCE THE PERSON TO THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS FOR AN INDETERMINATE TERM OF INCARCERATION OF AT LEAST THE MINIMUM OF THE PRESUMPTIVE RANGE FOR A CLASS 3 FELONY, AS SET FORTH IN SECTION 18-1.3-401, AND UP TO A MAXIMUM OF THE PERSON'S NATURAL LIFE, AS SET FORTH IN SECTION 18-1.3-1004 (1)(a). SECTION 3. In Colorado Revised Statutes, 18-1.3-1004, amend (2)(a) as follows: 18-1.3-1004. Indeterminate sentence. (2) (a) The district court having jurisdiction, based on consideration of the evaluation conducted pursuant to section 16-11.7-104, C.R.S., and the factors specified in section 18-1.3-203, may sentence a sex offender to probation for an indeterminate period of at least ten years for a class 4 felony or twenty years for a class 2 or 3 felony and a maximum of the sex offender's natural life; except that, if the sex offender committed a sex offense that constitutes a crime of violence, as defined in section 18-1.3-406, or committed a sex offense that makes him or her THE SEX
--	--

	OFFENDER eligible for sentencing as a habitual sex offender against children pursuant to section 18-3-412, or COMMITTED a sex offense requiring sentencing pursuant to paragraph (e) of subsection (1) SUBSECTION (1)(e) of this section, OR COMMITTED SEXUAL ASSAULT ON A CHILD THAT IS A CLASS 4 FELONY PURSUANT TO SECTION 18-3-405, OR COMMITTED SEXUAL ASSAULT ON A CHILD BY ONE IN A POSITION OF TRUST THAT IS A CLASS 4 FELONY PURSUANT TO SECTION 18-3-405.3, OR COMMITTED A SEXUAL ASSAULT ON A CHILD BY ONE IN A POSITION OF TRUST THAT IS A CLASS 3 FELONY PURSUANT TO SECTION 18-3-405.3 (2)(a), the court shall sentence the sex offender to the department of corrections as provided in subsection (1) of this section. For any sex offender sentenced to probation pursuant to this subsection (2), the court shall order that the sex offender, as a condition of probation, participate in an intensive supervision probation program established pursuant to section 18-1.3-1007, until further order of the court. SECTION 4 In Colorado Revised Statutes, 18-7-401, add (2.5) as follows: 18-7-401. Definitions. (2.5) "COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY" MEANS SEXUAL ACTIVITY FOR WHICH ANYTHING OF VALUE IS GIVEN TO, PROMISED TO, OR RECEIVED BY A PERSON. SECTION 5. In Colorado Revised Statutes, amend 18-7-402 as follows: 18-7-402. Soliciting for A child FOR COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY. prostitution. (1) A person commits soliciting A CHILD for child prostitution COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY if he THE PERSON: (a) Solicits another A CHILD for the purpose of prostitution of a child or by a child COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY;
--	--

	(b) SOLICITS ANOTHER FOR COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A CHILD (b)(c) Arranges or offers to arrange a meeting of persons for the purpose of prostitution of a child or by a child KNOWING THE MEETING WILL FACILITATE COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A CHILD; or (c)(d) Directs another to a place knowing such direction is for the purpose of prostitution of a child or by a child WILL FACILITATE COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A CHILD. (2) Soliciting for child prostitution COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY is a class 3 felony. THE COURT SHALL SENTENCE A PERSON CONVICTED PURSUANT TO THIS SECTION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS FOR A TERM OF AT LEAST THE MINIMUM OF THE PRESUMPTIVE RANGE FOR A CLASS 3 FELONY, AS SET FORTH IN SECTION 18-1.3-401. SECTION 6. In Colorado Revised Statutes, 18-7-403, amend (1)(a), (1)(b), and (2) as follows: 18-7-403. Pandering of a child. (1) Any person who does any of the following for money or other thing of value commits pandering of a child: (a) Inducing a child by menacing or criminal intimidation to commit prostitution ENGAGE IN COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY; or (b) Knowingly arranging or offering to arrange a situation in which a child may practice prostitution ENGAGE IN COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY. (2) Pandering under paragraph (a) of subsection (1) PURSUANT TO SUBSECTION (1)(a) of this section is a class 2 felony. Pandering under paragraph (b) of subsection (1) PURSUANT TO SUBSECTION (1)(b) of this section is a class 3 felony. THE COURT SHALL SENTENCE A PERSON CONVICTED PURSUANT TO SUBSECTION (1)(a) OF THIS SECTION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS FOR A TERM OF AT LEAST THE MINIMUM OF THE PRESUMPTIVE RANGE FOR A CLASS 2
--	--

	FELONY, AS SET FORTH IN SECTION 18-1.3-401. THE COURT SHALL SENTENCE A PERSON CONVICTED PURSUANT TO SUBSECTION (1)(b) OF THIS SECTION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS FOR A TERM OF AT LEAST THE MINIMUM OF THE PRESUMPTIVE RANGE FOR A CLASS 3 FELONY, AS SET FORTH IN SECTION 18-1.3-401. SECTION 7. In Colorado Revised Statutes, amend 18-7-404 as follows: 18-7-404. Keeping a place of child prostitution FOR COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A CHILD. (1) Any person who has or exercises control over the use of any place which offers seclusion or shelter for the practice of prostitution COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A CHILD and who performs any one or more of the following commits keeping a place of child prostitution FOR COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A CHILD if he THE PERSON PERFORMS ANY ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING: (a) Knowingly grants or permits the use of such place for the purpose of prostitution of COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH a child or by a child; or (b) Permits the continued use of such place for the purpose of prostitution of COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH a child or by a child after becoming aware of facts or circumstances from which he should reasonably know that the place is being used for purposes of such prostitution COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A CHILD. (2) Keeping a place of child prostitution FOR COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A CHILD is a class 3 felony. THE COURT SHALL SENTENCE A PERSON CONVICTED PURSUANT TO THIS SECTION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS FOR A TERM OF AT LEAST THE MINIMUM OF THE PRESUMPTIVE RANGE FOR A CLASS 3 FELONY, AS SET FORTH IN SECTION 18-1.3-401. SECTION 8. In Colorado Revised Statutes, amend 18-7-405 as follows:
--	---

	18-7-405. Pimping of a child. Any person who knowingly lives on or is supported or maintained in whole or in part by money or other thing of value earned, received, procured, or realized by a child through prostitution COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY commits pimping of a child, which is a class 3 felony. THE COURT SHALL SENTENCE A PERSON CONVICTED PURSUANT TO THIS SECTION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS FOR A TERM OF AT LEAST THE MINIMUM OF THE PRESUMPTIVE RANGE FOR A CLASS 3 FELONY, AS SET FORTH IN SECTION 18-1.3-401. SECTION 9. In Colorado Revised Statutes, amend 18-7-405.5 as follows: 18-7-405.5. Inducement of child prostitution COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A CHILD. (1) Any person who by word or action, other than conduct specified in section 18-7-403 (1)(a), induces a child to engage in an act which is prostitution by a child, as defined in section 18-7-401 (6), COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY commits inducement of COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A child prostitution. (2) Inducement of COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A child prostitution is a class 3 felony. THE COURT SHALL SENTENCE A PERSON CONVICTED PURSUANT TO THIS SECTION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS FOR A TERM OF AT LEAST THE MINIMUM OF THE PRESUMPTIVE RANGE FOR A CLASS 3 FELONY, AS SET FORTH IN SECTION 18-1.3-401. SECTION 10. In Colorado Revised Statutes, amend section 18-7-406 as follows: 18-7-406. Patronizing a prostituted child. ENGAGING IN COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A CHILD. (1) Any person who performs any of the following with a child not his spouse commits patronizing a prostituted ENGAGING IN COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A child:
--	--

	(a) Engages in an act which is prostitution of a child or by COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH a child, as defined in section 18-7-401 (6) or (7); or (b) Enters or remains in a place of prostitution FOR COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A CHILD with intent to engage in an act which is prostitution of COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH a child or by a child, as defined in section 18-7-401 (6) or (7). (2) Patronizing a prostituted ENGAGING IN COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A child is a class 3 felony. THE COURT SHALL SENTENCE A PERSON CONVICTED PURSUANT TO THIS SECTION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS FOR A TERM OF AT LEAST THE MINIMUM OF THE PRESUMPTIVE RANGE FOR A CLASS 3 FELONY, AS SET FORTH IN SECTION 18-1.3-401. SECTION 11. In Colorado Revised Statutes, 18-3-306, amend (3) as follows: 18-3-306. Internet luring of a child. (3) Internet luring of a child is a class 5 felony; except that INTERNET luring of a child is a class 4 felony if committed with the intent to meet for the purpose of engaging in sexual exploitation as defined in section 18-6-403 or sexual contact as defined in section 18-3-401; EXCEPT THAT INTERNET LURING OF A CHILD IS A CLASS 3 FELONY IF COMMITTED WITH THE INTENT TO MEET FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENGAGING IN COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY AS DEFINED IN SECTION 18-3-502(3). THE COURT SHALL SENTENCE A PERSON CONVICTED OF INTERNET LURING OF A CHILD FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENGAGING IN COMMERCIAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY TO THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS FOR A TERM OF AT LEAST THE MINIMUM OF THE PRESUMPTIVE RANGE FOR A CLASS 3 FELONY, AS SET FORTH IN SECTION 18-1.3-401.
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county	No, this requires the amendment of State statutes.

explored these alternatives?	
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	A similar bill was ran unsuccessfully in 2025. Advance Colorado is now organizing a ballot initiative on a similar issue.
What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	County Sheriffs of Colorado Colorado District Attorney's Council Colorado Organization for Victim Assistance Colorado Coalition Against Sexual Assault Colorado Children's Alliance Colorado Parent Advocacy Network
What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	Colorado Criminal Defense Bar.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	The Douglas County delegation is aware of this proposal. The majority of the delegation is in support.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county? Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	There may be additional incarceration costs.
What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? <i>Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.</i>	There may be additional safety and correction costs at the local, county, and state level.

Staff Feedback	<u>Risk / Difficulty:</u> Medium - This bill has been attempted in various forms more than once and has not succeeded. Additionally, the Colorado District Attorneys' Council (CDAC), has expressed concerns about the sentencing provisions in the bill. However, the political pressure on the majority party to find a workable solution to this issue may be increasing. <u>Time Commitment:</u> Medium - Drafting of bill language is not a time concern since this proposal has been attempted in prior legislative sessions. The main time commitment is persuading a member of the House Judiciary Committee to change their vote from last session and negotiating any bill language changes needed to address the concerns of traditional allies like CDAC.
----------------	---

State Funding Availability for Emergency Management	
Jefferson County (Commissioner Lesley Dahlkemper)	
Preferred Contact:	ldahlkem@jeffco.us
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	Rachel Zenzinger, Andy Kerr.
Who is your subject matter expert?	Nathaniel Whittington, Emergency Management Manager, 303-271-4947, njwhittington@jeffco.us
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	The State of Colorado's statutory framework--specifically C.R.S. 24 33.5 707--emphasizes the foundational role of local emergency management directors or coordinators in delivering disaster preparedness, response, mitigation, and recovery (C.R.S. 24 33.5 707(4)). As FEMA considers sweeping reforms and reductions to funding, county governments are burdened with increased costs to support all aspects of emergency management. Additionally, the state faces budget restrictions and cannot support an increase in funding through the general fund.
Areas of Impact:	Functionality of county programs or services.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	There is a funding shortfall.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	As federal capacity contracts, the argument for robust, state-supported emergency management becomes increasingly compelling. Strengthening local emergency management efforts empowers community-led mitigation, preparedness, and recovery. Similar to the Colorado Strategic Wildfire Action Program (COSWAP), which made the state's forest restoration and wildfire risk mitigation grants available to counties through SB21-259 , the state can restructure state funding so that counties are eligible to receive funding for emergency management. Additionally, the state can assist local emergency management efforts by creating a state-wide mutual aid agreement and a dashboard/data base of available resources.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	The funding solution would require a bill similar to SB21-259 .
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	The state-wide mutual aid agreement and dashboard do not require legislation.

Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	No.
What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	Colorado Emergency Management Association.
What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	Unknown.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	No.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county? Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	The problem does not require new funding from the state; just reprioritization and redistribution of existing funding.
What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? <i>Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.</i>	Successful local emergency management reduces long-term recovery costs.
Staff Feedback	<u>Risk / Difficulty</u> : Medium - There is precedent for restructuring grant funding for public safety purposes such that counties are eligible to apply for and receive additional funding (e.g. Colorado Strategic Wildfire Action Program). It is unknown at this time if the state is willing to explore this bill concept at a time when the Governor's Office is using money from a variety

	of funds to cover the costs associated with the loss of Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) money. <u>Time Commitment:</u> Medium - This bill proposal will require extensive conversations with the state Department of Public Safety's Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management, as well members and staff of the Joint Budget Committee.
--	--

Tourism, Resorts, & Economic Development

Proposition 123 Reform: AMI Flexibility for Affordable Homeownership in Rural and Resort Communities	
Archuleta County (Warren Brown)	
Preferred Contact:	warren.brown@archuletacounty.org
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	La Plata County, Commissioner Matt Salka
Who is your subject matter expert?	Emily Lashbrooke, Executive Director for Pagosa Springs Community Development Corp. (970)-264-3023, Emily@pagosaspringscdc.org
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	The statutory 100% Area Median Income (AMI) cap for Proposition 123's Affordable Homeownership Program prevents effective deployment of funds in rural and resort communities with high construction costs and low AMI benchmarks. Essential workers are being disqualified from workforce housing opportunities by marginal AMI overages--as little as \$200 annually over the cap--despite clear need and inability to afford market-rate homes.
Areas of Impact:	Functionality of county programs or services; Power/Authority/Mandate of county government; General community advancement.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	Statutory inflexibility in Proposition 123 implementation; outdated one-size-fits-all income cap.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	Amend C.R.S. 29-32-105.5 to allow rural and resort communities to petition for AMI eligibility flexibility in Proposition 123-funded programs. This includes: - Authorizing municipalities, tribal governments, housing authorities, and nonprofits to petition for higher AMI caps; - Requiring justification based on housing needs assessments, local affordability gaps, and workforce housing patterns; - Ensuring funding remains targeted toward affordability through deed restrictions and income-based pricing.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	Draft Amendment to HB23-1304 SECTION X. In Colorado Revised Statutes, amend 29-32-105.5 as follows: 29-32-105.5. Alternative eligibility for programs--local petition process--legislative declaration--definitions.

	(1) (a) The General Assembly finds and declares that: (I) The lack of affordable housing affects communities across Colorado, and Proposition 123 was approved by voters to address this issue statewide; (II) Income thresholds set by area median income (AMI) percentages may not always reflect local economic conditions, leading to unintended disqualifications for households narrowly exceeding the eligibility criteria; and (III) A formalized petition process should allow local governments, housing authorities, and other eligible entities to seek AMI flexibility when demonstrated housing and workforce needs justify such an adjustment. (b) It is the intent of the General Assembly that the petition process established in this section ensures that affordable housing funding remains accessible to communities experiencing affordability gaps while maintaining the program's commitment to serving lower-income households. (2) As used in this section, unless the context otherwise requires: (a) "Petition" means a formal request submitted by a local government, tribal government, or eligible housing entity to the division for an adjustment to AMI eligibility requirements. (b) "Eligible Entity" includes municipalities, counties, tribal governments, regional housing authorities, and nonprofit housing organizations designated to receive funding under this article. (3) Notwithstanding the requirements set forth in Section 29-32-104(1), a local government, tribal government, or eligible entity may petition the Division of Housing to use adjusted percentages of AMI for determining eligibility for affordable housing programs, including but not limited to: (a) Affordable Homeownership program (a) The land banking program; (b) The affordable housing equity program; and (c) Debt financing programs that are part of the concessionary debt program specified in Section 29-32-104(1)(c)(I) and (1)(c)(III). (4) A petition submitted under this section must include: (a) A housing needs assessment conducted within the past six years, incorporating: (I) Data from the state demographer or other publicly accessible sources; (II) Local workforce commuting patterns and housing cost burden analysis; and (III) Justification for the requested AMI adjustment, including evidence that households marginally exceeding the current AMI cap face affordability challenges. (b) A statement from the governing body of the local government or tribal government supporting the petition; (c) An impact analysis outlining how the proposed AMI adjustment would
--	---

	improve housing accessibility while maintaining the program's affordability objectives. (5) Upon receiving a petition, the Division shall: (a) Post notice of the petition on its website and establish a public comment period of no less than 30 days; (b) Evaluate the petition based on the submitted housing needs assessment, workforce conditions, and affordability trends; (c) Approve or deny the petition within 60 days, with written justification for its decision. (6) If a petition is approved, the Division shall establish an AMI adjustment, which may: (a) Allow households earning up to a percentage of AMI that meets the needs of the petitioning jurisdiction to qualify for for-sale affordable housing, provided that the household's total monthly housing cost does not exceed 35% of gross income; (b) Provide temporary AMI flexibility for a period of up to five years, subject to review and renewal; and (c) Require periodic reporting from the petitioner on the impact of the adjusted AMI eligibility on housing accessibility and affordability in the region. (7) Approval of a petition under this section does not exempt projects from requirements ensuring affordability, including long-term deed restrictions and income-based pricing models.
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	No, unfortunately this must be addressed through legislation. Yes. Local subsidy efforts remain insufficient under current AMI limits and restrictions.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	Not formally to date.
What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	Colorado Counties Inc. (CCI) CAST Housing Task Force Club 20 Region 9 Economic Development Archuleta County La Plata County Montezuma County Colorado Council of Churches

What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	Path 2 Zero
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	Senator Cleave Simpson is willing to submit a bill to formally introduce into the legislative process, and he indicated that Senator Mark Baisley will also be on board. Rep. Katie Stewart has indicated to La Plata County Commissioner Matt Salka that she would be interested in supporting the bill as well.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county? Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	Allows for more effective deployment of state dollars toward workforce housing, reducing local subsidy burdens. Greater flexibility in AMI thresholds will allow the community to retain its essential workforce--such as teachers, healthcare workers, and service industry employees--by increasing access to attainable homeownership. Without this flexibility, the county risks losing these workers to more affordable regions, which would strain local services, reduce economic stability, and increase long-term costs related to recruitment, training, and turnover.
What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? <i>Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.</i>	State: Better utilization of homeownership funds. Communities: Improved housing access for essential workers. Developers: Enhanced viability for workforce housing projects.
Staff Feedback	<u>Risk/Difficulties:</u> Medium - External stakeholders, so far, have been receptive to having this conversation (and will be with the proponents next week); if we are able to convince the initial Prop 123 Proponents (Gary Community Ventures) with data, this should be achievable. <u>Time Commitment:</u> Medium - If everyone can get on board (Gary Community Ventures, other affordable housing advocates, state departments, Governor's office municipalities), which seems achievable, but requires time, the time commitment is likely to be low.

Proposition 123 Corrections	
Jefferson County (Commissioner Rachel Zenzinger)	
Preferred Contact:	rzenzing@jeffco.us
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	Andy Kerr, Lesley Dahlkemper.
Who is your subject matter expert?	Kat Douglas, Housing, Economic, & Employment Services Director, Human Services Department, 720-289-4719, kdouglas@jeffco.us
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	Correct elements in Proposition 123, primarily unit credit for counties and AMI issues.
Areas of Impact:	Day-to-day operations of the county; Functionality of county programs or services.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	Proposition 123, as written, does not provide incentive for municipalities to coordinate the unit counts with counties. Counties often support development in both unincorporated areas and incorporated areas, however as written, any development financially (or otherwise) supported by counties in municipalities would not add to the county unit count. Counties and cities are required to enter an MOU to coordinate unit counts, however cities do not have to enter into these agreements. Proposition 123 currently does not fully acknowledge the development process or investments made by counties in critical housing efforts within municipalities. Counties invest with gap financing, bond cap, and tax credits. Municipalities have the ability to give tax exemptions, but that is directly impacting the counties, and as written, the counties would not receive any unit count for the property. The AMIs identified in Proposition 123 are also problematic and leaving some communities unable to count units they have invested in supporting critical community members with affordable housing options but not fully meeting the defined AMI per Proposition 123.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	Both counties and Municipalities should get full credit for the unit count of affordable housing preservation and new development when contributing to the project. AMI language should be adjusted to support communities that are developing to support urgent community needs. This mainly impacts rural and resort communities.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	Unknown at this time.

Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	MOUs between counties and cities are possible per DOLA, however it is up to each party to agree and there is no incentive for cities to agree to coordinate counts. The MOUs would only be to coordinate and share the count but would not allow for both municipality and county to get full credit for the units.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	No.
What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	Counties, Housing Authorities, Non-Profit and For-Profit affordable housing developers.
What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	Municipalities.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	No.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county? Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	Counties often provide funding for affordable housing and housing authorities.
What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? <i>Please consider any</i>	If Municipalities have to share unit counts, and they don't meet their municipal counts, they potentially risk losing out on one year of Prop 123 funding eligibility.

<i>relevant Colorado State Departments.</i>	
Staff Feedback	<u>Risk/Difficulties:</u> High – The proposal mainly impacts the Colorado Municipal League (CML), who initially has expressed concerns - it may be seen as an 'attack' on cities. <u>Time Commitment:</u> Medium – This largely depends on the position of CML - if they are opposed, it will be a high time commitment for tennis-style volley lobbying.

Taxation & Finance

Granting Excise Tax Authority with Voter Approval to Counties	
Boulder County (Commissioner Ashley Stolzmann)	
Preferred Contact:	astolzmann@bouldercounty.gov (also available by phone)
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	Open to all.
Who is your subject matter expert?	I have a DOR expert contact info, but they are not available for contact. Our County Attorney can weigh in as can I as one of the few elected officials in the state that has implemented an excise tax.
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	Counties have more limited taxation authorities than municipalities in the state. Counties mainly rely on state and federal funds in addition to local sales and property tax. In many areas, state and federal grants are being reduced or cut altogether, but the services needed still remain. Many counties are unable to make up the difference with existing local taxes and in many areas across the board sales and property taxes are unacceptable to the community members that must vote them in. Cities have excise taxing authority and there are a few examples where cities have effectively been able to target a product or service with a tax that the community supported taxing in order to provide tax revenue. Empowering counties with the authority to ask their voters if they would like to impose excise taxes is a matter of financial pragmatism. As counties continue to play a pivotal role in the lives of their residents, equipping them with the necessary tools and resources is essential for building resilient and thriving communities.
Areas of Impact:	Day-to-day operations of the county; Functionality of county programs or services; Power/Authority/Mandate of county government; General community advancement; Overall good vibes.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	funding shortfalls and ill-conceived structure of authority for counties.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	The Case for Granting Excise Tax Authority to Counties Empowering counties with the authority to ask their voters if they would like to impose excise taxes is a matter of financial pragmatism. One of the most compelling reasons for granting excise tax authority to counties (with voter approval) is to enhance their fiscal autonomy. Counties face unique challenges and demands that require tailored solutions. By having the power to levy excise taxes, counties can generate revenue that is directly linked to their specific needs and initiatives. This fiscal autonomy allows

	counties to become more self-reliant and less dependent on state and federal transfers, which are often subject to political fluctuations and budgetary constraints. In Colorado, Cities already have excise taxing authority. There are a few examples of voter approved excise taxes that are already in place in our state. Counties are at the forefront of addressing local issues such as infrastructure development, public health, human services, justice and public safety, and other local issues as identified by each area. Excise taxes provide a targeted revenue stream that can be earmarked for specific projects and programs that directly benefit the community. Typical examples that come to mind for most would be something like, excise taxes on fuel can be allocated to road maintenance and transportation infrastructure, while taxes on tobacco and alcohol can fund public health initiatives and addiction treatment programs. Excise taxes can also be on levied on services or different targeted goods. Many of these typical excise tax examples have specific state law and federal preemption or additional restrictions and they are not actually the focus of this discussion. Excise tax as discussed here is simply a specific tax levied on certain goods, services, or activities. Being able to target the taxes to the specific local situation can make this an attractive option for addressing local needs. One of the primary arguments for allowing counties to tax services (through excise tax authority) is the diversification of revenue streams. Traditionally, local governments have relied heavily on property taxes and sales taxes on goods to fund essential services. However, as the service sector continues to grow and dominate the economy (particularly as Colorado is rapidly aging), this reliance on goods-based taxation becomes increasingly unsustainable. By taxing services, counties can create a more stable and diverse revenue base that reflects the modern economic landscape. In conclusion, granting excise tax authority to counties is a prudent and forward-thinking policy that empowers local governments to address their unique challenges and priorities. By enhancing fiscal autonomy, promoting fiscal responsibility, and providing targeted revenue for local initiatives, excise tax authority strengthens local governance and fosters community development. As counties continue to play a pivotal role in the lives of their residents, equipping them with the necessary tools and resources is essential for building resilient and thriving communities.
--	--

Please provide sample language for this solution.	Insert the following language into C.R.S. 29-2 into a new section: 29-2-XXX. Countywide excise tax Each county in this state is authorized to levy a county excise tax in accordance with the provisions of this article. "No proposal for a county excise tax shall become effective until approved by a majority of the registered electors of the county voting on such proposal pursuant to section 29-2-104." Such a proposal for excise tax upon approval by a majority of the registered electors voting thereon, may be effective throughout the incorporated and unincorporated portions of the county or in the entire unincorporated portion of the county only. And insert the word "excise tax" into 29-2-104 to extend the procedure to excise taxes
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	No.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	Yes, action was punted.
What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	Public health related organizations, environmental organizations, transportation organizations; anyone who wants something funded.
What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	Chambers of commerce, hotels, service industries.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	Kyle Brown is interested in the concept and is likely to run a bill on this. If CCI supports this, he is more than likely locked in.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county?	This permissive proposal will have no fiscal impact on counties that choose not to use it and a positive impact on those who do when their proposals pass.

Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	
What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? <i>Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.</i>	Failure to run county programs creates numerous societal effects and quantifying the cost is not practical for this application.
Staff Feedback	This proposal will be an incredibly difficult lift. The experience from last year demonstrated just how organized and effective the opposition can be. Nearly every sector of the state's business community aligned against the measure, with particularly strong resistance from the short-term rental industry and the outdoor recreation community. That coalition is well-resourced, highly mobilized, and prepared to argue forcefully that excise taxes will harm Colorado's tourism economy and local businesses. Without clear guardrails, strong framing, and strategic limitations, this effort is unlikely to gain traction and risks repeating the dynamics we saw previously. Moving forward without addressing those concerns would almost certainly result in the proposal being dismissed out of hand. <u>Time Commitment:</u> Advancing this policy would require significant time and energy. Building support in the face of organized statewide opposition will involve intensive stakeholder engagement, coalition building, and message development. This would represent a major investment of political capital.

Taxation Reform: Remove the "Status Quo" Classification of Energy Facilities	
Dolores County (Commissioner Eric Stiasny)	
Preferred Contact:	eric.stiasny@dolorescountyco.gov
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	None at this time.
Who is your subject matter expert?	Amber Blackmore, Dolores County Assessor, 970-677-2385, amber.blackmore@dolorescountyco.gov
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	C.R.S. § 39-4-102(1.5)(C) provides that the location of a small or low impact hydroelectric energy facility, a geothermal energy facility, a biomass energy facility, a wind energy facility, or a solar energy facility on real property shall not affect the classification of that real property for purposes of determining the actual value of that real property as provided in C.R.S. § 39-1-103 and the energy production facilities enumerated in C.R.S. § 39-4-102(1.5)(C) often require large acreage, typically resulting in the use of agricultural real property for facility placement. The subject energy facility installations, especially solar facilities, are often clearly industrial in nature, densely covering hundreds of areas of land in solar panels, electrical infrastructure, and tall industrial fencing, and C.R.S. § 39-4-102(1.5)(C), creates a taxation scheme which is inequitable, disingenuous and detrimental to the communities highly impacted by such huge industrial facilities, with no adjustment up in real property tax base to help offset the negative impacts (increased demand on county road infrastructure, hydrologic issues, devaluation of neighboring properties, increased strain on emergency services). County assessors are normally tasked with identifying the actual use of real property when determining classifications, but pursuant to C.R.S. § 39-4-102(1.5)(C), assessors are mandated to ignore the obvious industrial use of sometimes huge parcels while the farmers and ranchers using property for actual agricultural purposes are forced to repeatedly prove their agriculture use cycle in order to maintain their agricultural classification, these huge industrial placements receive a permanent agricultural classification contrary to their actual use.
Areas of Impact:	Day-to-day operations of the county; Power/Authority/Mandate of county government; General community advancement.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	C.R.S. § 39-4-102(1.5)(C) restricts County Assessors from correctly appraising and re-appraising energy facilities.

What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	Legislation be adopted simply eliminating in its entirety C.R.S. § 39-4-102(1.5)(C) and allowing county assessors to accurately and fairly classify the subject energy facilities.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	*Strike C.R.S. § 39-4-102(1.5)(C) The location of a small or low impact hydroelectric energy facility, a geothermal energy facility, a biomass energy facility, a wind energy facility, or a solar energy facility on real property shall not affect the classification of that real property for purposes of determining the actual value of that real property as provided in section 39-1-103.
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	Private property owners whose land is leased to an energy facility and is classified as agricultural have requested for their classification be modified to commercial, which the current statute prohibits. We have been unable to generate any solutions through appraisals from the County Assessor or even at landowner protest to change energy facility classification short of modification to state-level legislation.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	No.
What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	Potentially the Colorado Assessors Association.
What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	Those with interest in energy facility development.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	I have spoken with Rep. Larry Don Suckla regarding this issue. Rep. Suckla gave the same initial statement as the majority of our citizens and many of my fellow commissioners: "I thought it was classified as commercial." This view stems from the observation that energy facilities are obviously and glaringly industrial and commercial in nature, not agricultural. Rep. Suckla stated he would coordinate with his staff and seek a bill to rectify the issue.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county?	Inherent financial problems from energy facilities in our counties is increased demand on county road infrastructure, hydrologic issues, devaluation of neighboring properties, and increased strain on emergency services. Financially, the county would see increased tax revenue by a potential tax classification change.

Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	
What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? <i>Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.</i>	Financial implications are largely contingent upon the classification upon which the energy facility is set in. The state could see additional tax revenue as a higher percentage of classification would be commercial.
Staff Feedback	This proposal will be challenging to advance and carries significant political and stakeholder risk. The existing statute was deliberately crafted to incentivize renewable energy development by preserving favorable tax treatment for landowners who host renewable facilities. Attempting to repeal or substantially amend this provision will be met with strong, coordinated opposition from the renewable energy industry, environmental advocates, and a wide array of stakeholders committed to advancing Colorado's clean energy goals. From a policy perspective, this proposal will be framed by opponents as an attack on Colorado's renewable energy economy and as creating barriers to investment at a time when the state is making aggressive commitments to clean energy deployment. Renewable developers, and clean energy coalitions will almost certainly mobilize against the measure, arguing that increased tax burdens will discourage projects and undermine state climate goals. Where this proposal does have a chance is in the larger energy conversation that will occur in the 2026 legislative session. This will be the topic of the session with the governor looking to cement his legacy on environmental issues and this could be a point of leverage in the conversations around statewide citing and the 2040 renewable goals. <u>Time Commitment:</u> Energy related issues will be the most lobbied areas in the 2026 legislative session. Moving this forward as a stand alone piece of legislation would require significant time, resources, and political capital, if this were to move as part of a larger package it would not require as much work.

Sustainable Aviation Fuel Tax Credit	
Pitkin County (Commissioner Greg Poschman)	
Preferred Contact:	greg.poschman@pitkincounty.com
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	N/A
Who is your subject matter expert?	Levi Borst - Management Analyst - Pitkin County - 970.309.2330 - levi.borst@pitkincounty.com
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	Colorado should consider a program providing a tax credit for either the production of or consumption of Sustainable Aviation Fuel (SAF).
Areas of Impact:	Functionality of county programs or services; General community advancement; Local/Regional/Statewide economic development.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	Cost & availability of SAF.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	Support new legislation, or amendments to existing legislation, which would provide tax credit incentives for the production/consumption of SAF designed to be competitive with other states.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	From July 1, 2027, through December 31, 2038, sustainable aviation fuel (SAF) sold to or used by an air common carrier, certified by the carrier to be used in Colorado, earns a Sustainable Aviation Fuel Purchase Credit (SAFPC) in the amount of \$1.50 per whole gallon of SAF purchased. Only that portion of each gallon of aviation fuel that consists of SAF, as defined in Section XYZ, is eligible to earn the credit. For a sale or use of aviation fuel to qualify to earn SAFPC, taxpayers must retain in their books and records a completed copy of Producer Certification of Sustainable Aviation Fuel (SAF) from the producer of the aviation fuel that the aviation fuel sold or used and for which SAFPC was earned meets the definition of sustainable aviation fuel. Purchasers must complete a Sustainable Aviation Fuel Purchase Credit Certification, to certify SAFPC used on a qualifying purchase.
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	There is no other mechanism for a tax credit incentive.

Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	No.
What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	Airlines with SAF transition goals. Private industry / refineries. Other communities looking to support economic growth - especially in places where existing jobs/industries might be fading. Climate friendly organizations would likely support as well.
What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	Fossil fuel-based aviation fuel producers.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	No.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county? Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	The direct cost to the county itself is minimal. Likewise, there are few direct county cost implications to the solution.
What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? <i>Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.</i>	For practical purposes, SAF is generally cost prohibitive for airlines and general aviation users. As a result, potential producers are not encouraged to install production facilities, or even explore the feasibility of SAF in many cases. For those who do use SAF, it remains wildly expensive, and ships from very long distances. The largest financial implication of the solution could be the reduction in tax revenue to the State.
Staff Feedback	The primary obstacle will be cost and fiscal impact. A \$1.50-per-gallon credit, extended over more than a decade, could amount to tens of millions in foregone revenue depending on uptake. In a budget environment already constrained by structural deficits and TABOR limitations,

	legislators will be very reluctant to create a long-term, high-dollar tax credit that reduces General Fund flexibility. <u>Time Commitment:</u> This proposal would require a significant investment of time and advocacy. Proponents would need to educate legislators on the benefits of SAF, build credibility around climate and economic development arguments, and defend against fiscal critiques in both committee and budget debates. The long credit window (2027–2038) further complicates messaging, as legislators often resist locking the state into extended financial commitments.
--	---

Real Estate Transfer Fee	
Pitkin County (Commissioner Kelly McNicholas Kury)	
Preferred Contact:	kelly.mcnicholas@pitkincounty.com
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	Patti Clapper - Pitkin County
Who is your subject matter expert?	Levi Borst - Management Analyst - Pitkin County - 970.309.2330 - levi.borst@pitkincounty.com
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	Allow counties to implement a real estate transfer fee, to offset community impacts caused by increasingly unaffordable real estate.
Areas of Impact:	Functionality of county programs or services; Power/Authority/Mandate of county government; General community advancement.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	Lack of legislative authority.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	Have the Colorado Legislature grant legislative authority to local governments to implement a real estate transfer fee. This would likely involve a test from the Attorney General to affirm the legality of such authority.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	THE GOVERNING BODY OF EVERY LOCAL GOVERNMENT IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO IMPOSE A REAL ESTATE TRANSFER FEE ON EVERY DOCUMENT IN WRITING, WHEREBY TITLE TO REAL PROPERTY SITUATED WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT IS TRANSFERRED, WHICH FEE SHALL BE MEASURED BY THE CONSIDERATION PAID OR TO BE PAID FOR SUCH GRANT OR CONVEYANCE AND SHALL BE DUE AND PAYABLE BY EITHER THE GRANTOR, THE GRANTEE, OR BOTH, AT THE TIME OF TRANSFER CONTEMPORANEOUSLY THEREWITH. THE DOCUMENT SHALL NOT BE RECORDED WHEREBY OR WHEREIN TITLE TO REAL PROPERTY SITUATED WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT IS TRANSFERRED UNTIL THE REAL ESTATE TRANSFER FEE HAS BEEN PAID OR EXEMPTED. (b) THE GOVERNING BODY OF EVERY LOCAL GOVERNMENT IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO IMPOSE THE AMOUNT OF THE REAL ESTATE TRANSFER FEE, PROVIDED SUCH FEE DOES NOT EXCEED FOUR PERCENT OF CONSIDERATION PAID FOR THE GRANT OR CONVEYANCE OF REAL PROPERTY.
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation?	Voter repeal of TABOR.

Has your county explored these alternatives?	
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	No.
What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	As this is permissive, specific to the local jurisdiction, and would not trump existing real estate transfer taxes, many local governments would be in support. Local housing advocates and non-profits would also be in support.
What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	Realtors.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	Not this session. Some have shown support in the past, but with the Governor's Office position on real estate transfer fees, we have not yet identified sponsors for this session.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county? Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	The costs of the problem are far-reaching. Funding housing and related services without a tool such as this has been a huge challenge for all local governments. We struggle to adequately fund many nexus areas, such as affordable housing, and child care. As for the solution, some minor administrative time and associated costs to launch and maintain the program, but nothing noteworthy.
What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? <i>Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.</i>	The financial impacts of the problem on other communities and their local workforces are similarly immeasurable. The financial implications of the solutions are likely to be felt by those buying/selling real estate - which may thereby impact realtors and other associated industries. As this is a locally administered program, there should be no impacts to any state departments.
Staff Feedback	This proposal represents one of the most politically difficult concepts under consideration. The real estate and development industries—

	including the Colorado Association of Realtors, homebuilders, title companies, and chambers of commerce—have historically been among the most organized and well-funded opponents of transfer fees. They are likely to view this proposal as an existential threat and will spare no expense in mounting a unified statewide campaign against it. Additionally the legal ambiguity over fee vs. tax classifications and the constitutional prohibition on transfer taxes adds an additional layer of risk and potential litigation. <u>Time Commitment:</u> Proponents would face an extraordinary time and resource burden. Passing enabling legislation would face an almost certain multimillion-dollar opposition effort. This would be a multi-year, high-intensity commitment.
--	--

Amending Board of Adjustment Requirements for Counties	
Larimer County (Commissioner Jody Shadduck-McNally)	
Preferred Contact:	shaddujl@co.larimer.co.us
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	N/A
Who is your subject matter expert?	Rebecca Everette, Director of Community Development; everetrd@co.larimer.co.us
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	C.R.S. 30-28-117 and 118 require Colorado counties to provide for a Board of Adjustment to review variances and appeals to zoning regulations. This is in addition to requirements for a Planning Commission and Board of Appeals (for building permits). The statutory requirements are overly prescriptive and result in both administrative costs and customer impacts when the Board is unable to fulfill its duties. In Larimer County, we are particularly challenged to fill the required number of seats and maintain quorum for hearings.
Areas of Impact:	Day-to-day operations of the county; General community advancement; Unfunded mandate/fiscal responsibility.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	Outdated statute.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	The proposed solution is to revise the language in C.R.S. 30-28-117 and 118 to: 1.) Establish a minimum number of board members (3) but remove the current maximum (5); 2.) Remove the requirement for a concurring vote of a supermajority on all appeals; and 3.) Allow a Planning Commission, Board of Appeals, Board of County Commissioners, or hearing officer to fulfill the role and functions of a Board of Adjustment (rather than requiring a separate body). An alternative solution could be to remove the requirement for a Board of Adjustment altogether and allow counties to handle variances and appeals in whatever way best fits their established processes.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	C.R.S. 30-28-117 (1) The board of county commissioners of any county which enacts zoning regulations under the authority of this part 1 shall provide for a board of adjustment of three or more members and for the manner of the appointment of such members. The function and duties of the board of adjustment may be fulfilled by the county's planning commission (see 30-28-103, C.R.S.), board of review (see 30-28-206, C.R.S.), board of county

	commissioners, or an appointed hearing officer in place of a standalone board. (4) Meetings of the board of adjustment shall be held at the call of the chairperson and at such other times as the board in its rules of procedure may specify. The chairperson, or in their absence the acting chairperson. Supplemental Material: See expanded revisions with strikethroughs here.
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	No - the statutory language is explicit and constrictive in not allowing room for alternative approaches.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	Not to our knowledge.
What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	Other statutory counties, possibly homebuilder groups and housing advocates.
What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	None identified.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	No.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county? Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	The county bears additional administrative costs to support a board with limited scope and functionality. Because it is difficult to recruit the required number of members and maintain a quorum of at least 4 members per meeting (out of a 5 member board), meetings are frequently canceled at the last minute, which causes delay and financial hardship to variance applicants and appellants. It is also a significant waste of resources and staff time when the meetings are cancelled last minute due to a lack of quorum. The solution could save costs for the county by allowing the Board of Adjustment functions to be absorbed by another established body. This

	would also increase predictability and reduce wait times (and therefore costs) for community development customers. This solution supports the goal of reducing unnecessary barriers to housing production.
What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? <i>Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.</i>	See above.
Staff Feedback	This proposal would be far less difficult than the others under consideration. Updating Board of Adjustment rules is largely an administrative and governance matter, not a new tax or revenue stream. Some concern may come from land use attorneys, developers, or citizen groups who prefer the checks and balances of a separate Board of Adjustment could arise. <u>Time Commitment:</u> While less controversial than fiscal proposals, it will still require stakeholder outreach to developers, planners, and citizen groups to ensure support and avoid it being cast as reducing public accountability. Low-to-moderate difficulty. Compared to tax or classification changes, this proposal is far more achievable, though it requires careful framing around local control, efficiency, and modernization.

CONCERNING PROVIDING FUNDING TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO SUPPORT CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF COUNTY ROADS THAT PROVIDE ACCESS TO STATE-OWNED PARKS AND STATE WILDLIFE AREAS, AND IN CONNECTION THEREWITH, UTILIZING OVERAGE OF THE KCW PASS AS THE APPROPRIATION	
Park County (Commissioner Amy Mitchell)	
Preferred Contact:	amy.mitchell@parkcountycogov
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	The following commissioners have voiced support for the bill: Erik Stone - Teller County, Warren Brown - Archuleta County, Terry Hofmeister - Philips County, Cody Davis - Mesa County, Tony Haas - Las Animas County, Paula McPheeters - Pueblo County, Dallas Schroeder - Elbert County, Arlan Van Ry - Alamosa County.
Who is your subject matter expert?	Nick Bredsnajder, Director of Public Works, Park County.
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	Counties that have state parks are required to provide safe road access to park visitors. The extreme number of visitors creates a much higher traffic volume than the Highway User Tax Fund provides to counties. The disproportionate number of visitors accessing the parks compared to the residential population served by these roads is an unfunded mandate levied upon the 35 counties that host 43 state parks. <u>Park County as an example:</u> With approximately 18,000 in population and 311,388 visitors to Eleven Mile and Spinney in 2024, many towing campers to the over 300 camp sites and boats to the marina and boat launch, Park County does not have the funding to maintain safe access to Eleven Mile and Spinney state parks. The state needs to provide funding to counties that do not have the financial ability to provide a road that can withstand the heavy traffic traveling to the heavily used state's parks. Visitors suffer vehicle damage when traveling to the state parks. A standard passenger vehicle is not designed to withstand heavily used gravel roads. Those who cannot afford a more robust vehicle are disproportionately negatively impacted. The state built the parks, people are coming, the state needs help!
Areas of Impact:	1. Road maintenance budget. The Public Works Road and Bridge Department's, Lake George division faces an impossible task to maintain the access roads; county roads 90, 92, 23 and 59. The Highway User Tax Fund (HUTF) does not provide sufficient funding to compensate for the high traffic volume. Park received for 2025

	\$6,169,675 in HUTF for 1,576 miles of eligible roads providing \$3,915 per mile with only 150 miles of hard surface roads. According to Average Daily Trip standards, roads that suffer more than 500 trips per day should be a hard surface. The access roads to State Parks should be paved which is beyond the HUTF budget. 2. Emergency Responders. Lake George Fire District and Hartsel Fire District are responsible for responding to emergencies in the State Parks and the surrounding areas. Response time is diminished, and emergency vehicles are damaged by the rough surface of the heavily used roads. 3. Surrounding area residents. The 67 full-time residents, those with second homes and several businesses located on the state park access roads suffer vehicle damage and a negative impact on their quality of life due to the volume of traffic damaging the roads. 4. Park visitors, especially those who purchase a Keep Colorado Wild pass, have a reasonable expectation to be able to get to the park in any passenger vehicle.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	There is no existing funding for counties that must maintain roads that provide access to heavily used state parks. The Highway Users Tax Fund is insufficient to properly maintain the roads that serve the population of the counties, let alone to maintain the roads that suffer large traffic volume serving the state parks.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	Establish a grant fund for counties that host state parks and wildlife areas, based on need, utilizing the revenue that exceeds the \$36 million designated in the Keep Colorado Wild (KCW) pass legislation. The Keep Colorado Wild Pass (KCW) was created for "using the pass fees to finance a number of goals of the division of parks and wildlife related to increased conservation of, safety at, and access to state parks and public lands; and making an appropriation." Under SB21-249, \$36 million is tagged for: State Parks \$32 million, Search and rescue \$2.5 million and avalanche safety \$1.5 million. The remaining revenue is dispersed 50% to the Outdoor Recreation Cash Fund and 50% to the Wildlife Cash Fund. According to SB21-249, "For each state fiscal year, the division will use the wild pass fees collected to achieve stated goals such as providing affordable access to state parks and public lands; managing state parks; supporting search and rescue and avalanche safety efforts; conserving vulnerable species and habitats; funding equity, diversity, and inclusion programs; and financing regional outdoor partnerships for community-driven planning and projects." The KCW is a self-generating revenue stream which will not impact the state general fund. Diverting the overage to road construction and maintenance to state parks will improve access to state parks, a stated objective of SB21-249. Once the demand has been met, allow the overage revenue to revert back to the Cash Funds.

	People who purchase a KCW pass have a reasonable expectation of being able to get to the park.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	SB23-059 as introduced which can be easily amended.
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	Park County has explored all possible solutions since 2023. Park applied for Congressional Designated Spending, Community Project Funding and has been pursuing FLAP through FHWA. Community project funding for 2023 awarded \$850,000 which is nowhere close to the \$23,000,000 Park County needs to pave 24-26 miles of road. Additionally, Park has been pursuing a FLAP grant through FHWA which now has been paused until 2026. "If" the 2026 grant application is approved, the best-case scenario would be a 2029 start date for construction. No other road construction grants are available for this need.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	Yes, in 2023 SB23-059 was a CCI priority bill. The bill was amended to a study, which will prove the problem, and the bill provided for a \$2.00 stipend to be added to a park day pass if the county is approved for the stipend. This did not provide meaningful funding to pave roads. Total day passes purchased at Eleven Mile and Spinney state parks since the inception of the KCW in 2023 is 14,435, yielding \$28,870. For 2024 only 5,310-day passes were purchased yielding \$10,620.00. The stipend will not fund road construction or maintenance.
What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	1. Coloradoans and out-of-state tourists who enjoy recreating at state parks. Namely the population of Denver and Colorado Springs who enjoy fishing, boating, paddle boarding and outdoor recreation within 2.5 hours from their home. 2. Residents who live on the roads that provide access to state parks. 3. Emergency Services - Fire and Ambulance who need to respond to emergencies at the state parks and nearby residents and cannot respond quickly due to the condition of the roads. 4. Employees working at the state parks who have to endure vehicle damage to get to work.
What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	DNR/CPW and the Governor, who want the overage dedicated to the Parks and Recreation Cash Fund and the Wildlife Cash Fund which are also funded by lottery revenue. The KCW revenue provided to the Parks and Recreation Cash Fund is created by the strategic outdoor recreation management and infrastructure cash fund CRS 33-10-11. This fund also requires a specified percentage based on more than \$20 million or less than \$20 million of lottery fund money, to be distributed to the infrastructure cash fund. The money in the cash fund is continuously appropriated to the Division of Parks and Wildlife for specified outdoor recreation and management purposes. The Wildlife Cash Fund, which was

	created in section 33-1-112 (1), also receives a specified percentage of lottery fund money based on an above or below \$20 million threshold. The KCW revenue provided to the Wildlife Cash Fund can facilitate the implementation of the restoration of gray wolves to Colorado per C.R.S. 33.2-105.8.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	Senator Mark Baisley will sponsor the bill. Have not reached out to other legislators regarding a bill but have spoken to Senator Mike Weissman about the critical issue of road access to Eleven Mile state park after his constituent from Aurora connected us. I will reach out to legislators to garner support.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county? Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	<u>Financial implications:</u> Park County spends a higher portion of our \$6.1 million HUTF attempting to maintain the state park access roads compared to the remaining county roads, especially based on population. After one week of grading the roads, the surface is destroyed. Park is spending money and dedicating resources to serve tourists and forsaking residents. <u>Financial implications for the solution:</u> None.
What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? <i>Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.</i>	The impacted parties are: 1. People who want to visit and recreate at a state park and suffer damage to their boat, trailer, camper or vehicle. Some suffer roll-overs driving too close to the shoulder. I have numerous letters and photos depicting the damage. 2. Emergency responders. Lake George Fire District has suffered a sheered-off shock absorber in-route to a structure fire which rendered the water tender inoperable and unable to reach the fire. Fortunately, the fire did not result in a wildland forest fire. 3. Residents suffer from dust inhalation, especially on the weekends when traffic is heavy, up to 1,000+ vehicles per day. 4. DNR may suffer reduced KCW Pass purchases since those on the front range who like to recreate at Eleven Mile and Spinney may not continue to purchase the pass due to the vehicle damage caused by accessing the parks. Financial implications of the solution: The Colorado Parks and Wildlife Cash Fund and The Wildlife Cash Fund will not receive the excess funds. However, they receive 15% or 20% of the lottery fund, so they will still receive funding.
Staff Feedback	This proposal is more feasible than many of the tax-related concepts but still carries notable challenges. The Keep Colorado Wild Pass has only recently been implemented, and stakeholders are cautious about reopening the statute or reallocating funds. Colorado Parks and Wildlife

	(CPW) and conservation groups will strongly defend the current allocations, arguing that any diversion of funds undermines the pass's original promise to voters and park users. <u>Time Commitment:</u> Moderate. This would require negotiating directly with CPW, outdoor groups, and legislators to build consensus around adding a local-share component without destabilizing existing beneficiaries.
--	---

Health & Human Services

SNAP Benefits	
El Paso County (Commissioner Carrie Geitner)	
Preferred Contact:	carriegeitner@elpasoco.com
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	None
Who is your subject matter expert?	Brandon Wilson, Government Affairs Advisor, El Paso County, 719-208-9635, BrandonWilson@elpasoco.com Ryan Parsell, Government Affairs Executive Director, El Paso County
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) currently permits the purchase of sugar-sweetened beverages and candy, despite overwhelming evidence linking these products to chronic diseases such as obesity, diabetes, and heart disease—conditions that disproportionately affect low-income populations. As a taxpayer-funded program intended to support nutritional well-being, SNAP’s allowance of nutritionally poor, high-sugar items raises concerns about program alignment with public health goals, fiscal efficiency, and long-term health equity. The Board of County Commissioners is responsible for administering safety net programs. The current SNAP policy conflicts with strategic efforts to improve community wellness and reduce long-term service costs. Moreover, it raises concerns among constituents about the responsible use of taxpayer-supported benefits. Without local authority to regulate SNAP purchases, the board is left to manage the consequences without the tools to enact preventive policy. This creates an urgent need for legislative action at the state level to enable counties to better align SNAP administration with public health objectives.
Areas of Impact:	Functionality of county programs or services.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	Colorado’s SNAP recipients are disproportionately affected by the prevalence of sugar-sweetened beverages and candy, which are strongly linked to negative health outcomes such as obesity, type 2 diabetes, cardiovascular disease, tooth decay, and liver disease. In Colorado, roughly 29% of adults and 18% of children consume at least one sugary drink daily, while 25% of adults are obese and 6.9% have diagnosed diabetes. Because SNAP is a taxpayer-funded program intended to support nutritious food consumption, allowing benefits to be used for soda and

	candy undermines both public health and fiscal responsibility. Prohibiting these purchases could significantly reduce diet-related chronic diseases, align SNAP policy with health guidelines, and curb healthcare costs.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	El Paso County supports the introduction and passage of state legislation directing the Colorado Department of Human Services (CDHS) to apply for a waiver from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) to restrict the use of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits for the purchase of candy or prepared desserts. This legislative effort reflects the County's commitment to promoting public health, advancing nutritional education, and ensuring responsible stewardship of taxpayer-funded assistance programs. By pursuing this waiver, El Paso County seeks to align SNAP purchasing policies with evidence-based dietary guidelines and reduce the burden of diet-related chronic diseases among vulnerable populations in Colorado.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Rule Manual Volume 4, SNAP 10-CCR 2506-1 4.130.2 ELIGIBLE FOODS Households can only purchase eligible foods with SNAP benefits. Eligible foods include: A. Any food or food product intended for human consumption, except for alcoholic beverages, tobacco, and hot food, including hot food products prepared by the retailer and sold at above room temperature for immediate consumption, and candy and soda. B. Seeds and plants to grow foods for personal consumption by eligible household members. <i>El Paso County's proposed legislative change would be to direct CDHS to apply for a waiver from USDA to add candy and prepared desserts to the list of items that cannot be purchased with SNAP benefits in Colorado.</i>
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	Yes, but we believe that pursuing a legislative solution is the best option at this time.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	No.
What possible organization(s)	Proponents include the El Paso Board of County Commissioners, Rep. Rose Pugliese, other members of the El Paso County delegation, public health

would support your proposed solution?	organizations, medical and healthcare providers, nutrition and food policy advocacy groups, and other local governments.
What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	Opponents could include members of the El Paso County state delegation, other members of the General Assembly, food and beverage industry groups, and anti-hunger and food access advocacy groups.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	Yes. House Minority Leader Pugliese was interested in the concept and in helping us secure a bill title.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county? Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	Counties: Savings associated with reduced health and welfare burdens. Potentially some cost associated with high constituent call volume.
What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? <i>Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.</i>	State: potential cost with waiver development, IT upgrades, outreach, etc.
Staff Feedback	<u>Risk / Difficulty</u>: High - In early August, Colorado received a waiver from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) to exempt soda and sugary beverages from SNAP benefits. The state drew significant opposition from food advocacy organizations for submitting and receiving this waiver. This will make the path to seeking additional waivers via legislation very challenging. Additionally, the Colorado Department of Human Services has indicated that applying for waivers is a time-consuming endeavor which may translate into a fiscal note being applied to this bill. <u>Time Commitment</u>: Low - The bill language is straightforward, there will likely be members of the minority party desiring to sponsor it, and a

	minimum number of stakeholder sessions will be needed to explain the bill and have interested parties make position decisions.
--	--

Revising the Child Welfare Prevention and Intervention Services Cash Fund	
Larimer County (Commissioner John Kefalas)	
Preferred Contact:	kefalajm@co.larimer.co.us
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	N/A
Who is your subject matter expert?	Heather O'Hayre, Director, Larimer County Human Services, ohayrehj@co.larimer.co.us, (970) 498-6310 Hannah Ditzenberger, Policy Analyst, Larimer County Human Services, ditzenha@co.larimer.co.us, (970) 498-6322
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	Colorado's child welfare system is underfunded by \$25-30 million for SFY24-25, and the State needs to address this shortfall. Larimer County's Department of Human Services has had to make significant service cuts through contracts and other staffing reductions as a result; impacting the services and safety of our community. The federal Family First Prevention Services Act (passed as part of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018) created the structure for states and counties to draw down federal Title IV-E funding for prevention services. Prior to this, states only received federal funding for administrative costs and out-of-home placements. In response to the federal Family First Prevention Services Act (FFPSA), SB18-254 made several changes to Colorado's child welfare funding structure, including the creation of the Child Welfare Prevention and Intervention Services Cash Fund ("the Fund"). The legislation (SB18-254) impacted two funding processes related to the child welfare system. First, the Colorado Department of Human Services (CDHS) could no longer retain unspent capped allocation money in years when there were funds remaining. Any unspent money is transferred to the Fund. Second, any direct Title IV-E funding for prevention services that is drawn down by the state is transferred to the Fund as a way to try to increase other prevention funds received. As a requirement of FFPSA, states were required to submit a prevention plan to our federal partners; requiring approval prior to implementation and before any prevention federal funding could be provided. In 2019-2021, CDHS contracted with a vendor to develop Colorado's FFPSA prevention plan; counties, families and other stakeholders were included. The intent of Colorado's plan was to scale primary prevention across

	Colorado to prevent children and families from ever coming into contact with the child welfare system. The plan was more aggressive than the minimum requirements of the FFPSA which sought to decrease out-of-home placements and repeat interactions with the child welfare system. The plan was initially denied by our federal partners and it took the state many more months and several more attempts before the plan was approved in September 2022. The plan that was approved was changed significantly from the initial design, however SB18-254 had already been implemented. Additionally, following the passage of HB22-1295 and the creation of the Colorado Department of Early Childhood (CDEC), the Fund and the Colorado Child Abuse Prevention Trust Fund Board was moved from the Division of Child Welfare (CDHS) and all oversight and spending is completely disconnected from child welfare practice. The Colorado Child Abuse Prevention Trust Fund Board now makes recommendations to the Executive Director of the CDEC on how all funding in the Fund should be spent. The intent of SB18-254 in creating the Fund and the initial design of Colorado's primary prevention efforts are admirable. However, especially during a budget crisis, these dollars should be used to support county child welfare services that focus on preventing out-of-home placements. Redirecting the Title IV-E prevention dollars back to child welfare for in-home services that prevent out-of-home placement is needed at a time when Larimer County and many other counties are reducing services due to the significant underfunding in child welfare.
Areas of Impact:	Budget challenges limit our ability to provide functional, high quality programs and services to our clients and thus impact the day-to-day operations of the county, the functionality of county programs or services, and general community advancement.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	Funding shortfall and funding allocation.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	Right now, all unspent general child welfare fund dollars included in the initial allocation to each county are transferred to the Child Welfare Prevention and Intervention Services Cash Fund. Additionally, any IV-E funding derived from CDHS and county activities also gets transferred to CDEC. We propose that all prevention IV-E funding derived from CDHS and county activities should remain with CDHS to fund in-home services that prevent out-of-home placement (in alignment with FFPSA). The monies would then be redistributed to counties to help them provide essential services that prevent out-of-home placements. The details of this would fall under the purview of the Child Welfare Allocation Committee.

	Any IV-E funding derived from CDEC activities would remain under the purview of the CDEC.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	The bill would seek to modify C.R.S. 26-5-104 with specific language to be developed: (7) Close-out process for county allocations. (a) (I) There is created in the state treasury the child welfare prevention and intervention services cash fund, referred to in this subsection (7) as the “fund”. The following two special accounts are created in the fund: (A) The small- and medium-sized counties account, referred to in this subsection (7) as the “small- and medium-sized account”; and (B) The all-counties account, referred to in this subsection (7) as the “all-counties account”. (II) The state department is authorized to accept gifts, grants, and donations, which must be transferred to the fund and credited to the all-counties account within the fund. (III) In addition to transfers credited to the all-counties account within the fund pursuant to subsection (7)(a.6) of this section, the general assembly may directly appropriate general fund money to the fund. If the general assembly makes a direct appropriation of general fund money to the fund, the money must be credited to the all-counties account within the fund. The state department, in consultation with the counties, shall determine the allocation of any money credited to the all-counties account within the fund, which money may be allocated to all counties, regardless of size. (IV) The state department, in consultation with counties, shall allocate all money from the fund to increase local child welfare prevention and intervention services capacity, which allocations must be used by a county for the delivery of child welfare prevention and intervention services that have been approved by the state department. (V) The state department shall work collaboratively with the state board of human services to promulgate rules concerning the allocation and use of money from the fund. (a.3) (I) For state fiscal year 2018-19, and for each state fiscal year thereafter, except for state fiscal years 2019-20, 2020-21, and 2021-22, the state department retains any unspent general fund money included in the initial allocation to each balance of state county, up to five percent of the total general fund money allocated to balance of state counties, as described in subsection (4)(b) of this section and referred to in this subsection (7) as “small- and medium-sized counties”.

	(II) Retained money pursuant to subsection (7)(a.3)(I) of this section must be transferred into the fund and credited to the small- and medium-sized account within the fund. (III) Money from the small- and medium-sized account within the fund must be allocated by the state department, in consultation with small- and medium-sized counties, to small- and medium-sized counties to increase local child welfare prevention and intervention services capacity and must be used by counties for the delivery of child welfare prevention and intervention services that have been approved by the state department. (a.5) Subject to the limitations set forth in this subsection (7), the state department may, at the end of a state fiscal year based upon the recommendations of the child welfare allocations committee, allocate any unexpended capped money for the delivery of specific child welfare services to any one or more counties whose spending has exceeded a capped allocation for such specific child welfare services. (a.6) Subsequent to the allocation of any unexpended capped money pursuant to subsection (7)(a.5) of this section, and except for state fiscal years 2019-20, 2020-21, and 2021-22, any portion of the remaining state general fund money must be transferred to the fund and credited to the all-counties account within the fund for allocation by the state department to counties for the delivery of state-department-approved child welfare prevention and intervention services. (b) A county may only receive money pursuant to subsection (7)(a.5) of this section for expenditures other than those attributable to administrative and support functions as referred to in section 26-5-101 (3)(m) and for authorized expenditures attributable to caseload increases beyond the caseload estimate established pursuant to subsection (3) of this section for a specific capped allocation. (c) A county may not receive money pursuant to the provisions of subsection (7)(a.5) of this section for authorized expenditures attributable to caseload increases for services in one capped allocation from unexpended capped money in another capped allocation. (d) As used in this section, “unexpended capped money” means money that has been appropriated for child welfare services, allocated to a county or group of counties as a capped allocation or allocations pursuant to the provisions of subsection (4) of this section.
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	No. This change needs to be made through legislation. Current statute requires the state department to allocate all remaining state general fund money to counties for the delivery of state-department-approved child welfare prevention and intervention services.

Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	No.
What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	Some advocacy organizations and other service providers serving children and families in their home might support this as they're currently seeing cuts in their funding from child welfare while also seeing their costs rise.
What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	Some advocacy organizations might oppose the reduction of funding for primary prevention efforts.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	We have not had formal conversations with legislators. However, we believe that Senator Kirkmeyer, and likely others, would support this legislation.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county? Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	As mentioned, Colorado's child welfare system is underfunded by \$25-30 million. This solution would help redistribute some funds back to counties, including Larimer County, to use for our child welfare services. We hope the redistribution of funds would enable us to address our budget challenges and help families involved in our child welfare system receive valuable services.
What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? <i>Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.</i>	This solution would redirect some funds away from state-approved prevention and intervention efforts. However, we believe that the reallocation of unspent child welfare funds would provide greater benefits to families involved with our system.
Staff Feedback	<u>Risk / Difficulty:</u> Medium - This is a pragmatic bill that directs federal funds earned from child welfare activities to be invested back into child welfare activities. The challenge is that this money is currently diverted to the state Department of Early Childhood for broader purposes associated with the prevention of child abuse. This may result in a "turf" issue for members of

	the board, which includes legislators (Rep. Gilchrist and Rep. Bacon), that oversees this funding for the Department. <u>Time Commitment:</u> High - This bill requires multiple discussions with the state Department of Early Childhood, state Department of Human Services, and members and staff of the Joint Budget Committee. Additionally, the Governor's Office staff that oversees early childhood initiatives and the two legislators on the board will require in-depth discussions about this proposal.
--	---

Revisions to the Legislative Fiscal Note Process	
Larimer County (Commissioner John Kefalas)	
Preferred Contact:	kefalajm@co.larimer.co.us
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	N/A
Who is your subject matter expert?	Heather O'Hayre, Director, Larimer County Human Services. ohayrehj@co.larimer.co.us, (970) 498-6310 Hannah Ditzenberger, Policy Analyst, Larimer County Human Services. ditzenha@co.larimer.co.us, (970) 498-6322
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	Counties administer human services programs in Colorado under the supervision of multiple state departments. Despite this, the Colorado General Assembly has no formal process to thoroughly understand the fiscal impact changes to human services programs will have on counties. As a result, unfunded and under-funded state mandates create a significant strain on county human services budgets. Over the last several years, counties have been forced to pause, reduce, or eliminate certain services to community members due to unfunded mandates. Additional Background: County human services agencies are experiencing significant budget challenges across programs due to increased costs of business, reduced or flat funds from the state, and increased requirements from state and federal rule or statutory changes. This current reality is prior to any future changes that might come from federal budgets or programmatic changes. If implemented, federal changes to Medicaid, SNAP, and other programs would add to county administrative and budget burden. Over at least the past five years, the state legislature has made significant changes to the administration of county human services programs without providing needed funds to implement these changes. For example, in 2025, the state enacted at least four human services bills (HB25-1035, HB25-1097, HB25-1200, HB25-1271) that increase county administration or case management with no appropriations listed in the fiscal note. In other recent bills (for example, HB22-1259, HB21-1094, and SB24-008), the legislature has appropriated funds to the state, but the appropriations did not consider the county costs or adequately cover implementation. In addition, in some program areas, specifically in services

	to older adults and adults with disabilities, funding has remained flat, despite increasing costs of operations. Currently, legislative council staff must provide information related to the fiscal impact and the potential administrative aspects of a proposed legislation to local government in the bill's fiscal note. However, the process for soliciting and incorporating county feedback is not robust and does not adequately consider county budgets or operations. Legislative council staff must solicit more specific budget calculations and justifications from state departments and agencies (C.R.S. 2-2-322), and this should be the practice for county human services agencies as well. In addition, the process of soliciting and incorporating information from counties is not standardized. The inclusion of accurate county fiscal information in a bill's fiscal note can be dependent on the specific fiscal analyst working on a bill. For example, in 2025, CCI lobbyists worked diligently with a fiscal note staffer to include certain county costs in the fiscal note for HB25-1271. The inclusion of county information was welcome but, unfortunately, unique and required building a relationship with the analyst. Including anticipated county costs should be standard practice and required by statute.
Areas of Impact:	Because unfunded human services mandates increase our costs, the problem impacts our day-to-day operations, the functionality of county programs and services, and our ability to provide certain services to community members.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	Colorado does not require legislative staff to solicit and incorporate county fiscal information in the fiscal note. As a result, the legislature does not understand how certain legislation would impact county human services operations.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	The bill would seek to modify C.R.S. 29-1-304.9 by adding something similar to the language below: "Beginning July 1, 2026, for any bill that relates to a human services program that counties are mandated to administer on behalf of the state, staff of the legislative council must request fiscal information from an association of statewide county commissioners that is representative of all counties in the state. The association shall provide information on the fiscal impact of a legislative measure in the manner requested by the staff of the legislative council for consideration by the staff in connection with the preparation of a fiscal note for the measure. The association shall substantiate the calculation of the fiscal impact of the legislative measure in its response to a request for information by providing any documentation that clearly

	identifies any assumptions supporting that calculation and a narrative discussion of the justification for any increase or decrease in workload. Staff of the legislative council must include the fiscal information received from county human services in the fiscal note.”
Please provide sample language for this solution.	Please see above for sample language.
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	No.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	No. This proposal is unique in that it focuses on the problem of unfunded mandates to human services programs specifically. In 2023, CCI brought forward legislation (HB23-1113) that would require an analysis of the potential impact of a pending bill on a county or a city and county. This legislation was focused broadly, and it received pushback from environmental and other advocacy groups unrelated to human services.
What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	We have not had conversations about the proposal with interested parties. However, this bill would provide the Joint Budget Committee with a better understanding of Colorado's fiscal environment, so we expect JBC members would be supportive of this legislation. Additionally, we have heard through CCI that many other counties are supportive of a bill concept like this.
What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	The bill could potentially increase legislative staff workload; however, this process exists today although legislative staff often don't include the county fiscal impact data they receive.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	We have not had specific conversations with local legislators. However, we know that Senator Kirkmeyer is very interested in addressing human services unfunded mandates, and Senator Marchman is also interested in this topic based on an update from our peers in Boulder County.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county?	Because unfunded human services mandates increase our costs, the problem impacts our day-to-day operations, the functionality of county programs and services, and our ability to provide certain services to community members.

Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	
What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? <i>Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.</i>	County commissioners are responsible for county budgets. Inadequate funding and unfunded mandates related to human services programs have forced counties in Colorado to reduce, eliminate, or pause services to community members. Additionally, if implemented, Colorado Counties, Inc (CCI) as the statewide association for counties along with the Colorado Human Services Directors Association (CHSDA) would create a more formalized structure for providing fiscal impact data through this new process. It is our hope that county costs would be funded in future legislation; however, this bill alone does not have a fiscal impact. There may be minimal resources required from CCI and CHSDA to provide this data in the future but the outcome of having county costs clearly documented for the legislative process will provide greater benefits.
Staff Feedback	<u>Risk / Difficulty:</u> Medium - The primary challenge for this bill proposal is finding bill sponsors because many legislators rely on vague fiscal notes to pass bills through the Appropriations Committees. This bill proposal will make that harder to do. <u>Time Commitment:</u> Low - There are few entities and individuals interested in the fiscal note process at the General Assembly, which makes outreach and stakeholder efforts rather easy. Most of the time needed for this bill proposal is to receive and address feedback from three state agencies (Department of Early Childhood, Department of Health Care Policy and Financing, and Department of Human Services) and the Legislative Council Staff that write the fiscal notes for each bill.

Land Use & Natural Resources

County Enforcement Authority – Ordinances, Zoning, Building, Pest and Weed Control	
Morgan County (Commissioner Kelvin Bernhardt)	
Preferred Contact:	ksbernhardt@co.morgan.co.us mlinke@co.grand.co.us
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	Grand County (Commissioner Merrit Linke)
Who is your subject matter expert?	• Kathryn Sellars, Morgan County Attorney. 720-376-6528. kms@hpcwlaw.com • Maxine LaBarre-Krostue, Grand County Attorney. 970-725-3045. mlabarre@co.grand.co.us • Shira Cohen, Assistant County Attorney (Grand). 970-725-3045. scohen@co.grand.co.us
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes
Supplemental Material	<u>View expanded summary of this legislative proposal here.</u>
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	Enforcement of County ordinances and zoning and building regulations is split between the jurisdictions of District and County courts. Generally, if counties want injunctive relief for these violations, they must seek that relief in District Court. If counties want to seek civil penalties, they must seek that relief in County Court. As such, enforcement is not streamlined or efficient, it results in a significant decrease in the capacity to enforce these regulations despite the county community's overwhelming desire to see these issues addressed. In addition, the civil infraction process to prosecute violations of these provisions, and the provisions in the pest and noxious weed statutes, conflicts with the Rules of Civil Infractions. Civil penalties are not available for ordinance violations, and pest and noxious weeds, but should be an avenue for enforcement. Civil penalties for violations of building and zoning regulations (\$100 a day) are woefully inadequate to serve as a detriment or motivator for violators. Counties track far behind municipalities in the amount of fines that may be sought (compare to municipal fines in a court of record that can be up to \$2650 or \$300 for a municipal court which is not of record). Civil infraction penalties (\$100 a day) for violations of zoning and building regulations track behind civil infraction penalties for ordinance violations

	(up to \$1000), even though these violations are all traditionally considered nuisances.
Areas of Impact:	Day-to-day operations of the county; Functionality of county programs or services; Power/Authority/Mandate of county government; General community advancement.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	Poor legislative drafting, likely brought on by a lack of understanding of court procedure/jurisdiction and abatement processes. Failure to update statutes to allow for more effective enforcement.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	Legislation is the only means to solve this issue.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	View sample language here.
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	No, only the legislature can fix these issues.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	Not to our knowledge.
What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	We believe there will be wide support for these changes among county governments.
What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	We cannot identify any organization that would oppose this solution.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	Yes, they want to see how the CCI process turns out.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county?	It costs counties more time (and fees for counties that do not have in-house counsel) to enforce their regulations under the current law when their citizens are demanding that action be taken. There are no financial implications to the solution.

Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	
What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? <i>Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.</i>	There are no financial implications of the problem to any other impacted parties. There should not be any financial implications of the solution to any other impacted parties.
Staff Feedback	<u>Risk/Difficulties:</u> Medium – While this is strictly a county authority issue, it is possible other organizations have significant concerns with how counties may utilize this authority and the scope of reforms. CCI staff has set up a large stakeholder meeting for next Wednesday to get a better gauge on the matter. <u>Time Commitment:</u> High – While county attorney's have done a fabulous job proposing statutory changes, there could be quite a bit of negotiating with stakeholders on details and combatting their concerns.

2026 Amendment to Colorado Wildfire Resiliency Code	
Delta County (Commissioner Wendell Koontz)	
Preferred Contact:	wkoontz@deltacountyco.gov
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	Craig Fuller and Mike Lane; Delta County Commissioners.
Who is your subject matter expert?	Kris Stewart; Delta County emergency Manager.
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	The 2025 Colorado Wildfire Resiliency Code (CWRC) requires adoption by 1 April 2026 and enforcement by 1 July 2026. CWRC identifies Counties, Municipalities, and Fire Districts as the Governing Body required to implement, perform inspections, keep detailed records, and enforce the codes which are essentially building codes. For the 15 counties in Colorado that do not have building departments or staff and for the municipalities that are understaffed, and for the Fire Districts that are staffed by part-time volunteers, the timeline is unobtainable. There are not enough qualified staff or funds available to develop a department, fund the operation, and staff it. Additionally, the maps approved by CWRC are inaccurate, misleading, and confusing. Land parcels of the same topographic and vegetation types may have up to three different wildfire risk classifications. The Wildfire Resiliency Code Board recognized the mapping issues even at adoption of the CWRC.
Areas of Impact:	Day-to-day operations of the county; Power/Authority/Mandate of county government.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	problematic rulemaking and insufficient funding.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	The first request is to allow the Governing Bodies (Counties, Municipalities, and Fire Districts) to phase in the 2025 CWRC through 2028. This will provide a systematic budgeting and staffing process. Governing Bodies with existing building codes and departments will be able to adopt and enforce as in 2026 or sooner and provide best practices for as others develop that program. Second request is to redevelop the CWRC maps for accuracy and postpone enforcement based on the current maps. The third request is to provide funding to hire, train, equip and staff required by the CWRC. Funding would be needed through the startup phase and for five years of operation of the building departments.

Please provide sample language for this solution.	I will need help drafting specific language.
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	Yes. The wildfire risk maps could be redeveloped by the CWRC Board.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	I am unaware of other organizations working on this issue.
What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	The fifteen counties without building departments. They include: Baca County, Cheyenne County, Costilla County, Custer County, Delta County, Dolores County, Kit Carson County, Mineral County, Montezuma County, Phillips County, Prowers County, Saguache County, Sedgwick County, Washington County, and Yuma County. Additionally, CML representing municipalities and rural Volunteer Fire Departments.
What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	Colorado Wildfire Resiliency Board and insurance companies.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	Not yet.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county? Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	Developing a brand-new department with 3 to 5 staff members, training, office space, equipment, and vehicles will require +\$500,000 annually. The phased in development and requested funding will allow for a systematic budgeting and logistical solution.
What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties?	Unknown.

What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.	
Staff Feedback	<u>Risk/Difficulties:</u> High – The lead sponsors & proponents heard many of these concerns when the original bill went through the legislative process and were not sympathetic. In addition, a small delay to implementation was granted to counties last legislative session. A new voice (rather than counties) to lead this charge would go a long ways to achieving new reform. <u>Time Commitment:</u> High – It will require significant time to again convince sponsors, other legislators and proponents of these concerns; why last year’s delay was insufficient; and why the work of the Code Board is insufficient, especially when opportunities were provided to stakeholders to provide input. To make waves on this issue will require building a new, large coalition.

Amending Utility Condemnation Authority	
Elbert County (Commissioner Dallas Schroeder)	
Preferred Contact:	dallas.schroeder@elbertcounty-co.gov
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	None yet.
Who is your subject matter expert?	Dallas Schroeder, Elbert County Commissioner. dallas.schroeder@elbertcounty-co.gov
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	Utilities using condemnation authority before appearing before a PC or BOOC/Town Board that currently allows for speculative takings that undermine constitutional rights and weakens local land use authority and public trust.
Areas of Impact:	Power/Authority/Mandate of county government; Local landowner property rights.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	A utility proposed traversing Elbert County from north to south with a transmission line. Condemnation proceedings were initiated before the utility appeared at the public hearing for either the PC or the BOCC. This hurt the individual landowner and disregarded the local land use authority.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	This proposed bill strives to ensure that utilities cannot initiate condemnation proceedings until all required local governments' permits are approved, protecting private property owners from speculative takings and supporting local control over land use decisions.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	Section 1: Legislative Declaration: Reaffirms public utilities and responsibility of government to protect individual property rights Section 2: Amend 40-5-105: PUC Certification of Need (CPCN) does not authorize condemnation without local approval. Section 3. New 40-5-106 Prohibits condemnation without final permits; ensures identified property Section 4: Effective date and petition Clause: Effective Jan 1, 2027, unless overturned by voters.
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	No alternatives.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a	Not that I am aware of.

solution to this problem before?	
What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	CML, Colorado Farm Bureau and others who generally support local control and property rights.
What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	Colorado Energy Office, Xcel and other PUC regulated utilities.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	Rep. Richardson and Sen. R. Pelton have committed as sponsors.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county? Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	Potential for reduced property values. Reduced areas for economic growth.
What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? <i>Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.</i>	<u>Problem:</u> Reduced values for landowners. Infringement of property rights. Infringement of 1st amendment. <u>Solution:</u> May extend the timeline of projects.
Staff Feedback	<u>Risk/Difficulties:</u> High – This proposal is already viewed to be an attack on one specific utility provider, who while unpopular, has a very robust, strong presence at the Capitol. <u>Time Commitment:</u> High – It will require a high degree of grassroots advocacy from the membership to create the necessary amount of pressure on legislators to penalize the utility provider.

Eliminating 35-acre subdivision loophole	
Huerfano County (Commissioner Karl Sporleder)	
Preferred Contact:	Commissioners@huerfano.us
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	None.
Who is your subject matter expert?	Carl Young, County Administrator, Huerfano County, 719.225.3890
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	Huerfano County has experienced a significant uptick in the number of 35-acre subdivisions that turn productive agricultural land into vacant land hoping for residential development. When that sparse development happens, the County experiences heavier use of County roads and other services without the tax base to fund said services.
Areas of Impact:	Day-to-day operations of the county; Functionality of county programs or services; Power/Authority/Mandate of county government; General community advancement.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	State Statute.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	We propose to eliminate the 35-acre exemption contained in 30-28-101(10)(b) or raise the exemption from 35 acres to a size usable for grazing.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	Strike 30-28-101(10)(b) and remove other references to that section, which reads: (b) The terms “subdivision” and “subdivided land”, as defined in paragraph (a) of this subsection (10), shall not apply to any division of land which creates parcels of land each of which comprises thirty-five or more acres of land and none of which is intended for use by multiple owners.
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	Huerfano County is preparing to publish for public comment significant revisions to our land use code that severely limit the ability to build on newly created exempt 35 acre lots. While this may ultimately be effective it makes it more complicated to develop in the County and increases bureaucracy.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a	CCI has a published white paper that explains various attempts to get around this provision.

solution to this problem before?	
What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	Agricultural groups.
What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	Realtors, well drillers, large lot developers.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	Not yet.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county? Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	This problem drains the County's resources by increasing traffic along County Roads and pulling our staff into landowner disputes involving access. Many of these subdivisions only provide for access easements with no built roads. Easements may not take into account physical barriers to access.
What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? <i>Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.</i>	This change will significantly impact businesses that specialize in creating these subdivisions.
Staff Feedback	<u>Risk/Difficulties:</u> Medium – This will likely come down to a rumble with housing advocates (both affordable and for-profit) and, potentially, the farming/agriculture/private property rights advocates. While some will be sympathetic to the situation in Huerfano county, it has yet to be seen if it is enough to reverse this long-standing policy. <u>Time Commitment:</u> Medium – It will come down to back 'n forth lobbying with these other groups, depending on their level of opposition.

AQCC Regulation 31 OPPOSITION	
Morgan County (Commissioner Tim Malone)	
Preferred Contact:	tmalone@co.morgan.co.us
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	Logan County.
Who is your subject matter expert?	Cass Yearous, Morgan County Dept of Solid Waste Management Director. 970.867.9713 cyearous@co.morgan.co.us Katheryn Sellars, Law Firm representing Morgan County, kms@hpwclaw.com
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	Unfunded mandate being imposed through administrative rulemaking by the Air Quality Control Commission that will potentially make County landfills impossible to operate.
Areas of Impact:	Day-to-day operations of the county; Functionality of county programs or services.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	Too broad delegation of authority to state agency, lack of funding support from the State, problematic rulemaking.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	Legislative action and advocacy through rulemaking process.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	The statutes that grant the Air Quality Control Commission rulemaking powers to address greenhouse gas emissions need to be amended to limit and/or reduce the AQCC's authority to impose unfunded mandates on local governments. Especially, but not limited to, the following: C.R.S. § 25-7-102, -105, -106, -109. The first and desired option is to prohibit AQCC's ability to regulate greenhouse gas emissions from local government operated landfills. As a second option the amendment could prohibit the promulgation of rules regulating local government landfill facilities and operations related to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions until the state budgets full funding for the implementation of such regulations. As a third option or combined with other options, a legislative amendment could require AQCC in its rulemaking to consider and establish deadlines for compliance with any new regulations with that deadline being a minimum of 10 years, while also providing local governments with the ability to opt out of certain regulations if funding is not available or the implementation of such regulations is not practical or impossible.

Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	The County is actively participating as a member of a coalition of local governments in the AQCC rulemaking process. There is no indication that the AQCC is sympathetic to the local governments' concerns.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	Possibly CCI is working on it, Other CO Counties have formed a coalition.
What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	All Colorado county landfills that will be negatively impacted.
What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	Environmental Activists.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	Yes, Senator Byron Pelton.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county? Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	If passed the regulations that landfills would be forced to conform to would be financially crippling. Estimate costs could range from 3-5 million .
What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? <i>Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.</i>	The same costs would be statewide with any County/Private owed landfill. State funding would be necessary to ensure that these landfills stay open and operational.

Staff Feedback	<u>Risk/Difficulties:</u> Medium – If the proposal is to reverse the rulemaking entirely - this will be a significant lift, as the perception will be that counties negotiated in good-faith with the AQCC for additional time to comply with the rules. If the proposal is simply to identify resources for counties to comply - the biggest difficulty is identifying new and/or sharing existing pots of funding, given the current budget constraints at the state level. <u>Time Commitment:</u> Low – Still largely varies on the solution being sought, however, I do believe other entities will want to ensure counties are able to comply with the rulemaking; this has already been expressed from the Colorado Department of Public Health & Environment (CDPHE).
----------------	---

Agriculture, Wildlife, & Rural Affairs

Preventing Illegal Wildlife Harvesting	
Eagle County (Commissioner Tom Boyd)	
Preferred Contact:	tom.boyd@eaglecounty.us
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	Larimer County
Who is your subject matter expert?	Laura Hartman, Senior Policy Analyst, Eagle County. 970-328-8613. laura.hartman@eaglecounty.us
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	There is a loophole in current law that allows for hunting wildlife on land owned by public entities with minimal consequences. Despite posted rules and local regulations restricting hunting or access, hunters have habitually hunted on county open space (for example). In this scenario, the county can only issue a civil infraction and CPW statute does not cover land owned by public entities or recognize local hunting restrictions. Hunters can simply pay the associated fine (minimal) and keep the illegally taken animal. This is a stark contrast to the consequences for an illegally taken animal on private land. These unequal protections for public lands, like county open spaces, incentivise illegal hunting with minor consequences. Hunters violating local rules bring negative impacts to local hunting programs that provide public education, mentorship, and the public's hunting access. Currently, a violation of local hunting rules does not impact the hunter's ability to hunt or allow for animal seizure (by CPW) of an animal taken where prohibited by local laws. If CPW considered the violation of local hunting rules as an "illegal take", then they could treat the incident as they currently do with other "illegal take" situations. Currently, if hunters can just pay the (maximum) \$100 civil infraction fine then they can "pay their way" out of illegally harvesting an animal. This fine is overshadowed as our county hosts hunters spending over \$30,000 for a guided or private hunting opportunity. Because of this gap, some hunters might be financially incentivized to illegally hunt on county lands and not participate in guided or private hunting. Counties often partner with CPW on their public lands to pursue wildlife conservation goals. Allowing CPW to enforce on municipal and county public lands will better ensure conservation goals are met and solidify the integrity of existing hunting programs on county open spaces.

Areas of Impact:	Management and pursuit of conservation goals on open space lands; Public access and public safety (hunting where unsafe); Day-to-day operations of the county; Functionality of county programs or services; Power/Authority/Mandate of county government; General community advancement.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	In recent years, CPW has not been able to apply the same protections given to private lands on municipally or county owned public lands. There are no CPW statutes that recognize local hunting rules which have rapidly evolved over the last 20 years. Successful land conservation by local open space programs has created thousands of acres which are not eligible for “illegal take” protections. As these acres were secured into public ownership, the state did not afford similar hunting management as found on adjacent federal and state lands. All other public lands in Colorado have forms of site specific hunting rules, but counties and municipalities (deputies, open space rangers, etc.) have not been afforded the same powers given to state lands and have been asked to rely on CPW. Our federal lands have site specific hunting rules (National Parks, Monuments, sensitive or recreation areas on USFS/BLM) not enforced by CPW, but by federal law enforcement Rangers. Without CPW’s enforcement, a county’s previous option was to summon an individual for a hunting violation and attempt to involve the local District Attorney. They could pursue impacts to the hunter’s licence privileges and seizure of the animal. However, when the Colorado Legislature changed rule violations on county open space lands from a class 2 petty offence to a civil infraction they also removed the local District Attorney’s ability to act in these cases.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	Eagle County has worked with Larimer County, law enforcement agencies, CPW, DNR, and county attorneys to identify a lead solution: amending title 33.6.120. This statute currently defines that it is unlawful to take an animal outside of its season or in an area closed by commission rule. Changes would further indicate that it is unlawful to take an animal in an area that is closed to hunting via a county resolution or ordinance and encourages the development of wildlife management plans in collaboration with CPW. The proposed language, below, would include other jurisdictions such as municipalities, utilities, and schools and colleges who share in the current adverse consequences of the loophole. DNR/CPW has a position request pending approval from the Governor's Office as of 9/23. If approved by the Gov's Office, CPW could move into

	a formal support role to help introduce and pass this legislation. Eagle County will provide a verbal update on 10/3 if the position request has been approved.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	C.R.S.A. § 33-6-120 § 33-6-120. Hunting, trapping, or fishing out of season or in a closed area (1) It is unlawful for any person to fish, trap, hunt, or take any wildlife outside of the season established by or in an area closed by commission rule, <u>or in violation of a duly adopted resolution or ordinance in an area owned, operated, or controlled by any political subdivision or state public body.</u> Any person who violates this section is guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction, shall be punished by a fine and an assessment of license suspension points as follows: (a) For each incident that is not related to the hunting or taking of a big game animal, the fine shall be equal to twice the cost of the most expensive license for such species and ten license suspension points shall be assessed; (b) For the hunting or taking of big game, fifteen license suspension points and a fine that is equal to twice the cost of the most expensive license for such species shall be assessed. <u>(c) The governing body of any political subdivision or state public body is authorized to restrict, regulate or prohibit any activity in this section through the adoption of a resolution or ordinance. Nothing in this section shall prohibit the Colorado Division of Parks and Wildlife and any political subdivision or state public body from entering into wildlife management agreements.</u>
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	Eagle County has engaged with our Sheriff, local Wildlife Managers, and regional CPW staff to address the issue. After much consultation, DNR and CPW came to the table to indicate they prefer a change in statute as the best way to address the loophole and indicated 33.6.120 is the proper change.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	Eagle County staff worked with the Rocky Mountain Ranger Association to take up the issue. Their board sent a letter to CPW staff supporting a rule change that would close this “gap” or “loophole” in CPW’s ability to enforce. CPW attempted to manage this with rulemaking, but was unsuccessful and now favors a statutory change.

What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	The Rocky Mountain Ranger Association, CPW/DNR, CML, Colorado Mountain College, Denver Water, State Land Board, and potentially the Colorado Sheriff's Association.
What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	Potential opposition from hunters who will see an equalization of penalties.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	No, we have not contacted legislators.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county? Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	Administrative and staff time is increasingly spent on hunting enforcement at local open space lands. Hunting in Eagle County brings income and financial benefit to our local economy. Illegal hunting on county open space land negatively impacts our local conservation efforts to improve herd numbers. While there is no actual fiscal loss "number" associated with fewer animals to hunt, the derailing of our conservation efforts may reduce the economic benefits we receive from hunters.
What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? <i>Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.</i>	There could be increased costs to CPW for enforcing local hunting ordinances. However, just the closing of the loophole and increase in potential consequences for ignoring local hunting ordinances will serve as a deterrent for illegal wildlife harvesting on open space. So, we believe additional enforcement from CPW would be minimal. The change in law would result in the desired behavior change. CPW indicated that their funding for this would not come from the General Fund. So, there would be no fiscal note.
Staff Feedback	<u>Risk/Difficulties</u> : Medium – While a simple problem, which many have acknowledged exists, it does appear that there are numerous methods by which to solve it, which each have their own unique hurdles & opponents. Initially, DNR has shown interest in working towards a solution, which may be possible through their existing rulemaking authority without further legislative action, and conversations are underway to identify possible paths forward.

	<u>Time Commitment:</u> High – Negotiating with the various stakeholders and identifying the 'right' solution will take significant time; further time commitment, will depend on which solution is being sought.
--	---