CCI Colorado Counties, Inc.
ELEVATING IMPACT. UNIFYING COLORADO.

2026 Legislative Priority Proposals
Updated 9/15/25

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? *Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.*	Per fiscal note of HB25-1089 no financial impact.
Staff Feedback	Risk / Difficulty: 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. Time Commitment: 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.