Master Table
2027 Legislative Priority Proposals

Updated: 9/3/26

General Government

Defining Autopsy Report and Autopsy Report Release Requirements	
Larimer County	
Preferred Contact:	Commissioner Jody Shadduck-McNally, Chair, Lairmer County BOCC, shaddujl@co.larimer.co.us
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	None.
Who is your subject matter expert?	Stephen Hanks J.D. D-ABMDI , Larimer County Coroner, Larimer County, (970)498-6151, hankssk@larimer.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.	Outdated statute, Lack of existing statute/regulation, Inconsistency with other law and public policy This proposal seeks to solve many issues that coroner offices face when autopsy reports and other investigative documents in the coroners' case files are requested. (1) It will define autopsy report in accordance with the national standard which Colorado law follows for the performance of autopsies; (2) it will outline how autopsy reports are released and how coroners protect private information within autopsy reports; and (3) it will state how other documents within coroner case files are to be reviewed as criminal justice records. C.R.S. 30-10-606.5 relies on the national standard for who performs autopsies and how autopsies are performed which includes everything from beginning the autopsy to the final written autopsy report. The current definition at C.R.S. 30-10-606.7 does not align with this national practice standard. The current definition is found within the statute only discussing autopsies of minors but is being applied outside of that statute to request additional documents and photographs for autopsies performed on deceased adults. When releasing autopsy reports there is no standard between coroner offices in Colorado. Some offices heavily redact information, some minimally redact information, some deny release completely under a variety of circumstances, and some redact nothing and release full reports. There is significant confusion about what is releasable and what is

	protected information when it comes to health care, especially surrounding confidentiality of reproductive health and behavioral health information. There are laws and strong public policy supporting confidentiality and protection of PHI and PII, but nothing protecting that information within autopsy reports, creating a loophole and allowing protected information to flow freely into the public. Additionally, the 1974 case law which is the controlling law making autopsy reports public record, noted that those ""autopsy reports sought contain only medical information relevant to a determination of the cause of death."" This is not so today. Autopsy reports today are much more in-depth and detail every bodily system and organ, to include reproductive systems and presence of contraceptive devices and operations. Finally, coroners understand that autopsy reports are public records, but coroners do not know how the rest of their case files are viewed. There is argument for all other coroner files to be criminal justice records allowing for a balancing test and review before allowing or denying inspection, and this is supported in the same 1974 case law which distinguishes ""coroner's files"" from the ""autopsy report itself."" However, just like denying or releasing autopsy reports, every coroner has a different understanding of what to do. The Larimer County Coroner's Office has heard from families over the years regarding the release of autopsy reports as provided below: The family member did not understand why the Coroner's Office was able to release the autopsy report. The member was informed that in Colorado, the autopsy report is public record. The family member was surprised by this and had no idea that this was law and inquired about HIPAA regulations. The family member was informed that state statute allows the autopsy report to be a public record. A family member of a deceased individual was upset and did not understand how the Coroner's Office could send autopsy reports to anyone requesting them. They were upset that the autopsy mentioned her family member was "severely depressed". The medical examiner included "medical history significant for depression". The family member was informed that records like that can be included if seen in medical records.
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?	Outdated statute, Lack of existing statute/regulation, Inconsistency with other law and public policy

	This proposal seeks to solve many issues that coroner offices face when autopsy reports and other investigative documents in the coroners' case files are requested. (1) It will define autopsy report in accordance with the national standard which Colorado law follows for the performance of autopsies; (2) it will outline how autopsy reports are released and how coroners protect private information within autopsy reports; and (3) it will state how other documents within coroner case files are to be reviewed as criminal justice records.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	The bill will define Autopsy Report as follows and place it in C.R.S. 30-10-600.3 Definitions: ""AUTOPSY REPORT"" MEANS THE REPORT OF AN EXAMINATION AND DISSECTION OF A DEAD BODY BY A PHYSICIAN FOR THE PURPOSE OF DETERMINING THE CAUSE, MECHANISM, OR MANNER OF DEATH. BUT AUTOPSY REPORT DOES NOT INCLUDE ANY WRITTEN ANALYSIS, DIAGRAM, PHOTOGRAPH, TOXICOLOGICAL REPORT, OR INVESTIGATIVE REPORT, WHICH SHALL BE ASSESSED UNDER PART 3, ARTICLE 72 OF TITLE 24. This definition will eliminate and replace the definition in C.R.S. 30-10-606.7(1)(a). This new definition will apply to all forensic autopsy reports prepared at the request of the coroner. This new definition uses the definition of Autopsy as defined in the ""Forensic Autopsy Performance Standards"" adopted by the National Association of Medical Examiners, which also dictates how autopsies are performed (see C.R.S. 30-10-606.5(1)(a)). The bill will retitle C.R.S. 30-10-606.7 as Autopsy Reports – confidentiality and release of information. The bill will remove the Autopsy Report definition as used here. All provisions relating to the confidentiality and non-public record status of autopsy reports on minors will not be changed or affected. The bill will add language to C.R.S. 30-10-606.7 directing coroners to redact protected health information and personally identifiable information not directly associated with the immediate cause and manner of death. This includes reproductive healthcare and mental/behavioral health information that is protected throughout other laws and supported with strong public policy statements. As an example, our Autopsy Report release policy stated: Redactions will include date of birth, identifying marks, medical history not associated with the immediate cause of death, mental and behavioral

	health history, reproductive healthcare history and descriptions of reproductive organs, sociological information, and/or scholastic achievement data which is protected by Colorado Open Records Act and HIPAA. The bill will apply C.R.S. 30-10-606.7(2)(b) to all autopsy report requests and include legal next-of- kin as another individual permitted to receive the full unredacted autopsy report.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	C.R.S. 30-10-600.3 Definitions (1) ""AUTOPSY REPORT"" MEANS THE REPORT OF AN EXAMINATION AND DISSECTION OF A DEAD BODY BY A PHYSICIAN FOR THE PURPOSE OF DETERMINING THE CAUSE, MECHANISM, OR MANNER OF DEATH. BUT AUTOPSY REPORT DOES NOT INCLUDE ANY WRITTEN ANALYSIS, DIAGRAM, PHOTOGRAPH, TOXICOLOGICAL REPORT, OR INVESTIGATIVE REPORT, WHICH SHALL BE ASSESSED UNDER PART 3, ARTICLE 72 OF TITLE 24. C.R.S. 30-10-606.7 Autopsy reports - confidentiality and release of information (1) As used in this section, unless the context otherwise requires: (a)DELETE [""Autopsy report"" means the report of the coroner or the coroner's designee on the post-mortem examination of a deceased individual to determine the cause or manner of death, including any written analysis, diagram, photograph, or toxicological test results.] (2)(b) ADD ""Legal next-of-kin"" (3)(a) DELETE [(IV) Name of the deceased minor.] (5) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, upon written request by any individual, a coroner shall release an autopsy report. Before releasing an autopsy report pursuant to subsection (5)(a) of this section, the coroner shall redact information not relevant to the determination of the immediate cause and manner of death, and information that is confidential or protected from public disclosure pursuant to article 72 of title 24, or any other applicable state or federal law.
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation?	No

Has your county explored these alternatives?	
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	Not to our knowledge, no
What possible organization(s) would ***support*** your proposed solution?	Colorado Coroners Association and individual coroners offices (I have heard support from Denver, Boulder, and Weld Coroners)
What possible organization(s) would ***oppose*** your proposed solution?	Operation Rescue Kansas; CFOIC and other CORA/FOIA or media groups wanting full access to reports and information
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	Working on it, but none confirmed yet
What are the financial implications of this ***problem*** to your county? Are there any financial implications to this ***solution*** either?	It could reduce staff time spent and capacity for answering questions from the public and less time spent in court trying to protect privacy for families.
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.*	Same as above, we cannot think of any significant costs to impacted parties It could reduce staff time spent and capacity for answering questions from the public and less time spent in court trying to protect privacy for families.
Staff Feedback	<u>Risk / Difficulty:</u>

	Time Commitment:

Local Governance and Commissioners Elections	
Adams County	
Preferred Contact:	Julie Duran Mullica - Adams County
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	N/A
Who is your subject matter expert?	Jane Best, Adams County Sr Advisor for Legislative Affairs, jbest@adamscountyco.gov, 303-717-0963.
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	Bills similar to Modification of County Commissioner Elections HB1203 continue to be proposed and we anticipate seeing one next session. Adams County would like to bring forward for discussion that CCI taking a more proactive stance this legislative session to try to find common cause on this issue. This will prevent reactive attention to an issue we anticipate being re-introduced.
Areas of Impact:	Power/Authority/Mandate of county government
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	This bill seeks to override what counties, such as Adams, have previously brought to the county citizens for a vote. This legislation seeks to override the will of local citizens and governance decisions.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	Continue to work on amendments that were brought forward last legislative session. There were several ideas for carving out counties that have already put this issue forward for county citizens to vote and decide. Other suggestions would be to detail language that would ensure the will of the people and term timelines are honored by what has already been voted on at the local level. Progress was made throughout last session and amendments were made but they fell short of satisfactory for some counties. Amendment L07 states counties over 70K residents and states it will be required to elect their ""base"" three commissioners by district. If a county decides to have five commissioners, the additional two commissioners may be elected by districts or ""at-large"" as the voters may choose. (No more ranked choice voting). Every decennial year (2030, 2040, 2050 etc.), the voters of a county with only 3 commissioners must be asked if they wish to move to 5 commissioners; and if so, if they want the additional 2 commissioners elected ""at large"" or by adding an additional two districts. A concern remains that the county citizens have already voted on a process for their BoCC and even with L07, this would require some board to all be in-district and voted on only by electors in the district, or 3 in-district voted

	on by only the electors in the districts and 2 at large. Further, though L07 amendment was made to address concerns on rank choice, it still has ranked choice voting for the primary elections. Lastly, should this bill move forward it would cut short the terms of some elected Commissioners.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	we need to give more consideration to sample language that is agreeable to counties impacted by this legislation.
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	No- as it is anticipated this bill will return at the state level.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	CCI and CCAT both worked on this issue last year reactively and successfully.
What possible organization(s) would ***support*** your proposed solution?	CCAT, other counties, AFSCME, Colorado District Attorneys (based on opposition to HB1203 last year)
What possible organization(s) would ***oppose*** your proposed solution?	ACLU, Colorado Common Cause (based on support for HB1203 last year)
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	Many reactive conversations happened last session. There have been no current proactive conversations.
What are the financial implications of this ***problem*** to your county? Are there any financial implications to this ***solution*** either?	No specifics at this time on implications to the solution other than cost savings of not having to revisit an issue about which the county has already voted.
What are the financial implications of this ***problem*** to any other impacted parties?	Voters have already determined how they seek to select Commissioners. Should a new state law be passed, this issue would hold the cost of going back on the ballot among other costs associated with disrupting processes voted on by county citizens.

What are the financial implications of this ***solution*** to any other impacted parties? *Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.*	
Staff Feedback	Risk / Difficulty: Time Commitment:

Updating the Colorado Privacy Act for the Age of Artificial Intelligence	
Gunnison County (Commissioner Liz Smith)	
Preferred Contact:	Liz Smith, Gunnison County eksmith@gunnisoncounty.com; 303-350-3954
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	N/A
Who is your subject matter expert?	Jefferey Riester Director of Legislative Affairs / Senior Assistant Attorney General Jefferey.Riester@coag.gov
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	No.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	The enactment of the Colorado Privacy Act (CPA) in 2021 established important consumer rights and created a framework for the responsible collection, use, and protection of personal information. The law provides Colorado residents with rights to access, correct, delete, opt-out, and limit the use of their personal data and creates obligations on businesses that collect and process that information. The CPA and its implementing regulations also recognize that sensitive inferences derived from personal data warrant protection. Since the CPA's enactment, however, advances in artificial intelligence, machine learning, and large-scale data integration have fundamentally changed how businesses create, control, and commercialize information. Rather than simply collecting personal data, many AI-enabled systems generate proprietary datasets—including persistent object identifiers, behavioral signatures, movement histories, confidence scores, and predictive models—from combinations of customer data, publicly available information, and automated analysis. These datasets are often commercially valuable in their own right and can be used to identify, re-identify, or track individuals across time, systems, and jurisdictions. The CPA provides limited guidance on when the aggregation of otherwise public information becomes regulated personal data, how AI-generated proprietary datasets should be classified, or when entities that create and control these datasets assume the responsibilities of data controllers. Examples: •Automated License Plate Reader (ALPR) systems. Modern ALPR platforms operate as multi-jurisdictional surveillance networks that generate proprietary datasets from thousands of cameras. While local

	agencies may access only a limited subscription, vendors can create and retain searchable movement histories, object fingerprints, behavioral patterns, and other AI-derived datasets that are not publicly available and may be shared across subscription networks, including with out-of-state or federal entities. •AI-enabled behavioral health services. AI counseling platforms increasingly collect highly sensitive information about mental health, trauma, substance use, and emotional well-being. Although the CPA regulates sensitive data, important questions remain regarding AI-generated behavioral profiles, inferences, model outputs, and other proprietary datasets created outside traditional healthcare privacy frameworks such as HIPAA. This issue is particularly relevant to counties because local governments increasingly rely on private technology vendors to provide critical public services while having little ability to negotiate or oversee how vendors generate, retain, license, or share proprietary datasets beyond the services purchased by the county. Updating the CPA would establish clearer statewide standards governing AI-generated datasets and surveillance infrastructure, placing responsibility on the entities that create, control, and profit from those systems rather than expecting individual local governments to address these issues through contract negotiations alone.
Areas of Impact:	Power/Authority/Mandate of county government, General community advancement, civil liberties, consumer protections, health and human services
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	The CPA appropriately regulates many forms of personal data and sensitive data inferences, but it was enacted before recent advances in artificial intelligence, machine learning, and large-scale surveillance infrastructure fundamentally changed how information is created and used. Modern AI systems do not merely infer characteristics from personal data—they generate proprietary datasets, persistent identifiers, behavioral profiles, movement histories, and predictive models from combinations of personal data, publicly available information, and automated analysis. The CPA provides limited guidance on when these AI-generated datasets become regulated personal data, how they should be classified, or when the entities creating, controlling, retaining, licensing, and commercializing them assume the responsibilities of data controllers. As a result, businesses may develop and profit from commercially valuable surveillance datasets whose governance, retention, downstream sharing, and accountability are not clearly addressed within the CPA's existing framework.

What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	The proposal would modernize the Colorado Privacy Act to address how artificial intelligence, machine learning, and advanced data analytics create, aggregate, and commercialize new categories of information. The legislation would clarify when AI-generated datasets, persistent identifiers, and other proprietary data products derived from combinations of personal data, publicly available information, and automated analysis become regulated personal data; strengthen standards governing de-identified and anonymized data in light of modern re-identification capabilities; extend protections for legally protected healthcare data; and clarify the responsibilities of entities that create, control, retain, license, or commercialize AI-generated datasets to ensure they are subject to appropriate privacy, security, retention, and accountability requirements.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	•**Clarify "Personal Data."** Amend the definition of "personal data" to specify that information generated through automated analysis—including AI-generated identifiers, behavioral profiles, movement histories, confidence scores, or other persistent identifiers—is personal data when it is linked or reasonably linkable to an identified or identifiable individual, regardless of whether it was derived from personal data, publicly available information, or a combination of data sources. •**Define "Derivative Digital Identifier**." "Derivative digital identifier" means an identifier or persistent representation generated through the automated analysis of personal data, publicly available information, visual, auditory, geospatial, or sensor data that is used or reasonably likely to be used to identify, re-identify, recognize, correlate, or track an individual, object, or device across time, systems, or locations, including identifiers derived from physical attributes, movement patterns, behavioral characteristics, or statistical confidence models. •**Revise "De-identified Data" and "Anonymized Data."** Clarify that data is not considered de-identified or anonymized if, considering all means reasonably likely to be used—including artificial intelligence, machine learning, aggregation, or other automated analysis—it can reasonably be used to identify, re-identify, recognize, correlate, or track an individual or to generate a derivative digital identifier or other persistent identifier. •**Clarify Controller Responsibilities.** Specify that an entity that creates, determines the purpose of, retains, licenses, commercializes, or otherwise controls AI-generated datasets, derivative digital identifiers, behavioral profiles, or other proprietary data products assumes the responsibilities of a controller with respect to those datasets, regardless of whether the original source data was provided by another controller or consisted of publicly available information. •**Define "Legally Protected Healthcare Data."** Expand sensitive data protections to include information that identifies, tracks, or reveals that an individual has sought, received, provided, or inquired about healthcare

	services lawful in Colorado, including through AI-generated profiles, location history, behavioral analysis, or associations with healthcare providers or facilities. •**Amend Data Minimization (§ 6-1-1308).** Clarify that AI-generated datasets, derivative digital identifiers, behavioral profiles, and other proprietary data products remain subject to the Act's requirements for purpose limitation, data minimization, retention, deletion, and consumer rights. The creation of such datasets shall not create a separate category of information exempt from the requirements of this part, and they may not be retained, licensed, transferred, or used for secondary purposes beyond those expressly disclosed and authorized under the Act.
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	Counties cannot control vendor architecture, derived-data creation, downstream sharing, or retention practices through local action alone.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	The 2026 legislative session saw bills that proposed to regulate industries like ALPR companies by shifting compliance responsibility to the local level, and without addressing how to ensure compliance with out-of-state and federal governments (SB26-070, SB26-071). Another bill proposed to ban governmental purchase of personal data from third parties without addressing how companies are selling derived personal data that is not captured in statutory definitions (HB26-1037). That legislation similarly put the burden on local governments to navigate. Updating the CPA provides a structural solution that does not burden local governments. This may also reduce the opposition the above bills drew from entities like law enforcement agencies, human resources directors, etc.
What possible organization(s) would ***support*** your proposed solution?	Personal privacy is important to Coloradans across the political spectrum. Specific organizations that would likely support include: local government organizations; child welfare advocates; domestic violence organizations; immigration rights organizations; privacy organizations like Electronic Privacy Information Center; school privacy advocates; behavioral health, reproductive health, and healthcare organizations.
What possible organization(s) would ***oppose*** your proposed solution?	Tech companies and data brokers, AI platform and ALPR/surveillance providers
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution?	Yes. At least one is interested in sponsoring and views this as a more elegant solution than some of the legislation in 2026 focusing on specific technologies or commerce of data. AG's office is interested in CPA update as well.

If so, what was their response?	
What are the financial implications of this ***problem*** to your county? Are there any financial implications to this ***solution*** either?	The proposal would reduce liability exposure lawsuits that could be brought against local governments who increasingly rely on contracts for technology we can't fully control (e.g., violations of CPA, SB25-276, child privacy, etc.)
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.*	Businesses and vendors who create and process the types of data described in new definitions would incur costs to ensure compliance.
Staff Feedback	<u>Risk / Difficulty:</u> <u>Time Commitment:</u>

Publication of County Legal Notices on the County's Official Website	
Mesa County	
Preferred Contact:	Cody Davis Commissioner, Mesa County 970-640-4330, cody.davis@mesacounty.us
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	N/A
Who is your subject matter expert?	Alec Anderson Operations Manager Mesa County Administration Todd Starr Mesa County Attorney
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Supplemental Materials	Mesa County will supply supporting cost estimates.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	Colorado law requires counties to publish a wide range of legal notices in a printed newspaper of general circulation, and to pay the newspaper's rates to do so. These include notices most residents now expect to find online: budget hearings, proposed ordinances and resolutions, land use and zoning hearings, bid and procurement solicitations, election notices, and similar matters. The publication requirement dates to a time when the local newspaper was the only practical way to reach the public. That is no longer true. Every county, most municipalities, and a growing number of special districts already maintain official websites capable of hosting these notices at little or no marginal cost, and the state already operates a central website where the same notices are collected. The result is that local governments, many under real budget pressure, are required by statute to buy space in private newspapers for information they could publish themselves, permanently and for free, on the internet. In practice the mandate operates as a subsidy of the print newspaper industry paid for with public funds. The cost is not trivial for smaller counties and districts, and it rises every time a newspaper raises its column-inch rate. This proposal would require that every notice the county is now required to run in its designated official publication be published instead on the county's official website.
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?	An outdated statutory framework. The obligation flows from the statute directing the Board of County Commissioners to designate an official

	newspaper to carry the county's legal notices, and from the many substantive statutes that then route particular notices into that publication, such as county budget notices under § 29-1-106, publication of county ordinances under § 30-15-405, and comparable municipal requirements in Title 31. Section 24-70-103(5) already requires that every notice published in a newspaper also be posted, at no additional charge, on the statewide website at publicnoticecolorado.com. The notices are therefore already online. The county is simply required to pay a newspaper to serve as the gatekeeper. The General Assembly has been moving in this direction for years, and its recent enactments confirm the premise while leaving the paid print requirement in place.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	All legal notices that the county is required to publish in the official publication designated by the Board of County Commissioners shall instead be published on the county's official website, for the same duration currently required, and newspaper publication of those notices shall no longer be required. To preserve the protections the current system provides, the proposal would: (1) require that posted notices remain continuously available and searchable in a permanent county archive, so there is a neutral, unalterable record equivalent to the newspaper archive; (2) require a certificate of posting from the county clerk or designee, replacing the publisher's affidavit currently used to prove publication; and (3) preserve a fallback for any local government that does not maintain a suitable website, and a reasonable option for communities without reliable broadband, so that no jurisdiction is stranded. Those entities could continue to use newspaper publication or a designated public posting place.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	The proposed remedy amends C.R.S. § 39-11-105 and adds a controlling provision that operates notwithstanding the specific notice statutes, so that every notice the county is required to publish in its designated official publication shall instead be published on the county's official website for the same duration now required, and newspaper publication of those notices is no longer required. The amendment would add a certificate of posting by the county clerk or designee in place of the publisher's affidavit, and would require that posted notices remain continuously available and searchable in a permanent county archive. Several statutes route specific notices to the designated publication, including the treasurer's delinquent tax list and tax lien sale notice under C.R.S. § 39-11-102 and the county's claims, expenditures, and semiannual financial statement under C.R.S. § 30-25-111; Section 24-70-103 supplies the qualifying-newspaper standards. In Linville v. Russell, the Colorado Supreme Court held that the general official-newspaper designation was sufficient to comply with § 39-11-105's tax-list publication requirement.

	Because the delinquent tax list and tax lien sale notice bear on the validity of tax sales and treasurer's deeds, the amendment would expressly provide that website publication in compliance with this section satisfies the publication requirement for those notices, and that a tax sale or treasurer's deed is not subject to challenge on the ground that the notice appeared on the county's official website rather than in a newspaper. This provision does not alter the separate mailed-notice requirement to the delinquent owner under C.R.S. § 39-11-101, which is preserved unchanged. Exact drafting and confirmation of all conforming citations to be developed with CCI and the Office of Legislative Legal Services.
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	No non-legislative fix is available. The obligation to publish in the Board's designated official publication is imposed by statute, so relief requires a statutory change. The county already posts most of this information voluntarily on its own website. It simply cannot stop paying for duplicate newspaper publication without legislative authorization.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	The General Assembly has moved in this direction for years. In 2018, Senate Bill 18-156 eliminated the requirement that counties publish their monthly financial statements and semiannual salary reports in newspapers and allowed those to move to county websites, phased in by 2022. More recently, House Bill 26-1095, signed May 19, 2026, requires newspapers to post legal notices online for free and prohibits placing them behind a paywall or subscription. That bill confirms the premise of this proposal, that these notices belong online and should be freely accessible, while leaving in place the underlying obligation to pay a newspaper to run them. Once the notice must be free and online in any event, the paid print requirement serves the newspaper's balance sheet more than it serves the public.
What possible organization(s) would ***support*** your proposed solution?	Counties statewide, all of which bear the cost of publishing in their designated official newspaper. Rural counties that have lost their local newspaper have a particular interest, since they currently pay to publish in an adjacent county where few residents will see the notice. The Colorado Municipal League and the Special District Association of Colorado would likely support the direction, though this proposal reaches counties only.
What possible organization(s) would ***oppose*** your proposed solution?	The Colorado Press Association, which has opposed similar measures (including SB 18-156) on the ground that newspaper notices provide a neutral, permanent, third-party record, reach a broad audience, and support the watchdog role of local journalism. The Association has also argued that newspaper websites draw more traffic than most government websites, and that some residents lack reliable internet access. The permanent county archive and certificate-of-posting provisions answer the

	record-integrity concern directly. Every Colorado county maintains an official website, and these notices are already required by existing law to appear online at no charge, so the reach of the county's own posting is broad. Individual newspapers, especially small rural papers that rely on legal-notice revenue, can be expected to oppose.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	Yes, both my legislators are in support of the bill - Sen. Rich and Rep. Soper. Rep. Soper is term-limited and will not be in the legislature next spring, but I do have support from his likely successor, Jason Bias.
What are the financial implications of this ***problem*** to your county? Are there any financial implications to this ***solution*** either?	For counties, this proposal produces direct, recurring savings by eliminating the requirement to publish legal notices in newspapers. In Mesa County, the gross annual cost of required publications is approximately $250,000. About $210,000 of that is recovered through fees paid by private applicants (for land use applications, liens, licensing, name changes, and the like), so the County bears roughly $40,000 in unrecovered annual costs. Just as important, the full $250,000 counts against the County's TABOR revenue limit because it is received and spent by the County. When TABOR refunds are required, those dollars effectively reduce the County's available revenue even though most of the cost was paid by private applicants. Because counties already maintain official websites, there is no material new implementation cost 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? *Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.*	Eliminating the newspaper publication requirement benefits the private citizens and businesses that currently pay these publication fees. There is no impact to the state General Fund and no identified impact to a state department. The primary fiscal impact of the solution falls on newspapers that currently receive legal-notice revenue, particularly small rural papers.
Staff Feedback	<u>Risk / Difficulty:</u> <u>Time Commitment:</u>

Interim Study Committee on Unfunded and Underfunded State Mandates.	
Mesa County (Commissioner Bobbie Daniel)	
Preferred Contact:	Bobbie Daniel Commissioner, Mesa County (970) 589-4700, bobbie.daniel@mesacounty.us
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	None identified at this time. In November 2025, 48 counties joined Mesa County in the letter to the Governor on this issue.
Who is your subject matter expert?	Bobbie Daniel, Mesa County Commissioner Todd Starr, Mesa County Attorney
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	This matter is being formally approved at an open meeting on July 28, 2026.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes
Supplemental Materials	Mesa County's Unfunded tracker has previously been shared with CCI and 64 counties and is available on request.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	Colorado law already declares that the state may not impose a new mandate, or increase the level of service for an existing mandate, on any local government without paying for it, and that an unfunded mandate is optional. That is section 29-1-304.5, C.R.S. In practice the protection does not work. The statute exempts costs the state passes down from federal law. It exempts cost increases caused by inflation or by growth in the number of people served. It does not reach mandates that predate the statute. And when a later, more specific statute imposes a duty, the courts hold that the specific statute controls and the general unfunded-mandate protection gives way. The result is that counties absorb the cumulative cost of state decisions they do not make and cannot decline. The burden is neither small nor isolated. Mesa County's public Fix It or Fund It review identifies specific state duties that arrive without money attached, among them administration of the Keep Colorado Wild pass at county motor vehicle offices, felony prosecution obligations funded only to the level of the elected district attorney's salary, weekend court coverage, and election-facility security requirements. Counties large and small, rural and urban, front range and west slope report the same pattern. Existing law names the problem and then exempts most of it.
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?	A statute that has been narrowed by its own exceptions and by the courts. Section 29-1-304.5 was enacted in 1991. It carves out federally driven

	costs, inflation, and caseload growth, and it does not reach mandates already on the books when it passed. Colorado courts have read it narrowly where a specific mandate collides with the general protection. The Court of Appeals did so again in April 2026 in Yellow Scene Magazine v. City of Boulder, holding that section 29-1-304.5 did not make an unfunded body-worn-camera production duty optional. Counties, municipalities, and sheriffs stood together as amici in that case in defense of the statute, and the statute still did not hold.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	Legislation creating a time-limited interim study committee on unfunded and underfunded state mandates. The committee would inventory existing state mandates on counties and other local governments, quantify their cumulative fiscal impact, and identify one or more mandates suitable to undo, to reassess, or to fund. It would then recommend legislation for the 2028 session. The concept is deliberately broad at this stage. The proponents do not ask the General Assembly to pre-select a target; they ask it to create the forum in which counties, the state, and other affected parties identify the mandates that carry bipartisan support for reform, that fall across a wide and diverse group of counties, and that, where appropriate, pair relief to local governments with a corresponding obligation or measure of accountability on the state. The committee should be built to survive the current budget climate. The General Assembly is reducing interim committee activity for fiscal reasons, so any new committee has to cost close to nothing. This proposal is designed accordingly. The committee would sunset after a single interim, meet a limited number of times, produce one report with a capped number of bill recommendations, and operate without new per diem or travel appropriations, drawing on existing Legislative Council staff and on the substantive support that CCI and its partner associations will supply.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	The proposal is enabling legislation rather than an amendment to a single existing section. It would create an interim study committee on unfunded and underfunded state mandates, fixing its membership, charge, meeting limits, staffing, sunset, and reporting duty, and directing it to recommend legislation for the 2028 session. Section 29-1-304.5, C.R.S. (state mandates; prohibition; exception) is the substantive statute most directly in view, and strengthening it, for example by narrowing its exceptions or adding an enforcement mechanism, is among the outcomes the committee could recommend. Exact drafting, the committee's composition, and any conforming citations to be developed with CCI and the Office of Legislative Legal Services.
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation?	Yes, and the non-legislative route has reached its limit. Counties have raised the issue directly with the state, including the November 2025 letter from 48 counties to the Governor, and CCI can convene a working group of

Has your county explored these alternatives?	counties to organize the effort. Those steps build the case but cannot change the statute, cannot compel the state to the table, and cannot themselves produce a bill. The reform this proposal seeks, a chartered interim committee with authority to study the mandates and recommend legislation, exists only if the General Assembly creates it. CCI's own working group would run in parallel and feed the committee. It is the non-legislative complement to the legislative ask, not a substitute for it.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	Counties have pressed the issue through every available channel. In November 2025, 48 Colorado counties joined Mesa County in writing to the Governor about the effect of unfunded mandates on their communities. That effort raised the profile of the problem but did not change the law or the incentives that drive it. Counties, municipalities, and sheriffs also stood together as amici defending section 29-1-304.5 in the Yellow Scene case, and the statute still did not hold. A durable remedy requires a legislative forum with authority to examine the mandates, quantify their cost, and recommend statutory change, which is why the counties now seek a legislative solution rather than another round of correspondence.
What possible organization(s) would ***support*** your proposed solution?	Likely proponents: counties statewide, which bear the cost of unfunded mandates directly, and CCI as the convening organization. The Colorado Municipal League, the Special District Association of Colorado, the Colorado District Attorneys' Council, and county sheriff and fire interests are logical partners, several of which already stood with counties as amici defending section 29-1-304.5 in the Yellow Scene case.
What possible organization(s) would ***oppose*** your proposed solution?	Likely skeptics: state agencies that would face new constraints or a reciprocal obligation, and legislative leadership wary of chartering a new interim committee while the General Assembly is cutting interim activity for budget reasons. The lean, sunsetting, low-cost design of the committee is meant to answer that concern directly.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	Members of the delegation are supportive of the Unfunded Mandates Campaign.
What are the financial implications of this ***problem*** to your county? Are there any financial implications to this ***solution*** either?	The larger fiscal impact is the point of the proposal. The state has placed a growing set of service and procedural duties on counties without corresponding appropriations, and counties carry that cost in local budgets. The study committee itself can be structured at or near zero state cost by removing per diem and travel and relying on existing Legislative Council staff. The impact to Mesa County alone is estimated to be $10m per year.

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.*	Other local governments, including municipalities and special districts, carry the same unfunded-mandate costs and stand to benefit from the same reform. On the state side, the committee itself imposes little or no cost. The state departments that issue these mandates would be the parties most affected by any recommendation the committee makes, whether that recommendation funds a mandate, reassesses it, or pairs relief for local governments with a corresponding obligation or measure of accountability on the state.
Staff Feedback	<u>Risk / Difficulty:</u> <u>Time Commitment:</u>

Transportation & Telecommunications

County Airport Authority Modernization	
Routt County	
Preferred Contact:	Sonja Macys, Routt County, email
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	Pending
Who is your subject matter expert?	Lynaia South and Molly Hamsher Routt County Attorney Office 970-870-5317 or 5268 lsouth@co.routt.co.us; mhamsher@co.routt.co.us
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Supplemental Materials	https://drive.google.com/open?id=1IEAcwwwSBD2bOhMSnApPHNHPYK4J2KwK, https://drive.google.com/open?id=1DgEwSaljNsfJSttflZfNw9bAMkStJ30z
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	County-owned airport passengers regularly utilize private transportation companies for transportation to and from county-owned airports. These transportation companies are regulated by the Public Utilities Commission which grants permits and/or CPCNs (certificates of public convenience and necessity) to private transportation providers. A CPCN obligates a common carrier to service the routes on its "authority," which often includes servicing county-owned airports. The proposed legislative amendments clarify that a county has the authority to regulate common carriers (and any other person or business engaged) who are engaging in commercial business activities conducted on airport property. The authority to regulate common carriers while on airport property provides counties with the authority to restrict common carriers who violate airport rules and regulations from engaging in commercial business activity on airport property. Without this clarifying language, county airports cannot meaningfully regulate common carriers operating on airport property which may expose counties to civil liability, impede the county's protection of its passengers and employees, and jeopardize county's compliance with federal grant assurance requirements. Absent such authority, counties are left with little authority or recourse over common carriers who violate airport rules and regulations.
Areas of Impact:	Day-to-day operations of the county, Functionality of county programs or services, Power/Authority/Mandate of county government, Fiscal impacts if the County is not able to enforce the fees it charges; ability to comply with federal grant assurance requirements

What is the ultimate source of this problem?	Outdated statute
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	Amend Article 4, Part 2, of Title 41 (County Airports) and Article 10.1 of Title 40 (PUC)
Please provide sample language for this solution.	See attached.
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	Routt County excluded a common carrier operating in violation of airport rules and regulations. The common carrier filed a petition with the PUC seeking a ruling that the County lacked the authority to exclude the common carrier from airport property. After briefing, an Administrative Law Judge issued a Recommended Decision finding that the County lacked the authority to exclude the common carrier from its property. The matter remains pending and sits with the Commissioners of the PUC for final determination on the issue. See PUC Proceeding 25D- 0435CP. Routt County continues to vigorously defend its position and will analyze all appellate options. There are no other known alternatives to state-level legislation at this juncture.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	Similar legislative changes were made to Public Airport Authority Law (as relevant here) to C.R.S. 41-3-106, following passage of HB23-1156. This legislation was championed by the Grand Junction Regional Airport Authority and its Executive Director, Angela Padalecki, and supported by the CO Airport Operators Association. The legislative sought to update the outdated provisions of Article 3 of Title 40 to encourage county and municipalities to consider creating an Airport Authority. In reviewing the committee hearings, the legislation passed with no known opposition.
What possible organization(s) would ***support*** your proposed solution?	Five counties supported Routt County's position in the pending PUC matter: Denver County (DIA), Montrose County, Eagle County, Pitkin County, and La Plata County. Other potential supports: CO Airport Operators Association and Municipalities who may seek to update their companion authority located at C.R.S. 41-4-204.
What possible organization(s) would ***oppose*** your proposed solution?	Common carriers, the Public Utilities Commission, and other private transportation providers regulated by the PUC.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	No.
What are the financial implications of	County-owned airports impose fees on common carriers who operate on county-owned airport property to generate income necessary to operate the airport and

this ***problem*** to your county? Are there any financial implications to this ***solution*** either?	to comply with federal grant assurances. In 2024, the Yampa Valley Regional Airport collected over $800,000 in revenues from commercial transportation companies. If a county-owned airport lacks the authority to exclude a common carrier violating airport rules and regulations, such as failure to pay required fees, the county loses this significant income and may be in violation of federal grant assurances, thereby jeopardizing not only future grant opportunities, but also the potential penalty of repaying previously received (and spent) grant funds. As federal grant funding comprises a sizable portion of airport operational budgets, the loss of this funding stream could lead to the closure of some county-owned airports. The proposed legislative amendment would ensure county-owned airports can continue to charge and collect fees and remain in compliance with federal grant assurance requirements.
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.*	Common carriers and other commercial business operators who are not compliant with airport rules and regulations and are restricted from operating at an airport would lose income and access to its customer base. Currently common carriers with CPCNs operate in a regulated monopoly which incentivizes private transportation companies to seek CPCNs. The solution does not change the financial implications for commercial business operators at airports as airports already impose fees and regulate these entities. The solution seeks only to address the conduct of bad actors.
Staff Feedback	Risk / Difficulty: Time Commitment:

HUTF distribution bill	
Park County	
Preferred Contact:	Jason Gemmer Park County Jason.gemmer@parkcountyco.gov
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	N/A
Who is your subject matter expert?	Jason Gemmer Park County Commissioner 719-839-9527, Jason.gemmer@parkcountyco.gov
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Supplemental Materials	https://ccionline.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/07/Park.HUTF_Distribution_Bill_Amended-002.pdf
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	County aligned funds from HUTF.
Areas of Impact:	Day-today Operations
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	Funding shortfall and Problematic rulemaking.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	The proposal modernizes Colorado's Highway Users Tax Fund (HUTF) distribution formula to better reflect the actual responsibility of maintaining local transportation infrastructure. The current allocation relies heavily on population, which disadvantages rural counties that maintain extensive road networks serving statewide commerce, agriculture, tourism, emergency services, and recreation. The proposal would: •Shift HUTF distributions to a blended formula that emphasizes certified road mileage while retaining a population component. •Establish a minimum annual allocation for every county to ensure basic transportation funding. •Create a fair road usage assessment for electric vehicles so all roadway users contribute to highway maintenance. •Improve accountability through annual road mileage certification, dispute resolution procedures, and periodic fiscal and performance reviews. •Phase implementation over multiple years to reduce fiscal disruption for local governments. This proposal is intended to create a more equitable, sustainable, and defensible funding model while maintaining compliance with the Colorado Constitution and federal transportation funding requirements.

Please provide sample language for this solution.	Sample statutory language includes: •Amend C.R.S. §43-4-208 to replace the existing county allocation formula with a blended distribution based upon: o70% Certified Primary Road Mileage o5% Certified Secondary Road Mileage o25% County Population •Establish a minimum annual county allocation of $250,000 prior to formula distribution. •Deposit all electric vehicle road usage assessment revenues into the Highway Users Tax Fund for distribution under the revised formula. •Require annual CDOT certification of county road mileage, establish an administrative appeal process through the Transportation Commission, and require periodic performance audits. (The complete statutory language is contained within the attached draft legislation.)
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	To the best of our knowledge, no meaningful long-term solution exists without legislative action. While counties continually seek efficiencies through improved asset management, grant opportunities, and local budgeting, counties have no authority to modify the statutory HUTF allocation formula. Local governments cannot independently address the structural inequity created by the current distribution methodology. Because the allocation formula is established in state statute, legislative action is necessary to provide a permanent statewide solution.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	Colorado Counties Inc. (CCI), county commissioners, CDOT, and other transportation stakeholders have discussed HUTF funding and transportation finance over many years. Previous efforts have generally focused on increasing transportation revenues rather than modernizing the distribution formula itself. While transportation funding has periodically increased through legislation and ballot measures, the underlying allocation methodology has remained largely unchanged. As a result, counties with extensive roadway systems continue to experience funding disparities relative to their maintenance obligations This proposal seeks to address that structural imbalance while preserving statewide transportation funding stability.
What possible organization(s) would ***support*** your proposed solution?	•Colorado Counties Inc. (CCI) •County Commissioners throughout rural Colorado •County Road and Bridge Departments •Colorado Association of Road Supervisors and Engineers (CARSE)

	•Colorado Farm Bureau •Colorado Cattlemen's Association •Colorado Wool Growers Association •Colorado Association of Conservation Districts •Rural economic development organizations •Emergency service providers that depend upon county roads •Tourism and outdoor recreation communities that rely on rural transportation infrastructure
What possible organization(s) would ***oppose*** your proposed solution?	Potential opposition may include: •Larger metropolitan municipalities that would receive a reduced percentage under the revised allocation formula. •Organizations representing urban local governments. •Electric vehicle advocacy organizations if they oppose additional EV road usage assessments. •Some environmental organizations concerned about additional registration fees on electric vehicles. •Potential concerns from CDOT if reductions to the state HUTF share affect statewide transportation programming.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	At this time, discussions with legislators are ongoing. The proposal is being refined prior to formal introduction, and additional stakeholder outreach is anticipated before the October Legislative Committee meeting. Feedback received thus far has generally recognized the need to revisit the current funding formula while emphasizing the importance of protecting statewide transportation funding and minimizing impacts on existing recipients.
What are the financial implications of this ***problem*** to your county? Are there any financial implications to this ***solution*** either?	The current HUTF formula results in counties with extensive roadway systems receiving funding that does not adequately reflect their maintenance responsibilities. This contributes to deferred maintenance, increasing construction costs, and greater long-term infrastructure liabilities. For counties such as Park County, improved funding alignment would: •Better match revenue with maintenance obligations. •Improve long-term pavement preservation. •Reduce deferred maintenance costs. •Improve budgeting certainty through predictable annual allocations. •Better support emergency response and public safety infrastructure. Implementation would require administrative coordination with CDOT for mileage certification; however, these costs are expected to be modest compared to the long-term funding benefits.
What are the financial implications of	The proposal redistributes existing HUTF revenues rather than creating a significant new tax structure, although it establishes a reasonable electric vehicle road usage assessment to ensure equitable user contributions.

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.*	Potential impacts include: •Some larger municipalities may experience slower growth or reductions in future HUTF distributions under the revised formula. •CDOT may experience adjustments to its share, which is why the proposal requires a comprehensive fiscal impact analysis before implementation. •The Department of Revenue would incur limited administrative costs to collect EV assessments. •CDOT would administer annual mileage certification, reporting, and oversight. •Rural counties would receive funding more closely aligned with the infrastructure they maintain, improving transportation system preservation and reducing long-term statewide maintenance costs. These responses closely follow the intent and content of your HUTF bill while presenting them in the format typically expected by Colorado Counties Inc. for legislative proposal submissions. They should provide a strong foundation for the October Legislative Committee review.
Staff Feedback	<u>Risk / Difficulty:</u> <u>Time Commitment:</u>

Justice & Public Safety

Cost for Ground Ambulance Services	
Lincoln County	
Preferred Contact:	Wayne E Ewing, Lincoln County, boccd1@lincolnco.us, (719)740-2032
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	Cheyenne County/Rick Pelton, Yuma County/Scott Weaver
Who is your subject matter expert?	Joe Miklosi and Mark Waller, lobbyists for Lincoln Health, (303)919-4748, jpm@joemiklosi.com Jeanie Vanderburg, Capstone Group, (303)850-0555, jvanderburg@capstonegroup.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.	Existing balance billing protections for ambulances do not apply in most Colorado communities, leaving consumers vulnerable to surprise bills. Colorado's current balance billing protections (HB19-1174) apply only to 9-1-1 transports provided by private ambulance services. Due to the completity of how public ambulance agencies are funded, the legislation allows balance billing to continue for public providers. •75% of ambulance agencies in Colorado are public departments not covered by the law. •Patients have no ability to choose who responds to their 9-1-1 call. •Patients who receive non-emergency ambulance service (such as transfers to rehab centers upon hospital discharge) from any ambulance agency, public or private, are also still subject to balance bills when carriers underpay. The federal government recognizes the challenges communities have in providing ambulance service. Instead of including ground ambulance service in its groundbreaking No Surprises Act legislation, it convened the multidisciplinary federal Advisory Committee on Ground Ambulance and Patient Billing (GAPB). In September 2024, the GAPB Committee provided Congress its recommendations on ways to eliminate balance billing without limiting patient access to the vital care that ambulance agencies

	provide. The recommendations reflect the understanding that fair reimbursement is directly tied to patient access and ambulance sustainability. Also of note, in its Phase II report, the Colorado EMS System Sustainability Task Force (created by SB22-225) recommends strengthening state laws related to payment for ambulance services, including the establishment of locally set rates and reasonable safeguards to prevent surprise bills. The proposed legislation draws from both of these recommendations. The problem and solution is covered in HB25-1088 and this bill would be the mirror HB25-1088. No Coloradan ever wants to call 9-1-1. But when it matters most, we expect highly trained medics to respond quickly. A bill like HB25-1088 protects patients who need care from receiving balance bills and establishes clear reimbursement rates to preserve patient access and improve ambulance sustainability in all Colorado communities. Ambulance agencies and their patients require a different balance billing solution than the rest of the health care industry. Unlike other healthcare providers, ground ambulance agencies receive significant funding through taxpayer support (which must go up when reimbursement declines). They are heavily regulated by local elected officials. Ambulance agencies also provide 9-1-1 service regardless of a patient's insurance coverage or ability to pay. Eight other states have adopted laws like HB25-1088 over the past two years. The data show clearly that these policies do not impact insurance premiums. Fiscal notes prepared by the states showed minimal, if any, cost impacts to carriers (0.00% to 0.07). In its recently published 2024 Employer Health Benefits Survey, KFF, an independent public source for health policy research, identified neither ambulance services nor legislation of this kind as factors impacting premium costs. HB25-1088 is a win for all Colorado. It allows the state to shield vulnerable Colorado consumers, promotes ambulance service sustainability, and includes guardrails to prevent healthcare and vehicle premium increases.
Areas of Impact:	Day-to-day operations of the county, Functionality of county programs or services, General community advancement

What is the ultimate source of this problem?	Funding for ground ambulance services has never been addressed for public essential services. Protection for 911 transportation was addressed for private ambulance services only. (HB19-1174)
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	A mirrored bill of HB25-1088 puts in place key GAPB Committee recommendations. The legislation specifically: •Prohibits all ambulance agencies from balance billing patients for both emergency and non-emergency transports. •Establishes reimbursement rates for ambulance services that are out of network. •Requires carriers to pay the rates adopted by governing political subdivisions, assuming those rates meet conditions designed to improve transparency and limit costs. •Creates a public-facing website of rates adopted by political subdivisions. •Ensures ambulance agencies are paid directly after a transport. Some carriers issue checks to patients – and expect patients to then reimburse ambulance agencies – which is confusing, inefficient, and not consumer-friendly. Nothing in the legislation prohibits carriers from entering into contracts with ambulance agencies directly. This bill, if passed, would complement HB26-1069 (Availability of Emergency Medical Services).
Please provide sample language for this solution.	Again, A mirrored bill of HB25-1088 puts in place key GAPB Committee recommendations. The legislation specifically: •Prohibits all ambulance agencies from balance billing patients for both emergency and non-emergency transports. •Establishes reimbursement rates for ambulance services that are out of network. •Requires carriers to pay the rates adopted by governing political subdivisions, assuming those rates meet conditions designed to improve transparency and limit costs. •Creates a public-facing website of rates adopted by political subdivisions. •Ensures ambulance agencies are paid directly after a transport. Some carriers issue checks to patients – and expect patients to then reimburse ambulance agencies – which is confusing, inefficient, and not consumer-friendly. Nothing in the legislation prohibits carriers from entering into contracts with ambulance agencies directly.

Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	This issue of reimbursement for ground ambulances can only be solved by state legislation.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	CCI backed HB25-1088 but it was not a priority bill. Going forward as a Priority Bill would greatly increase the odds of it passing again and being signed by the new governor. Last time it was vetoed at the governor's desk. This time it would also include payment for services rendered on the state highway.
What possible organization(s) would ***support*** your proposed solution?	I would hope all counties, ambulance services, and hospitals whether rural or urban and their clinics.
What possible organization(s) would ***oppose*** your proposed solution?	The insurance industry.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	I have the support of Karen McCormick, Rod Pelton, Dusty Johnson, and Chris Richardson
What are the financial implications of this ***problem*** to your county? Are there any financial implications to this ***solution*** either?	There are no financial implications to our county, but this legislation, or lack of, would definitely impact our EMS 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? *Please consider any*	It could impact the insurance industry because it would make them accountable for their obligations. It could also impact the JBC for the initial year.

relevant Colorado State Departments.	
Staff Feedback	Risk / Difficulty: Time Commitment:

Taxation & Finance

Legislative Reform for Accurate County Fiscal Impact Reporting	
Larimer County (Commissioner Jody Shadduck-McNally)	
Preferred Contact:	Email
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	None.
Who is your subject matter expert?	TBC
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	1. Eliminates the ""Indeterminate"" Loophole Currently, because the 120-day legislative session moves incredibly fast, the Legislative Council Staff (LCS) frequently uses phrases like ""The local government impact is indeterminate"" or ""This bill may increase county expenditures, but the exact amount cannot be estimated at this time."" By striking the ""when possible"" clause from the law, a bill cannot advance to a vote without a concrete, data-backed county impact assessment. It forces the state to pause and calculate the math before making policy. 2. Closes the ""Ghost Mandate"" Gap Right now, C.R.S. § 29-1-304.5 says counties don't have to comply with unfunded mandates. However, if a fiscal note claims the impact is ""indeterminate"" or ""minimal,"" the state can argue the bill isn't a mandate. Counties are then forced into a difficult legal position: either comply and absorb the cost, or sue the state to prove it's an unfunded mandate. Adding a mandatory 72-hour county consultation window ensures local budget experts provide the real data upfront. If the data shows a net-positive cost, the bill is instantly flagged as a ""Potential Unfunded State Mandate,"" giving counties the immediate legal backing to opt-out of compliance without costly lawsuits. 3. Stops Property Tax Diversion When the state passes laws affecting human services, public health, or local jail operations without funding them, counties still have to pay the bills. To do this, they are forced to divert local property tax revenue away from county priorities like road repairs, local law enforcement, and emergency services. This change protects local tax dollars. By forcing the state to explicitly fund its directives (or make them strictly optional), county property taxes stay in the community to fund local infrastructure and services.

	4. Levels the Playing Field for Rural Counties Large counties have dedicated policy teams to watch the state legislature. Small, rural counties do not have the staff to analyze how a 100-page state bill will decimate their tiny local budgets. By standardizing a ""County Cost Calculator"" and requiring LCS to sample small, medium, and large counties equally, rural Colorado gets an automatic voice in the fiscal note process without having to spend limited resources on high-priced lobbyists. What is the ultimate source of this problem: Outdated statute, Lack of existing statute/regulation, Administrative policy gap
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?	Outdated statute, Lack of existing statute/regulation, Administrative policy gap
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	This proposal seeks to amend Joint Rule 22 of the General Assembly and C.R.S. § 29-1-304.9 to establish stricter statutory mandates: Eliminate Conditional Language, Mandatory County Consultation Window, and The ""Unfunded Mandate"" Trigger.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	HOUSE/SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 27-XXXX BY REPRESENTATIVE(S)/SENATOR(S) [Sponsor Name] CONCERNING AMENDMENTS TO JOINT RULE NO. 22 OF THE THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE SENATE TO STRENGTHEN TRANSPARENCY AND ENFORCEMENT OF FISCAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS. WHEREAS, Section 29-1-304.5, Colorado Revised Statutes, prohibits the General Assembly from imposing unfunded mandates on local governments, including counties and school districts; and WHEREAS, Accurate, exhaustive, and timely fiscal data is vital to upholding this statutory prohibition and protecting local taxpayers from the diversion of local property revenues; now, therefore, Be It Resolved by the [House of Representatives/Senate] of the [General] Assembly of the State of Colorado, the [Senate/House of Representatives] concurring herein: That Joint Rule No. 22 of the Joint Rules of the Senate and House of Representatives is amended BY THE ADDITION OF A NEW SUBSECTION to read: (g) Mandatory Local Government Impact Designation. (1) Every fiscal note prepared pursuant to this rule that identifies a net-positive expenditure or revenue reduction for a county, municipality, school district, or special district shall explicitly designate such legislation as a ""Potential Unfunded State Mandate or Reduction in Allocation"" unless the legislation contains

	a corresponding state appropriation sufficient to cover one hundred percent of said expenditure or revenue loss. (2) No committee of reference shall vote upon a bill bearing a ""Potential Unfunded State Mandate or Reduction in Allocation"" designation until the Legislative Council Staff has provided a verified County Cost Impact assessment incorporating data from a representative sample of affected local jurisdictions. Part 2: Sample Statutory Amendment Language (To Amend C.R.S. § 29-1-304.9) Note: In Colorado legislative drafting, text to be deleted is shown in strikeout, and new text to be added is shown in CAPITAL LETTERS. A BILL FOR AN ACT CONCERNING MEASURES TO ENSURE FISCAL TRANSPARENCY REGARDING STATE MANDATES ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS. Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado: SECTION 1. In Colorado Revised Statutes, 29-1-304.9, amend (1) introductory portion and (1)(a) as follows: 29-1-304.9. Fiscal note - mandatory local impact analysis. (1) For any proposed legislation introduced after ~~December 31, 2009~~ DECEMBER 31, 2027, that may have a fiscal impact on a county, school district, or board of cooperative services, the staff of the legislative council shall consider and SHALL provide in the local government impact section of the accompanying fiscal note, when possible, taking into consideration the constraints of the legislative session: (a) A reasonable, and timely, AND DATA-BACKED estimate of the fiscal impact on the counties, school districts, or boards of cooperative services chosen pursuant to subsection (2) of this section that would result from the proposed legislation. IF AN EXACT ESTIMATE CANNOT BE CALCULATED, THE FISCAL NOTE SHALL NOT DESIGNATE THE IMPACT AS INDETERMINATE, BUT SHALL PROVIDE A MINIMUM ESTIMATED COMPLIANCE COST FLOOR BASED ON HISTORICAL DATA; SECTION 2. In Colorado Revised Statutes, 29-1-304.9, add (4) as follows: (4) MANDATORY LOCAL GOVERNMENT REVIEW WINDOW. UPON CONFIDENTIAL RECEIPT OF A BILL DRAFT THAT IMPACTS LOCAL GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES, THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL STAFF SHALL PROVIDE A SECURE, MINIMUM SEVENTY-TWO HOUR WINDOW TO ACCREDITED STATEWIDE ASSOCIATIONS REPRESENTING COUNTY COMMISSIONERS AND MUNICIPALITIES TO SUBMIT LOCAL COST-COMPLIANCE DATA. THE ANALYSIS OF SAID DATA MUST BE FULLY INTEGRATED INTO THE PUBLISHED FISCAL NOTE PRIOR TO THE BILL'S FIRST COMMITTEE HEARING.

Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	We have explored this challenge and contemplating solutions for a few years now and we have explored any other alternative. We have come back to this needed legislative solution.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	In years past CCI and CCAT have explored a solution and those efforts were not successful
What possible organization(s) would ***support*** your proposed solution?	CCAT and other local governments, other counties, municipalities if the proposal is expanded
What possible organization(s) would ***oppose*** your proposed solution?	The State or Governor's Office
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	Working on it, but none have confirmed at this time. We are open to support or assistance with this effort.
What are the financial implications of this ***problem*** to your county? Are there any financial implications to this ***solution*** either?	We may have to hire staff to work on legislative analysis during the session so that we are not pushing work to the departments.
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*	Cost savings and removal of unfunded mandates, or better bills that don't require counties to comply without accompanying funding to install the mandate.

relevant Colorado State Departments.	
Staff Feedback	<u>Risk/Difficulties:</u> <u>Time Commitment:</u>

Strengthening County Revenues	
Clear Creek County	
Preferred Contact:	George Marlin, Clear Creek County, gmarlin@clearcreekcouty.us 303-949-0980
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	None yet. Many have expressed interest.
Who is your subject matter expert?	Colton Rohloff, County Manager, Clear Creek County, 970-409-6035, Crohloff@clearcreekcounty.us Peter Lichtman, County Attorney, Clear Creek County, 303-903-9040 plichtman@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.	County Fiscal deterioration. CCI produced a survey in 2026 to better understand the fiscal condition of counties throughout Colorado. The survey put collective data points to the pain that counties are experiencing as we try to provide services tailored to each of our communities. Seventy-eight percent of Colorado Counties report moderate to severe fiscal pressure. The survey found that instead of being positioned to meet the moment for our constituents who are experiencing an affordability crisis, 52% of counties are laying off staff, freezing wages and reducing benefits. Fewer people to provide the core services our constituents rely on, reduced morale among those who stay, and higher turnover is resulting in service level deteriorations. The problem shows no sign of abating on its own.
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?	CCI survey results show the top four drivers of this county fiscal crisis: cost inflation on both personnel and supplies, declining tax revenue and reduced state and federal funding. There are a myriad of factors driving these conditions. Some of these factors are recent, such as the change to the residential assessment rates combined with recent state budget cuts while others are the result of decades of downward pressure on our fiscal capacity, such as HUTF failing to keep up with inflation.

	None of these factors show any sign of abating themselves on their own. Counties will have to advocate for fiscal relief themselves and find partners who value the broad set of services we provide to support us in that advocacy.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	This proposal is to seek a solution in the 2027 session that provides fiscal relief to politically and economically diverse counties. Rather than propose a specific solution in July, this proposal is for CCI to dedicate ample bandwidth to defining solutions that meet our needs. Those solutions could involve new county authorities, voter options, statewide referred measures, or state budget investments.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	Sample language is not available at this time, due to the diversity of potential solutions
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	The solutions available to counties without new legislation remain largely confined to proposing increases in sales and property taxes or continuing to reduce staff and the services they provide, delay capital projects and reduce or eliminate programs.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	Many specific solutions have been proposed and debated over the years. Some have passed, such as the lodging tax efforts (both to reallocate and to increase the % to 6%) , but did not adequately address the needs of politically and economically diverse counties. In sum, these solutions do not bring in the level of funding necessary for counties to keep up with our statutory duties or the expectations of our constituents. Others have either not met the threshold to become CCI priorities or did not pass in legislature, such as the proposal to divert some of the Keep Colorado Wild funds to counties for road work. What each failed proposal has lacked is robust stakeholding with potential supporters to identify what has both support at CCI and a path through the legislature.
What possible organization(s) would ***support*** your proposed solution?	Organizations that would support our proposed solutions are those who value and advocate for issues that county governments address. Because County Governments have such a diverse array of services and expertise, the potential list of supporters could be quite large.
What possible organization(s) would ***oppose*** your proposed solution?	Organizations who may oppose a solution include those who may have to pay into a new revenue solution and those who lack confidence in county government as a credible partner in serving Coloradans. There may be organizations in Colorado who oppose more revenue tools for counties because of competition for limited dollars.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution?	Many legislators have engaged in both support of and in opposition to county fiscal enhancement. A solution that has a path through the legislature and the support of CCI can find legislative champions. If

If so, what was their response?	counties are able to do our jobs to the extent needed and required, it not only helps the State but advances our shared mission to serve Coloradans as they deserve
What are the financial implications of this ***problem*** to your county? Are there any financial implications to this ***solution*** either?	Clear Creek County is just one example of the financial implications of this problem. We have delayed crucial capital projects that will only become more costly with time, cancelled market evaluations of compensation and reduced staffing levels across the organization. A solution would allow Clear Creek to catch up on our capital, compensation and staffing needs, resulting in better services to our residents and better quality of life in our communities. The right solution will enable politically and economically diverse counties to do the same.
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.*	Many parties who rely on counties suffer under this environment. Departments from the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment and the Colorado Department of Human Service to Colorado State Patrol and the Division of Fire Prevention and Control rely on strong county governments to accomplish their missions. Without robust county engagement, these entities incur increased administrative costs and deterioration of their mission. Solutions would need to be designed such that the financial impact of divisions such as the Department of Revenue would be zero or close to zero in order to pass in the current fiscal environment.
Staff Feedback	Risk/Difficulties: Time Commitment:

Health & Human Services

Legislative Adjustments to Medicaid for Justice-Involved Individuals	
Larimer County	
Preferred Contact:	Commissioner Jody Shadduck-McNally, Chair, Larimer County, email or text
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	No
Who is your subject matter expert?	Emily Humphries, Community Justice Alternatives Director, Larimer County, 970 980-2671, humphre@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.	The proposal addresses two main issues currently faced by alternative sentencing programs: Financial and Operational Bottlenecks: Current rules require substance use disorder programs to contract with or employ a licensed physician (MD or DO). This creates unnecessary costs and administrative burdens because these programs do not provide physical medical interventions. The Medicaid ""Income Cliff"": While Medicaid coverage exists for individuals pre-release, participants in community corrections or work-release programs often lose their Medicaid coverage mid-program once they start earning income. This causes a disruption in care, as their income exceeds the standard eligibility limits, which can negatively impact their continuum of care and increase recidivism risks. Eliminate the Medical Director Requirement for Alternative Sentencing Non-Medical programs Colorado Rule/Statute Context: The Behavioral Health Administration regulates facility licensing under 2 CCR 502-1 (BHA Provider Rules), while Health Care Policy and Finance (HCPF) dictates billing credentials via the State Behavioral Health Services Billing Manual and 10 CCR 2505-10 Section 8.200. Current frameworks often require a contracted medical director (MD or DO) to oversee and authorize billing for behavioral health and substance use disorder (SUD) programs. For counties like Larimer County that operate alternative sentence programming delivering therapy and case management without physical medical interventions, this rule creates a severe financial bottleneck and the added cost of employing a medical director.

	Resolve the Medicaid ""Income Cliff"" for Active Justice-Involved Individuals Colorado Rule/Statute Context: Under C.R.S. § 25.5-5-201 (concerning optional groups eligible for medical assistance), Colorado has the authority to seek federal waivers to adjust eligibility terms. Colorado recently utilized this to launch the M-REACH (Medicaid Reentry and Community Health) initiative under an approved 1115 Demonstration Waiver amendment, which covers individuals pre-release (up to 90 days before leaving a carceral facility). However, it does not protect individuals post-release who are in community corrections or work-release programs; as soon as these individuals gain employment and earn income, they exceed the standard Modified Adjusted Gross Income (MAGI) cap and lose Medicaid mid-program. The proposal addresses two main issues currently faced by alternative sentencing programs: Financial and Operational Bottlenecks: Current rules require substance use disorder programs to contract with or employ a licensed physician (MD or DO). This creates unnecessary costs and administrative burdens because these programs do not provide physical medical interventions. The Medicaid ""Income Cliff"": While Medicaid coverage exists for individuals pre-release, participants in community corrections or work-release programs often lose their Medicaid coverage mid-program once they start earning income. This causes a disruption in care, as their income exceeds the standard eligibility limits, which can negatively impact their continuum of care and increase recidivism risks. This legislative proposal aims to streamline Medicaid operations for individuals serving a sentence in alternative sentencing programs (in Larimer County this includes STIRT (Strategic Individualized Remediation Treatment (21 days inpatient), IRT (Intensive Residential Treatment (90 days inpatient) and RDDT (Residential Dual Diagnosis Treatment)) by exempting non-medical programs from the mandate to employ a licensed physician, instead allowing clinical oversight by licensed non-prescribing professionals. It also seeks to resolve the Medicaid ""income cliff"" for justice involved participants by requesting a waiver to disregard earned income for individuals in these programs for up to 12 months post-release. Collectively, these adjustments are intended to ensure consistent funding, continuity of care, and uninterrupted access to care for justice-involved individuals while reducing the financial burden on counties.

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?	Problematic rulemaking, Lack of existing statute/regulation, Administrative policy gap
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	Eliminate the Medical Director Requirement for Alternative Sentencing Non-Medical programs Colorado Rule/Statute Context: The Behavioral Health Administration regulates facility licensing under 2 CCR 502-1 (BHA Provider Rules), while Health Care Policy and Finance (HCPF) dictates billing credentials via the State Behavioral Health Services Billing Manual and 10 CCR 2505-10 Section 8.200. Current frameworks often require a contracted medical director (MD or DO) to oversee and authorize billing for behavioral health and substance use disorder (SUD) programs. For counties like Larimer County that operate alternative sentence programming delivering therapy and case management without physical medical interventions, this rule creates a severe financial bottleneck and the added cost of employing a medical director. Resolve the Medicaid ""Income Cliff"" for Active Justice-Involved Individuals Colorado Rule/Statute Context: Under C.R.S. § 25.5-5-201 (concerning optional groups eligible for medical assistance), Colorado has the authority to seek federal waivers to adjust eligibility terms. Colorado recently utilized this to launch the M-REACH (Medicaid Reentry and Community Health) initiative under an approved 1115 Demonstration Waiver amendment, which covers individuals pre-release (up to 90 days before leaving a carceral facility). However, it does not protect individuals post-release who are in community corrections or work-release programs; as soon as these individuals gain employment and earn income, they exceed the standard Modified Adjusted Gross Income (MAGI) cap and lose Medicaid mid-program. This legislative proposal aims to streamline Medicaid operations for individuals serving a sentence in alternative sentencing programs (in Larimer County this includes STIRT (Strategic Individualized Remediation Treatment (21 days inpatient), IRT (Intensive Residential Treatment (90 days inpatient) and RDDT (Residential Dual Diagnosis Treatment)) by exempting non-medical programs from the mandate to employ a licensed physician, instead allowing clinical oversight by licensed non-prescribing professionals. It also seeks to resolve the Medicaid ""income cliff"" for justice involved participants by requesting a waiver to disregard earned income for individuals in these programs for up to 12 months post-release.

	Collectively, these adjustments are intended to ensure consistent funding, continuity of care, and uninterrupted access to care for justice-involved individuals while reducing the financial burden on counties.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	Colorado Rule/Statute Context: Suggested Proposal Language: Amend C.R.S. § 27-50-101 et seq. (BHA guiding statutes) and direct the BHA to modify licensing rules under 2 CCR 502-1 to create an explicit exemption for Criminal Justice Agencies. The language should specify that any justice-involved individuals or alternative sentencing provider delivering strictly non-medical behavioral health or residential SUD treatment is exempt from the requirement to contract with or employ a licensed physician. Clinical governance for these specific programs shall instead be authorized under a Colorado-licensed non-prescribing professional, such as a Licensed Addiction Counselor (LAC), Licensed Professional Counselor (LPC), or Licensed Clinical Social Worker (LCSW). Resolve the Medicaid ""Income Cliff"" for Active Justice-Involved Individuals: Suggested Proposal Language: Amend C.R.S. § 25.5-5-201 to authorize a 'Justice-Involved Transitional Coverage Carve-Out.' This legislation will direct HCPF to apply for an expansion of Colorado's Section 1115 Demonstration Waiver to explicitly disregard earned income for individuals actively enrolled and participating in a certified alternative sentencing, diversion, or community corrections program. Medicaid eligibility under Health First Colorado will be guaranteed for the duration of the active program enrollment, up to a maximum of 12 months post-release incarceration, regardless of earned income spikes, to maintain the continuum of care, increase safety, and mitigate recidivism.
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	No- The BHA rules continually change and in order to keep licensure, alternative sentencing programs must pivot continuously.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	Unsure
What possible organization(s) would ***support*** your proposed solution?	Other Medicaid billing providers in the state, including Community Corrections facilities, substance abuse providers in a justice-involved setting.
What possible organization(s)	Unknown

would ***oppose*** your proposed solution?	
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?	Projecting budget impacts is challenging due to the uncertainty surrounding Medicaid billing procedures and regulatory requirements. Maintaining the status quo may necessitate increased reliance on county general funds. Furthermore, the shift in work requirements poses a significant risk to service continuity for all clients, potentially disrupting their access to essential care thus increasing the risk of recidivism and public safety. If Medicaid funding and approvals become more consistent, there will be less reliance on county funds for non-general fund justice-involved individuals programs.
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.*	Any organization that does Medicaid billing - non-profits, local governments, small providers, and those that support and serve justice-involved individuals .
Staff Feedback	<u>Risk / Difficulty:</u> <u>Time Commitment:</u>

Aligning Foster Youth in Transition program services with allocated resources.	
Weld And Larimer Counties	
Preferred Contact:	Scott James Weld County sjames@weld.gov
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	Kristen Stephens Larimer County kstephens@larimer.org
Who is your subject matter expert?	Jamie Ulrich/Heather O'Hayre Director, Weld County Human Services 970-400-6510 ulrichjj@weld.gov/ohayrehj@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.	General: The Foster Youth in Transition (FYiT) program, established by HB21-1094, builds upon the federal John H. Chafee Foster Care Program for Successful Transition to Adulthood by providing extended supports to young adults ages 18-21 transitioning from foster care. Eligible youth can voluntarily remain in or re-enter child welfare to receive extended child welfare services, such as housing assistance and case management. While the federal Chafee program provides important funding and establishes a framework for assisting youth as they transition to independence, federal funding has never been sufficient to fully meet the needs of eligible youth nationwide. As a result, states have long supplemented limited federal resources with state and local funding to provide housing assistance, case management, education, employment supports, and other transition services for this population. Colorado's FYiT program (HB21-1094) was enacted with fiscal assumptions that substantially underestimated both participation and implementation costs. The original fiscal note anticipated approximately 58 participating youth statewide and included less than $900,000 for program delivery. In SFY26, counties are serving approximately 536 youth, with projected delivery costs exceeding $10.3 million. This compares to Chaffee program delivery costs of about $6.5 million in SFY21, prior to the Foster Youth in Transition program's implementation. Counties are required to provide comprehensive services to all eligible youth regardless of available appropriations. While limited federal Chafee funding offsets a portion of these costs, neither federal nor state funding has kept pace with actual program demand. Counties have therefore been forced to absorb millions of dollars in unfunded costs through the Child

	Welfare Block and county general funds. The funding gap extends beyond direct services and includes significant unbudgeted staffing and administrative workload required to operate the program. This proposal seeks to align the Foster Youth in Transition Program with both its original legislative intent and the fiscal realities facing Colorado's child welfare system by clarifying eligibility, strengthening program integrity, and ensuring limited resources are directed to youth most in need of successful transitions to adulthood. Specific Issues: •The Child Welfare Block is projected to be under appropriated by more than $30m at the close of SFY25-26. Colorado's FYiT program (HB21-1094) was enacted with fiscal assumptions that substantially underestimated both participation and implementation costs. The original fiscal note anticipated approximately 58 participating youth statewide and included less than $900,000 for program delivery. In SFY26, counties are serving approximately 536 youth, with projected delivery costs exceeding $10.3 million. This compares to Chaffee program delivery costs of about $6.5 million in SFY21, prior to the Foster Youth in Transition program's implementation. •Although Colorado offers housing vouchers and case management services to a set number of youth up to age 26 through the Fostering Success Voucher Program, youth currently have to choose between leaving the Foster Youth in Transition Program (FyiT) to access the Fostering Success program or staying in FYiT, placing further strain on counties to provide these supports. •The housing costs associated with FyiT as an entitlement, are driving significant strain on the program. Some youth participating in FYiT are receiving excessive funding for housing while living with relatives. Funds have been used to pay for the entire mortgage. Additionally, housing costs are very high in many communities, with monthly rents around $2,000 for a studio apartment. This cost as an entitlement is unsustainable to counties without additional funding. •Open eligibility- There is no consideration for permanency status at the time of enrollment, nor are there requirements around progress towards self-sufficiency, in current eligibility requirements. •There is uncertainty about whether FYiT is successfully preparing youth for adulthood by creating sustainable impacts to employment, housing, education, etc. There is no post-exit from FYiT survey to measure program effectiveness or outcomes. •Change of Venue- There can be a disconnect on which county is providing services and which county is paying for the program if a youth moves across county lines. There have been circumstances where a county is

	paying for out-of-state youth. There is not a way to transfer a FYiT case from one County System to another within Colorado.
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?	General: Broad, misaligned statutes and funding gaps. Court requirement for program eligibility that does not meet the needs of the youth Specific Issues: •The initial fiscal note only provides funding to cover less than 1/10th of the program costs today. There is not enough state or federal funding appropriated to counties to pay for the program as operated today as an open entitlement, without any guardrails or caps. •Although Colorado offers housing vouchers and case management services to a set number of youth up to age 26 through the Fostering Success Voucher Program, youth currently have to choose between leaving the Foster Youth in Transition Program (FyiT) to access the Fostering Success program or staying in FYiT, placing further strain on counties to provide these supports. •The housing costs associated with FyiT as an entitlement, are driving significant strain on the program. Some youth participating in FYiT are receiving excessive funding for housing while living with relatives. Funds have been used to pay for the entire mortgage. Additionally, housing costs are very high in many communities, with monthly rents around $2,000 for a studio apartment. This cost as an entitlement is unsustainable to counties without additional funding. •Open eligibility- There is no consideration for permanency status at the time of enrollment, nor are there requirements around progress towards self-sufficiency, in current eligibility requirements. •Current statute establishes eligibility for the Foster Youth in Transition Program based primarily on a youth's age and child welfare case history, rather than their permanency status at the time their case closes. As a result, youth may qualify for services even when they have achieved a permanent family or legal relationship and are not transitioning from foster care. For example, the current eligibility criteria include youth who entered state or county custody at age 16 or older, regardless of whether they were subsequently adopted, reunified with their parents, or placed in the permanent legal custody or allocation of parental responsibilities (APR) of a relative or other caregiver before case closure. Additionally, the statute allows youth who are age 18 or older and involved in a Dependency and Neglect (D&N) case, but who were never removed from their parents' care,

	to qualify for the program. These provisions expand eligibility beyond the original intent of supporting youth who are transitioning from foster care to adulthood. As a result, limited program resources are being used to serve youth who have already achieved legal permanency or who were never in out-of-home care, reducing the availability of services for youth who are aging out of foster care without permanent family supports. •Lack of regulatory guardrails to ensure best interest of youth and evidence-based practices. Delaying case closure can postpone the legal finalization of permanency for youth through reunification, adoption, allocation of parental responsibilities (APR), or guardianship. This is inconsistent with the child welfare system's primary goal of achieving timely permanency and legal stability for children and youth. Permanency decisions should be based solely on the best interests of the youth, rather than on eligibility requirements for a separate program. Revising the statutory eligibility criteria to align services with youth who are genuinely transitioning from foster care would eliminate this unintended incentive, support timely permanency, and ensure that program resources are directed to youth who exit foster care without permanent family supports. •Lack of Measured Outcomes, Cost Effectiveness. The Foster Youth in Transition (FYiT) Program does not currently require a standardized post-exit evaluation or follow-up survey to measure participant outcomes after services end. As a result, there is limited data to determine whether the program is achieving its intended purpose of promoting long-term housing stability, financial self-sufficiency, and successful transitions to adulthood.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	This proposal seeks to evaluate whether targeted statutory and programmatic changes are necessary to better align the program with available appropriations while preserving services for youth with the greatest need and maintaining the program's long-term sustainability. Potential policy options for consideration include: •Clarifying eligibility criteria to better align the program with its original legislative intent of serving youth transitioning from foster care to adulthood. •Establishing clearer documentation and participation requirements to ensure ongoing eligibility is based on verified engagement rather than intent alone. •Clarifying FYiT as the payer of last resort by requiring available federal, state, local, and community resources to be utilized before FYiT funds are expended. •Establishing reasonable parameters for housing assistance to ensure limited resources are distributed equitably and consistently across the state. •Clarifying how eligibility should apply when youth have achieved legal permanency prior to adulthood.

	•Ensuring permanency decisions are based solely on the best interests of the youth and are not influenced by program eligibility considerations. •Creating a clear statewide process for transferring FYiT cases between counties when youth relocate. •Establishing consistent outcome measurement and program evaluation requirements to assess whether the program is achieving its intended objectives and to inform future policy and funding decisions. These options are intended to serve as a starting point for discussion. Counties are seeking to determine whether one or more statutory, regulatory, or administrative changes could better align program requirements with available appropriations while preserving the program's core mission of supporting successful transitions to adulthood.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	Payor of Last Resort: (1) Financial assistance and services provided through the Foster Youth in Transition Program are intended to supplement, and not supplant, other available public and private resources. (2) The Foster Youth in Transition Program shall serve as the payor of last resort. Prior to authorizing expenditures from the program, the county department shall determine that: (a) No other federal, state, local, tribal, private, or community funding source is reasonably available to meet the identified need; (b) The participant has applied for, or is receiving, all benefits and services for which the participant is eligible, unless application is not feasible due to time-sensitive circumstances or other good cause as determined by the State Department; and (c) The requested expenditure is necessary to support the participant's transition to self-sufficiency and cannot be met through another available funding source. (3) The State Department shall establish rules identifying alternative funding sources to be considered before FYiT funds are authorized and shall develop uniform documentation requirements to demonstrate that program funds were used as the payor of last resort. (4) Nothing in this section shall prohibit the use of Foster Youth in Transition funds to address an immediate emergency when delaying assistance would jeopardize the participant's health, safety, housing stability, or employment, provided that the county department documents the emergency and pursues reimbursement or coordination with other funding sources when appropriate. Funding certain Living Arrangements: **Housing Assistance Eligibility and Limitations.** (1) Financial assistance provided through the Foster Youth in Transition Program for housing-related expenses shall be intended to support youth

	who are transitioning from foster care to independent living arrangements and who lack other available housing resources. (2) The State Department shall establish rules limiting the amount and duration of housing-related assistance provided to a participant who resides: (a) With a parent or legal guardian; or (b) With a relative or kinship caregiver, including a placement provider with whom the youth has an established familial or supportive relationship. (3) The limits established pursuant to this section shall consider: (a) The youth's level of financial need; (b) Whether the living arrangement is stable and permanent; (c) Whether the youth is contributing to household expenses; (d) Whether the youth has access to other available resources or benefits; and (e) Whether assistance is necessary to prevent housing instability or disruption of a safe living arrangement. (4) FYiT funds shall not be used to replace a parent's, guardian's, or caregiver's financial responsibility for supporting a youth who has a safe and stable living arrangement. (5) The State Department may authorize exceptions to the limitations established under this section when the department determines that assistance is necessary to protect the youth's safety, prevent homelessness, or support the youth's successful transition to adulthood. (6) The State Department shall establish reporting requirements to monitor housing assistance expenditures, including the type of living arrangement supported and the outcomes associated with the assistance. Eligibility - Intentions vs Actions: Sample language could amend C.R.S. § 19-7-304 to replace the phrase “is engaged in or intends to engage in” with language requiring that a youth “is actively and verifiably engaged in, and provides documentation that the youth is engaged in,” at least one qualifying education, employment, workforce development, or barrier-removal activity. There should also be a compliance process requiring written notice when a youth fails to provide documentation or no longer meets eligibility requirements. The youth should have thirty calendar days to reestablish eligibility, with one possible thirty-day good-cause extension when the youth is making documented good-faith efforts and the delay is due to a temporary circumstance outside the youth’s control. If eligibility is not reestablished by the end of the compliance period, the county department should proceed under C.R.S. § 19-7-313 to terminate the voluntary services agreement and the court’s jurisdiction, unless prohibited by federal law or court order.

	C.R.S. § 19-7-315 should be amended to require state rules on documentation, quarterly verification, compliance periods, good-cause extensions, termination for noncompliance, and standardized forms designed to minimize county administrative burden. Eligibility - Achieving Permanency: § 19-7-304 (1)(e) The youth has not achieved permanency through successful reunification with a caregiver or APR/RGAP to a relative or kin placement. **A youth is eligible for Foster Youth in Transition services only if the youth:** (a) Is eighteen (18) years of age or older; (b) Was in the legal custody of a county department of human or social services or the Colorado Department of Human Services on or after the youth's eighteenth birthday; and (c) Exited foster care to independence after attaining eighteen (18) years of age. **A youth is not eligible solely because the youth:** (I) Was in state or county custody prior to attaining eighteen (18) years of age but achieved permanency through reunification, adoption, guardianship, or allocation of parental responsibilities before the youth's eighteenth birthday; (II) Was the subject of a Dependency and Neglect proceeding but was never removed from the care and custody of the youth's parent or legal guardian; or (III) Met a prior age or case-history eligibility requirement but was no longer in the legal custody of a county department or the Colorado Department of Human Services upon attaining eighteen (18) years of age. Eligibility - Delaying Permanency: Decisions regarding reunification, adoption, guardianship, allocation of parental responsibilities, or case closure shall be based solely on the best interests of the youth and applicable state and federal child welfare requirements. Eligibility for services under the Foster Youth in Transition Program shall not be considered a basis for delaying permanency or extending the duration of a Dependency and Neglect case. Lack of Measured Outcomes, Cost Effectiveness: **Program Evaluation and Outcome Measurement.**

	(1) The State Department shall develop and implement a standardized process to evaluate the effectiveness of the Foster Youth in Transition Program. (2) At a minimum, the evaluation shall measure participant outcomes during program participation and, when exiting the program. (3) The evaluation shall include, but not be limited to, the following performance measures: (a) Housing stability; (b) Employment status and earned income; (c) Enrollment and completion of secondary, postsecondary, vocational, or workforce training programs; (d) Incidents of homelessness, housing instability, or involvement with emergency shelter services following program exit; (4) The State Department shall annually evaluate the cost-effectiveness of the program, including: (a) Total program expenditures; (b) Average cost per participant; (5) On or before January 15 of each year, the State Department shall submit a report to the General Assembly summarizing participant outcomes, program performance, cost-effectiveness, and recommendations for statutory or programmatic improvements. The report shall include aggregate data and shall not disclose personally identifiable information. Change of Venue: Change of Venue in Foster Youth in Transition Proceedings. (1) Upon motion of any party or on the court's own motion, the court may transfer venue of a Foster Youth in Transition proceeding to the district court of another county when: (a) The youth have established residence in the other county; (b) The county department in the receiving county is able to provide ongoing case management and services; and (c) The court finds that the transfer is in the best interests of the youth and promotes the efficient administration of justice. (2) Prior to transferring venue, the transferring court shall ensure that the receiving county department has been notified and has received all necessary case records, court orders, and documentation. (3) Upon acceptance of the transfer by the receiving court, the receiving county department shall assume responsibility for providing child welfare services in accordance with state law. (4) A transfer of venue shall not delay permanency planning, court hearings, or the provision of services to the youth.

	(5) All orders entered by the transferring court shall remain in full force and effect until modified by the receiving court. Not Meeting Programmatic Intentions and Goals: Same as Lack of Measured Outcomes, Cost Effectiveness
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	Some operational improvements could be made without legislation, including county documentation checklists, internal case-management practices, local caseworker guidance, and clearer expectations in voluntary services agreements. However, these tools would not resolve the underlying issue because counties must still administer the program under existing state statute. Without statutory change, counties would lack uniform statewide documentation requirements, clear compliance timelines, and a defined process for termination when eligibility is not reestablished. This leaves counties with inconsistent interpretation, administrative uncertainty, legal risk, and continued difficulty managing local costs.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	To our knowledge, this specific proposal has not yet been advanced by CCI. Other organizations were involved in creating and implementing the Foster Youth in Transition Program, but this proposal focuses specifically on tightening eligibility, documentation, compliance, county cost containment, and removal procedures. This program was flagged last year by the child welfare Joint Budget Committee staffer as an area that needs more evaluation because costs have far exceeded original appropriations.
What possible organization(s) would ***support*** your proposed solution?	Commissioners County Departments of Human Services Fiscal accountability organizations Taxpayer advocacy organizations Workforce development organizations Career and technical education stakeholders Legislators focused on county authority, fiscal responsibility, workforce readiness, and government accountability
What possible organization(s) would ***oppose*** your proposed solution?	Office of the Child's Representative Youth service providers Legal services organizations Youth counsel organizations Behavioral health advocates Disability advocates Organizations concerned that stricter eligibility requirements could reduce access to services for vulnerable young adults

	The Colorado Department of Human Services may also have concerns depending on administrative burden, federal funding requirements, rulemaking obligations, or broader policy priorities Some legislators may oppose the proposal if they believe the original broad eligibility standard is necessary to preserve access to services.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	Not at this time.
What are the financial implications of this ***problem*** to your county? Are there any financial implications to this ***solution*** either?	The current underfunding of the Foster Youth in Transition (FYiT) program creates a direct fiscal liability for counties. Because the program is an entitlement, counties are mandated to provide services regardless of whether state appropriations cover the actual per-participant cost (which is currently ~$15,311 per youth). The insufficiency of the original fiscal note forces counties to bridge the gap by diverting critical local tax dollars or depleting the Child Welfare Block, which is already strained by competing demands. This prevents counties from budgeting accurately for caseload growth and creates an unpredictable financial burden. Specific Issues: The financial impact to counties have been significant. This includes case management, eligibility determinations, documentation, housing coordination, service referrals, court work, legal review, administrative oversight, and related program costs. The state has not provided sufficient funding to fully cover these expenses. The current broad eligibility standard can increase county costs by allowing services to continue based on stated intent rather than verified participation. Without clear documentation and compliance requirements, counties have limited ability to ensure resources are directed to youth actively engaged in qualifying activities. The proposal may create some short-term administrative work, but those costs are expected to be offset by clearer eligibility standards, more consistent administration, reduced uncertainty, and the ability to terminate participation when eligibility is not reestablished after notice and a reasonable compliance period.
What are the financial implications of this ***problem*** to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of	The proposal may create implementation costs for CDHS, including rulemaking, standard forms, and county guidance on documentation, verification, compliance periods, and termination procedures. It may also affect the Judicial Department and Office of the Child's Representative because eligibility disputes could arise during court reviews or termination hearings.

this ***solution*** to any other impacted parties? *Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.*	Participating youth could lose services if eligibility is not maintained, but the proposal includes safeguards such as written notice, reasonable assistance, a thirty-day compliance period, one possible good-cause extension, and protections for documented medical conditions. Overall, the proposal may create some state and county implementation costs, but it is intended to improve program integrity, reduce county fiscal exposure, and focus public funds on youth who are actively participating in qualifying activities.
Staff Feedback	Risk / Difficulty: Time Commitment:

Agriculture, Wildlife, & Rural Affairs

Revegetation of Water Division 3	
Saguache County	
Preferred Contact:	Tom McCracken Saguache County Phone 719-221-1822
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.	The reduction of irrigated agricultural acreage within Water Division 3 has resulted in thousands of acres of dry agricultural lands that are susceptible to the spread of noxious weeds and the generation of significant dust during high wind events. These conditions negatively impact neighboring agricultural operations, public health, wildlife habitat, and roadway safety. Dust storms originating from these properties have reduced visibility on county and state highways and have contributed to multiple vehicle accidents. The proposal seeks to establish revegetation requirements that stabilize soils, reduce noxious weed infestations, and improve environmental conditions while protecting public safety.
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?	The reduction of irrigated agricultural acreage within Water Division 3 has resulted in thousands of acres of dry agricultural lands that are susceptible to the spread of noxious weeds and the generation of significant dust during high wind events. These conditions negatively impact neighboring agricultural operations, public health, wildlife habitat, and roadway safety. Dust storms originating from these properties have reduced visibility on county and state highways and have contributed to multiple vehicle accidents. The proposal seeks to establish revegetation requirements that stabilize soils, reduce noxious weed infestations, and improve environmental conditions while protecting public safety.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	Establish legislation directing the appropriate state agencies to develop revegetation standards for permanently or temporarily dried-up irrigated agricultural lands within Water Division 3. Landowners participating in water transfers, fallowing programs, or other water management activities would

	be required to implement approved revegetation or soil stabilization measures that reduce noxious weed infestations and minimize airborne dust. The legislation should also encourage partnerships between state agencies, local governments, conservation districts, and water conservation organizations to provide technical assistance and funding opportunities.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	"The Colorado General Assembly directs the Colorado Division of Water Resources, in consultation with the Colorado Department of Agriculture, local governments, conservation districts, and affected water conservation districts, to develop minimum revegetation and soil stabilization standards for agricultural lands that are permanently or temporarily removed from irrigation. The standards shall be designed to minimize the spread of noxious weeds, reduce airborne dust, protect public safety, preserve soil health, and promote long-term environmental stewardship. The Department shall establish guidance for implementation, monitoring, and compliance, while providing opportunities for technical and financial assistance to affected landowners."
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	Saguache County has begun discussions regarding voluntary collaboration with the Colorado Division of Water Resources and the Rio Grande Water Conservation District to identify practical solutions. While cooperative efforts are encouraged and may provide localized benefits, statewide legislative direction is needed to establish consistent standards, clarify agency responsibilities, and ensure long-term implementation throughout Water Division 3.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	To our knowledge, neither Colorado Counties, Inc. nor other statewide organizations have pursued legislation specifically addressing revegetation requirements for dried-up irrigated agricultural lands within Water Division 3. This proposal presents an opportunity to proactively address an emerging environmental and public safety concern.
What possible organization(s) would ***support*** your proposed solution?	•Rio Grande Water Conservation District •Colorado Division of Water Resources •Colorado Department of Agriculture •Colorado State University Extension •Local Conservation Districts •County Weed Departments •County Road and Bridge Departments •Colorado Counties, Inc. •Agricultural producers affected by noxious weed spread •Public health and environmental organizations
What possible organization(s) would ***oppose*** your proposed solution?	•Property rights organizations •Agricultural producers concerned about additional regulatory requirements or implementation costs •Water users participating in fallowing or water transfer programs

	•Organizations concerned with additional state regulatory oversight The proposal should emphasize flexibility, technical assistance, and available funding opportunities to minimize impacts on landowners.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	Yes. Saguache County Commissioners have discussed this issue with Representative Matthew Martinez. Representative Martinez expressed interest in the issue and indicated a willingness to continue discussions regarding potential legislative solutions.
What are the financial implications of this ***problem*** to your county? Are there any financial implications to this ***solution*** either?	The continued spread of noxious weeds and dust from dried-up agricultural lands increases county expenditures for weed management, roadway maintenance, emergency response, and coordination with state agencies. Dust-related traffic accidents also increase demands on law enforcement, emergency medical services, and road maintenance. While implementation of revegetation requirements may require initial investments for planning, technical assistance, and vegetation establishment, those costs are expected to be offset over time through reduced weed management expenses, improved roadway safety, lower maintenance costs, and protection of agricultural productivity.
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.*	State agencies, including the Colorado Division of Water Resources, Colorado Department of Agriculture, and Colorado Department of Transportation, may experience costs associated with implementation, technical assistance, and oversight. However, long-term savings may result from reduced noxious weed management, improved air quality, fewer dust-related transportation incidents, and improved environmental conditions. Agricultural producers, neighboring landowners, and local communities would benefit from healthier soils, reduced weed infestations, improved visibility on roadways, and better long-term land stewardship. Grant opportunities and cost-share programs should be explored to minimize financial impacts on individual landowners.
Staff Feedback	Risk/Difficulties: Time Commitment: