









10/12/18

	The County is supposed to notify the anatomical board within 48 hours and if they want the body and then the County has to take it to them. If the anatomical board doesn't want the body, then the County has to dispose of it, but again it references "burial". What is interesting is that if the anatomical board takes the body, they are expressly allowed to bury <u>or cremate</u> the body after they are done. See CRS 15-19-307.
<b>Proposed Solution</b>	We would like the statute to define burial and include cremation with one exception; if the Coroner decides the death was likely the result of criminal activity, we do not cremate. If a family member is located, but unable to pay for the costs and the County is still responsible, then the County must have the ultimate say on how to dispose of the body.
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	Savings to individual Counties. No expense for the State.
<b>Potential Proponents / Opponents</b>	Unknown
<b>*Risk/ Difficulties</b>	1
<b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>	2
<b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>	2
<b>County's Priority</b>	1

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--

10/12/18

<p><b>Ranking</b></p>	
<p><b>County</b></p>	<p><b>Arapahoe</b></p>
<p><b>Legislative Issue</b></p>	<p><b>Issue:</b> The state statute that allows counties to ban fireworks (C.R.S. § 30-15-401(1)(n.7) is too cumbersome to implement for the Fourth of July fireworks season.</p> <p><b>Background:</b> The statute giving counties the power to adopt ordinances allows counties to ban the sale and use of fireworks for a period up to one year, but in order for the ban to be effective between May 31 and July 5 of any year, the ordinance must include “an express finding of high fire danger, based upon competent evidence.” Competent evidence is defined in the statute to include “the use of the national fire danger rating system and other similar indices or information.”</p> <p>The most reasonable interpretation of this statute is that in order for a county to ban the sale or use of fireworks during a given Fourth of July season, the county’s BOCC must adopt a new ordinance, or <b>amend an existing</b> ordinance, to include a finding of high fire danger that is specific to that Fourth of July season. The issue is that adopting or amending an ordinance takes 20-30 days due to the statutory notice and publication requirements, and this can be problematic given that the fire conditions during the time period leading up to the Fourth of July can quickly go from bad to worse. Therefore, it can be difficult to get a ban in place in time to prevent the fires that could potentially happen due to the sale and use of</p>

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>          1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,          2 = moderate risk,          3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>          1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,          2 = important BOCC county issue,          3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>          1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,          2 = ordinary time commitment          3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--

10/12/18

	<p>fireworks during high fire danger during the Fourth of July season.</p> <p>In order to remedy this problem, we are proposing an amendment (see below) that will make it so that bans during the Fourth of July season can be implemented in a more practical and expedited manner. Specifically, we are proposing language to clarify that a BOCC can make a finding of high fire danger by resolution. Under this approach, a BOCC could adopt an ordinance banning fireworks prior to the Fourth of July season, but the ordinance would not be effective during the Fourth of July season unless the BOCC makes a subsequent finding of high fire danger in a resolution (as opposed to in the ordinance itself). The advantage to this change is that a resolution can be adopted much more quickly than a new ordinance or an amendment to an existing ordinance.</p> <p>We are also proposing an amendment to the definition of “competent evidence,” to clarify that counties can rely on nationally recognized predictions of future fire danger (like those from the National Interagency Coordination Center), as well as the fire danger under the national fire rating system.</p>
<p><b>Proposed Solution</b></p>	<p>C.R.S. § 30-15-401(1)(n.7) currently provides that counties may adopt ordinances to:</p> <p>“To prohibit or restrict the sale, use, and possession of fireworks, including permissible fireworks, as defined in <a href="#">section 24-33.5-2001(5)</a> and <a href="#">(11)</a>, for a period no longer than one year within all or any part of the unincorporated</p>

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>          1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,          2 = moderate risk,          3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>          1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,          2 = important BOCC county issue,          3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>          1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,          2 = ordinary time commitment          3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--

10/12/18

areas of the county; except that such an ordinance shall not be in effect between May 31 and July 5 of any year unless the ordinance includes an express finding of high fire danger, based on competent evidence, as defined in subsection (1)(n.5) of this section.”

We would like to amend this provision to read as follows (the highlighted sections are the additions/changes):

“To prohibit or restrict the sale, use, and possession of fireworks, including permissible fireworks, as defined in [section 24-33.5-2001\(5\)](#) and [\(11\)](#), for a period no longer than one year within all or any part of the unincorporated areas of the county; except that such an ordinance shall not be in effect between May 31 and July 5 of any year unless *pursuant to resolution the board of county commissioners makes an* express finding of high fire danger, based on competent evidence, as defined in subsection (1)(n.5) of this section, *and notice of the resolution and imposition of the ban or restriction shall be promptly published in the County’s legal publication.*”

In addition, we are proposing to amend the definition of “competent evidence” in C.R.S. § 30-15-01(1)(n.5)((V)(A) as follows (the highlighted sections are the additions):

“‘Competent evidence’ includes the use of the national fire danger rating system, and national interagency fire danger predictions or outlooks, and any other similar indices or information.”

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--



10/12/18

	Arapahoe County is open to considering other proposed solutions to this problem. However, we believe that this is a simple solution that requires minimal changes to the statute.
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	No fiscal impact to counties.
<b>Potential Proponents / Opponents</b>	The manufacturers and distributors of fireworks may be opposed to this legislation.
<b>*Risk/ Difficulties</b>	2
<b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>	2
<b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>	2
<b>County's Priority Ranking</b>	
<b>County</b>	<b>Pitkin</b>
<b>Legislative Issue</b>	<p>Provide counties the authority to issue business licenses. The ability to issue business licenses would enhance a County's ability to track business activities to ensure equitable tax liabilities among similar business activities; and provide counties more flexibility to enhance and protect public health, safety and welfare.</p> <p><b>Background:</b> Colorado counties do not have the</p>

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--

10/12/18

	<p>authority to issue business licenses, and as a result are denied one of the most basic tools to track business activities for taxation purposes. Recent disruptions caused by technology and changes in business processes have raised equity issues and brought into sharp relief the inability of counties to address them. A prime example in rural resort counties is the rise of online home rentals as an alternative to traditional lodging. In the absence of standards for when an activity constitutes a business activity, requiring a business license, there is little ability for counties to ensure tax liabilities, especially sales tax, are applied equitably. This puts traditional business activities at a disadvantage, and also denies collection of public revenues to offset the increased impact of commercial level activities on infrastructure and services. Similarly, business license authority would allow counties the ability to better regulate business activities to protect public health, safety and welfare.</p>
<p><b>Proposed Solution</b></p>	<p>Support legislation that allows counties to issue business licenses on an equal basis to Colorado Municipalities.</p>
<p><b>Fiscal Impact</b></p>	<p>Would likely result in higher state and local sales tax collections, would help level the playing field between similar business activities such as lodge and internet home rentals.</p>
<p><b>Potential Proponents / Opponents</b></p>	<p>Not at this time.</p>
<p><b>*Risk/ Difficulties</b></p>	<p>3</p>

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--

10/12/18

<b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>	2
<b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>	3
<b>County's Priority Ranking</b>	1
<b>County</b>	<b>San Miguel / Jefferson County</b>
<b>Legislative Issue</b>	<p>Change the requirement for Counties to publish financial reports</p> <p><b>Background:</b> The Governor vetoed SB 18-156 with this statement this year, “The underlying law was enacted in a time when newspapers were the dominant, if not sole, form of public information in all communities. For some communities, this is still the norm,” said Governor Hickenlooper in the veto letter. “We are persuaded that the sponsors’ concept is sound and the bill’s time is near. But that time must closely align with full broadband availability throughout the State. To that end, we encourage the sponsors to bring this bill next year with trigger language taking effect not at a date certain, but rather once full broadband buildout is achieved.”</p>
<b>Proposed Solution</b>	Municipalities and other local governments are already exempt from the publication requirements, regardless of broadband status. Proposal is to achieve relief for counties by changing the statute to allow counties to

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--

10/12/18

	"provide" information to a newspaper circulated within the county. Relief could also be achieved by providing information on the county's website.
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	Save thousands of dollars while still providing transparency.
<b>Potential Proponents / Opponents</b>	Newspaper lobby
<b>*Risk/ Difficulties</b>	3
<b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>	1
<b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>	3
<b>County's Priority Ranking</b>	
<b>County</b>	<b>Jefferson</b>
<b>Legislative Issue</b>	<p>Public Trustee Appointment</p> <p><b>Background:</b> The office of the Public Trustee is established in 38-37-101 et seq. In Denver and Broomfield, the Public Trustee is paid as provided by the city and county. In counties of the second class, the Public Trustee is appointed by the Governor. In counties of the third class the Treasurer serves as the Public</p>

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--

10/12/18

	<p>Trustee and receives additional compensation for performing the duties of the Public Trustee. The salary and benefits of the Public Trustee and the costs of running the office are to be paid only from the fees generated by the office.</p> <p>The Public Trustee of Boulder did not generate enough money to pay his own salary and expenses and is now appointed Public Trustee of Jefferson County as well. The Public Trustee in Jefferson County for the last year was out on medical leave and the Deputy Trustee assumed the responsibilities of the Public Trustee. The position of Public Trustee is not a high-volume job and the duties/ responsibilities are statutorily proscribed. Jefferson County, the 4th largest county in the State, has managed to perform its duties with a staff of three people. The Jefferson County Treasurer could easily assume these duties and the County would realize a cost savings of approximately \$97,000.00/year.</p>
<p><b>Proposed Solution</b></p>	<p>To promote efficiency and accountability and to reduce cost to taxpayers of government services, C.S.R. 38-37-102 should be amended to require the Treasurer to serve as Public Trustee in counties of the second classes. SB15-096 proposed, and failed, allowing Boards of County Commissioners (BCC) to determine whether to have an appointed Public Trustee or to have the Treasurer serve.</p>
<p><b>Fiscal Impact</b></p>	<p>Elimination of the position of Public Trustee would save the county approximately \$97,000 per year.</p>
<p><b>Potential Proponents /</b></p>	<p>Proponents: Boards of County Commissioners in second class counties, as classified by state statutes.</p>

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--

10/12/18

<b>Opponents</b>	Opponents: Public Trustees of second class counties, as classified by state statutes. Perhaps Governor.
<b>*Risk/ Difficulties</b>	3
<b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>	1
<b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>	3
<b>County's Priority Ranking</b>	

**Health and Human Services**

<b>County</b>	<b>Jefferson</b>
<b>Legislative Issue</b>	<p>Information Sharing Between Child Protection and Adult Protection</p> <p><b>Background:</b> Currently, the adult protection statute (26-3.1-102) and the child protection statutes (19-1-303 &amp; 19-1-307) do not allow adult protection workers and child protection workers to share information for any purpose at this point, including during assessments and/or during ongoing cases. There are times when adult protection and child protection workers need to share information, especially when there are investigations by both types of workers on the same family. It is important to note that there are criminal consequences with fines for</p>

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--

10/12/18

	<p>inappropriate disclosure of the information which could be an added incentive for changing the statutes.</p> <p>Additionally, the adult protection statute listed above does not allow the individual who is the subject of the report of abuse to request their own records, without a court order. The child protection statute (19-1-307) does allow the subject of the abuse to request their own records.</p>
<p><b>Proposed Solution</b></p>	<p><b>Information sharing:</b> Amend C.R.S. 26-3.1.-102 (probably subsection (7) and C.R.S. 19-1-303 and/or 19-1-307) to allow sharing of information between the two agencies. Suggested language to each statute would add potential language that information can be shared “for purposes of joint investigations or when the information is necessary to allow the respective agencies to adequately assess for safety and risk.”</p> <p><b>Request own records:</b> Amended C.R.S. 26-3.1-102(7) to add “(b)(III) Any person named in the report or record who was alleged as a vulnerable adult to be abused or neglected, or if the person named in the report or record is a minor or is otherwise incompetent at the time of the request, his or his guardian.”</p> <p>[This is drawing from, and slightly modifying, the language in Title 19 (19-1-307(2)(d)]</p>
<p><b>Fiscal Impact</b></p>	<p>No anticipated fiscal impact. It may result in slight cost savings if the two entities are able to share information and potentially conduct joint investigations.</p>
<p><b>Potential</b></p>	<p>None of which we are aware.</p>

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--

10/12/18

<b>Proponents / Opponents</b>	
<b>*Risk/ Difficulties</b>	2
<b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>	3
<b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>	2
<b>County's Priority Ranking</b>	
<b>County</b>	<b>El Paso</b>
<b>Legislative Issue</b>	<p>Amend CWAC membership to ensure that county commissions from the two counties with the largest caseloads can pick their representatives.</p> <p><b>Background:</b> CRS 26-5-103.5 (2)(b) reads:                      “Of the members appointed by the state department, at least two members must be representatives from the two counties in the state with the greatest percentage of the state’s child welfare caseload.”</p> <p>CDHS has shared with counties that they interpret this language to allow them to appoint anyone residing in the counties with the largest caseloads (citizen, non-profit representative, etc.) rather than who the county</p>

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                      1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                      2 = moderate risk,                      3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                      1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                      2 = important BOCC county issue,                      3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                      1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                      2 = ordinary time commitment                      3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--



10/12/18

	commission wishes to have represent them.
<b>Proposed Solution</b>	Amend CRS 26-5-103.5 (2)(b) to state that 1.) the two counties with the largest caseload appoint their own and 2.) no county can have more than 1 representative.
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	None
<b>Potential Proponents / Opponents</b>	Opponent: CDHS, non-profits
<b>*Risk/ Difficulties</b>	2
<b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>	1
<b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>	2
<b>County's Priority Ranking</b>	1
<b>Justice and Public Safety</b>	
<b>County</b>	<b>Fremont</b>
<b>Legislative Issue</b>	There is an inconsistency in the population threshold (100,000 v. 50,000) among the various statutes that specify whether the District Attorney (DA) or the County Attorney (CA) is responsible for handling involuntary commitment and other proceedings, specifically:

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--

10/12/18

1. Imposition of a legal disability or removal of a legal right for a person with an intellectual and developmental disability: DA in counties having a population of 100,000 or less, and CA for counties with population exceeding 100,000. §25.5-10-217, C.R.S.
  
2. Judicial proceeding to have any county officer declared incapacitated: DA in counties having a population of 100,000 or less, and CA for counties with population exceeding 100,000. §30-10-105(4)(c), C.R.S.
  
3. Involuntary commitment of a person with a substance use disorder: DA in counties having a population of 100,000 or less, and CA for counties with population exceeding 100,000. §27-82-108,(16) C.R.S.
  
4. Involuntary commitment of a person with an alcohol use disorder: DA in counties having a population of 100,000 or less, and CA for counties with population exceeding 100,000. §27-81-112(16), C.R.S.
  
5. Proceedings for commitment of a person with a mental health disorder: DA in counties having a population of 50,000 or less, and CA for counties with population exceeding 50,000. §27-65-111(6), C.R.S.
  
6. Proceedings for imposition of legal disability or deprivation of legal right for a person with a mental health disorder: DA in counties having a population of 50,000 or less, and CA for counties with population exceeding 50,000. §27-65-111(6), C.R.S./§27-65-127,

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--

10/12/18

	C.R.S.
<b>Proposed Solution</b>	Amend §27-65-111(6), C.R.S. changing “50,000” to “100,000”. This will make the population threshold in the mental health commitment statute consistent with all other statutes authorizing involuntary commitments for various disorders or incapacity
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	Negligible, if any.
<b>Potential Proponents / Opponents</b>	District attorneys
<b>*Risk/ Difficulties</b>	3
<b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>	2
<b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>	3
<b>County’s Priority Ranking</b>	3
<b>County</b>	<b>Mesa</b>
<b>Legislative Issue</b>	Sanctuary County Declared only by Resolution of the BOCC  <b>Background:</b> Counties are on a list without knowing who put them on, why they are on it and how to get off the list.

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--

10/12/18

<b>Proposed Solution</b>	Legislation: A Sanctuary County can only be declared by Resolution of the BOCC.
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	None unless state funds or federal funds become withheld from counties.
<b>Potential Proponents / Opponents</b>	None
<b>*Risk/ Difficulties</b>	2
<b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>	2
<b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>	2
<b>County's Priority Ranking</b>	2
<b>County</b>	<b>Gilpin</b>
<b>Legislative Issue</b>	Underfunded Courts  <b>Background:</b> Courts across the state continue to have insufficient funding to adequately handle caseloads.
<b>Proposed Solution</b>	Request the JBC increase the Underfunded Courthouse Cash Fund to \$8M per year, and run a bill that makes the grant more flexible and available to all counties.

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--

10/12/18

<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	
<b>Potential Proponents / Opponents</b>	
<b>*Risk/ Difficulties</b>	2
<b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>	1
<b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>	3
<b>County's Priority Ranking</b>	
<b>County</b>	<b>Ouray</b>
<b>Legislative Issue</b>	<p>EFF Reform - The Emergency Fire Fund was established 50 years ago. The fund's structure, funding, and strategy need to be updated.</p> <p><b>Background:</b> In 1967 wildfires consumed on average one tenth of the acreage they do across the state today. The EFF was set up and is currently funded to address a much smaller problem than exists today.</p>
<b>Proposed Solution</b>	The State of Utah had a similar structure for funding local fire suppression costs before the fire was transferred to state or federal responsibility. In 2017 Utah changed its EFF to encourage more 'pre-disaster mitigation'.

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--

10/12/18

	Those counties under the new system in Utah that utilize the EFF fund to reduce the risk of wildfire within their jurisdictions become more eligible for state-funded responsibility. Colorado should consider utilizing the model that Utah has now adopted.
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	Short-term those counties participating in the EFF system would see the same costs. In the long-term both Counties and State should see less cost as fire mitigation eventually achieves conditions in which wildfires do not cause as much economic harm.
<b>Potential Proponents / Opponents</b>	Wildfire councils, homeowners, fire protection districts, insurance companies, and others are likely proponents.
<b>*Risk/ Difficulties</b>	1
<b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>	2
<b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>	1
<b>County's Priority Ranking</b>	3
<b>Land Use and Natural Resources</b>	
<b>County</b>	<b>San Miguel</b>
<b>Legislative Issue</b>	<b>Streamline Access to Infrastructure Resources</b>

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--

10/12/18

	<p><b>made available by SB 18-002 (Financing Rural Broadband).</b></p> <p>Background: The voters of San Miguel County approved a ballot measure in 2014 to get the county out from under the provisions of SB05-152, allowing the county to spend public moneys to enhance broadband infrastructure for its citizens. The county has been working hard for the several years to bring high-speed Internet access to citizens but is having difficulty in expanding existing easements to install fiber optic lines across private property in order to bring broadband to the county.</p>
<b>Proposed Solution</b>	Expand the use of existing utility easement to include broadband infrastructure like fiber optic or cell towers.
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	Potential increased tax revenues for the county if new businesses locate as a result of expanded broadband.
<b>Potential Proponents / Opponents</b>	
<b>*Risk/ Difficulties</b>	3
<b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>	
<b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>	3
<b>County's Priority</b>	

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--

10/12/18

<b>Ranking</b>	
<b>County</b>	<b>Larimer</b>
<b>Legislative Issue</b>	<p>The perfection of easements for the installation of fiber optic cable is a time consuming and expensive endeavor. Complexity, time demands and cost to perfect the easement create a barrier to the development of high speed internet in areas of the state. This is especially true in the rural, areas outside of cities and towns. Historically, easements to cross private property have been granted for a single utility type i.e. gas, electric or telephone. Under C.R.S 38-8-105 only the utility specified in the easement documents is permitted to install the facilities associated with the type of utility permitted in the easement. The easement requires perfection to permit or change the use/ownership of a facility not specified in the original easement.</p> <p><b>2.) Background:</b> Many counties are facing the need to develop fiber networks to support the needs of their public safety networks, their business communities and their citizens. In many cases, the major impediment to the development of the fiber optic networks is the ability to access the easements to install the fiber facilities. Many of the easements were created as specific electrical easements during the time of the first wiring of the areas. Little or no thought was given to the future need for installing communications (telephony) facilities for future use.</p>
<b>Proposed</b>	An interdisciplinary team of local, county and state

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--



10/12/18

<p><b>Solution</b></p>	<p>resources if forming to address the development of the language necessary to allow for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Previously installed fiber optic cable to carry traffic not associated with its original purpose. (fiber installed to support electrical smart grid functions being permitted to carry open access internet traffic)</li> <li>- Instillation of fiber optic cable in electrical easements without requiring the easement to be changed to permit the addition of the fiber optic cable as an additional use.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Fiscal Impact</b></p>	<p>Minimal fiscal impact. Could increase the workloads in the Clerk and Recorder and Assessor Offices to process the updated easement documents.</p>
<p><b>Potential Proponents / Opponents</b></p>	<p>Proponents:_High level discussions have occurred with other counties with the similar issues, LETA 911, Colorado Broadband Office and OIT. Opponents:_None have been contacted.</p>
<p><b>*Risk/ Difficulties</b></p>	<p>3</p>
<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b></p>	
<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b></p>	<p>3</p>
<p><b>County's Priority Ranking</b></p>	

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b> 1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed, 2 = moderate risk, 3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b> 1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget, 2 = important BOCC county issue, 3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b> 1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead, 2 = ordinary time commitment 3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
--	--	---

10/12/18

<b>County</b>	<b>Jefferson</b>
<b>Legislative Issue</b>	<p>Disconnection of Town/City Property</p> <p><b>Background:</b> In 2016 the County ran legislation to attempt to address the potential disconnection of property from towns and cities. The original proposal was to allow the County the right to approve the disconnection which was met with much opposition from property right advocates and was not likely to be passed. Next, the County proposed including criteria similar to the court ordered disconnection criteria to the disconnection process which also met with opposition. The legislation that ultimately was adopted only required towns/cities to meet with the County to discuss concerns with disconnection.</p>
<b>Proposed Solution</b>	<p>There are many potential approaches. One possible solution is to revise the disconnection statutes so that is mirrors the annexation statutes in that at the time of disconnection the party is required to rezone in the County. This option would focus on the portion of the disconnection relating to rezoning within the County and add a provision to CRS 31-12-501 to add a requirement similar to CRS 31-12-115(2 and 3) relating to zoning the property within 90 days of disconnection within the County. Perhaps in this section specifically we state that notwithstanding any provisions of CRS 24-68-106 (the vested property rights statute) the property must be rezoned. This would give notice the property owner that they will need to decide what is more important to them, the rights within the town/city or the risk of</p>

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--

10/12/18

	disconnection to the County. During the legislative process it is likely the proposed language will be revised and the County may have other restrictions on how the property can be rezoned. It is hard to anticipate what the opposition may require, but that may look something line CRS 31-12-115(6) or CRS 31-12-602(d).
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	Fiscal impact depends on the property disconnected, but additional services are required for disconnected property including law enforcement and road maintenance services.
<b>Potential Proponents / Opponents</b>	Towns and cities will likely oppose any changes to the current system. Based on possible changes to vested property rights, we will likely receive some opposition from vest rights proponents.
<b>*Risk/ Difficulties</b>	3
<b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>	
<b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>	3
<b>County's Priority Ranking</b>	
<b>Taxation and Finance</b>	
<b>County</b>	<b>Ouray, Mineral, Pitkin</b>
<b>Legislative</b>	The Gallagher amendment to the State Constitution is

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--

10/12/18

<p><b>Issue</b></p>	<p>causing severe detriment to County, Municipal, and special district budgets.</p> <p><b>Background:</b> In 1982, Gallagher fixed a concern that was relevant to the day. With the addition of Article X, Section 20, adjustments to Gallagher have become difficult even where the viability of fire protection districts is now threatened. While an Interim Committee has been appointed to study various remedies and potential fixes to Gallagher, there is no promise or guaranty that the Interim Committee will refer any recommendations for legislative consideration. As a placeholder, and further, and in the alternative, it is prudent that CCI hold a place in its legislative agenda for 2019 to address these issues.</p>
<p><b>Proposed Solution</b></p>	<p>a. Run the same bill that CCI initiated in the 2018 session.</p> <p>b. Re-set the property assessment cycle to every 4 years, effective immediately and retroactive to 2018, while a proper solution can be put into place.</p> <p>c. Redefine “Commercial” and “All Other” categories of properties.</p> <p>d. Refer to the 2019 or 2020 statewide ballot the question proposed by Colorado Mountain College</p> <p>e. Freeze or adjust residential – remove Gallagher – provide adjustments to seasonal businesses</p>

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--

10/12/18

<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	Without relief from the projected impacts of Gallagher in its current form, many functions of local government will decline to the point of being cut altogether.
<b>Potential Proponents / Opponents</b>	Proponents would be most counties, special districts, school districts, municipalities and those that rely on the services they provide.  Opponents may include residents of counties that have seen exceptional growth in property values and the correspondingly lower residential property rates that Gallagher causes.
<b>*Risk/ Difficulties</b>	3
<b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>	1
<b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>	3
<b>County's Priority Ranking</b>	2
<b>County</b>	<b>Gunnison/Summit</b>
<b>Legislative Issue</b>	Short term rental properties being assessed as a residential property while traditional lodging establishments are being assessed as commercial creating an unfair and unbalanced taxation situation.  <b>Background:</b> Short term rentals currently are assessed as

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--

10/12/18

	<p>residential properties, though often these properties are being utilized as commercial lodging. The definition of hotel and lodging in CRS 39-1-102 is “improvements and the land associated with such improvements that are used by a business establishment primarily to provide lodging, camping, or personal care or health facilities to the general public and that are predominantly used on an overnight or weekly basis...” While there are some short term rentals that are predominantly residences that occasionally rent their home, more and more these properties are being used as commercial lodging the majority of the time. This both creates an undue burden on the traditional lodging establishments that are assessed the full commercial rate as well as encourage the acquisition of properties that could be in the general workforce housing inventory to be utilized in a commercial way, lowering the available housing in communities throughout Colorado.</p>
<p><b>Proposed Solution</b></p>	<p>Assess STR at either the commercial rate or some other rate. This would create a more equitable assessment system where actual use is reflected in the assessment rate and create a shift in the formula for Gallagher which would lessen some of the burden on current commercial properties.</p>
<p><b>Fiscal Impact</b></p>	
<p><b>Potential Proponents / Opponents</b></p>	
<p><b>*Risk/ Difficulties</b></p>	<p>3</p>

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--

10/12/18

<b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>	2
<b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>	3
<b>County's Priority Ranking</b>	
<b>County</b>	<b>Gunnison</b>
<b>Legislative Issue</b>	<p>Short term rentals (Airbnb/ VRBO/ etc.) within Colorado have increased dramatically in recent years. While these alternative lodging establishments create opportunities for both the renter and the property owner they also create a significant reduction in both home ownership and long term rental inventories in communities throughout Colorado, inventory that is critical in supporting the workforce housing needs of our residents.</p> <p><b>Background:</b> According to Airbnb, a significant player in the short term rental market, the number of properties being rented in Colorado through their website increased 68% between 2016 and 2017 alone. In some resort communities over 30% of current residential properties are being short term rented with many of the properties being purchased specifically for this use. In Gunnison County there are 1,400 properties currently being utilized for short term rentals. A recent housing needs</p>

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--

10/12/18

	<p>assessment indicated that the current need for additional workforce housing units in throughout the county is 900. Many of the properties that are currently being utilized for short term rentals have traditionally been utilized for long term workforce housing which is created an undue burden on housing not only in the mountain and resort communities, but in the front range metro areas throughout the state. Currently home rule municipalities have the authority, and some already do, to ask the electorate to approve through an election to levy a tax on short term rental. This bill would enable counties to have the same ability.</p>
<p><b>Proposed Solution</b></p>	<p>Create the ability, should a county choose to, to ask the county electorate, through an election process, to levy a short term rental tax for use by the county or local housing authority towards the development of affordable and workforce housing. This tax would only be applicable on properties that are short term rented (less than 30 days at a time) for more than 30 total days in one calendar year.</p>
<p><b>Fiscal Impact</b></p>	
<p><b>Potential Proponents / Opponents</b></p>	
<p><b>*Risk/ Difficulties</b></p>	<p>3</p>
<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b></p>	<p>2</p>

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--



10/12/18

<b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>	3
<b>County's Priority Ranking</b>	

**Transportation and Telecommunications**

<b>County</b>	<b>Pitkin</b>
<b>Legislative Issue</b>	<p>Local authority and oversight of broadband infrastructure in a public right of way.</p> <p><b>Background:</b> Per state and federal statute, utilities have a right to the public right of way. Through past legislation, broadband infrastructure (loosely defined) has been afforded the same access to the public rights of way with the intent to reduce the barriers for deploying broadband, especially in rural areas. However, under the legislation, the additional step to make broadband regulated as a utility has created an inherit conflict it local government authority of infrastructure. Local governments (County or municipal) do not have the authority to deny broadband providers access to the public rights of way but can exercise their police powers in how the infrastructure is installed (i.e. permitting requirements). This is the same for water, electrical, etc. However, most utilities operations are regulated under the PUC. For broadband providers, there is inherit right to the public ROW with no regulation or oversight once the infrastructure is installed. As deployment of broadband in</p>

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--

10/12/18

	<p>rural areas becomes an ever-increasing issue, communities are now exposed to a conflict of lacking the ability to ensure that areas lacking service are provided affordable, reliable services.</p> <p>In Pitkin County we now have a provider that is offering a service at over \$1000/month in an unserved area. The county did not have the ability to deny the request and now there is no oversight of affordability or services provided.</p>
<b>Proposed Solution</b>	PUC regulations as "utility-like" even if Broadband providers are not a utility.
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	
<b>Potential Proponents / Opponents</b>	Telecom Industry
<b>*Risk/ Difficulties</b>	3
<b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>	3
<b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>	3
<b>County's Priority Ranking</b>	

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--

10/12/18

<b>County</b>	<b>San Miguel</b>
<b>Legislative Issue</b>	Reestablish a network open access policy for the state of Colorado.
<b>Proposed Solution</b>	Prohibit blocking, throttling and paid prioritization on any network built using public funds.
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	None to State
<b>Potential Proponents / Opponents</b>	Telecoms
<b>*Risk/ Difficulties</b>	2
<b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>	3
<b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>	2
<b>County's Priority Ranking</b>	

<p><b>* Risk/Difficulties</b>                  1 = low risk to counties/minimal political capital needed,                  2 = moderate risk,                  3 = high risk/political capital needed to pass</p>	<p><b>**County Commissioner Importance</b>                  1 = critical to BOCC county operations/budget,                  2 = important BOCC county issue,                  3= county technical fixes, important issues not directly related to county government</p>	<p><b>***CCI Time Commitment</b>                  1 = not time intensive and/or CCI not in the lead,                  2 = ordinary time commitment                  3 = very time intensive and/or county specific issue</p>
---	---	--