

SB13-111 – Mandatory Reporting of Elder Abuse
For the Health District of Northern Larimer County Board of Directors

Bill Title:	Concerning abuse of at-risk adults
Issue Summary:	This bill requires certain professionals to report the abuse or exploitation of at-risk to law enforcement within 24 hours of the observation or discovery of abuse or exploitation. Further requires the Peace Officers Standards and Training Board to create new training curriculum to recognize and address at-risk elder abuse.
Bill Sponsors:	Rep. Schafer (D), Sens. Hudak (D)
Bill History:	02/20/2013 - Senate Committee on Judiciary Refer Amended to Appropriations
Date of Analysis:	February 20, 2013
Prepared by:	Dan Sapienza, Policy Coordinator; Bruce Cooper, Medical Director

[Note: This analysis was created prior to amendments in Committee on February 20, 2013 and may not fully reflect those changes, although some discussion of amendments is included after “Current Legislation”]

BILL SUMMARY

This bill requires certain professionals to report the abuse or exploitation of at-risk elders (those 70 years or older) to law enforcement within 24 hours of the observation or discovery of abuse or exploitation. It further requires the Peace Officers Standards and Training (POST) Board to create new training curriculum to recognize and address at-risk elder abuse.

In addition to those professionals already urged to report elder abuse, this bill adds physical therapists, EMS providers, chiropractors, and clergy.

BACKGROUND

Evidence suggests that one in 10 older adults experiences some form of elder abuse, but only one in 25 cases is reported to social services agencies.¹ A 1998 study estimated that for each reported case of elder abuse, 5 cases identified by sentinels working with the elderly population go unreported.² Given that reporting and adult protection services are the foundation of our current system to address elder abuse, these statistics point to importance of increasing reporting.

However, that study also found that fewer than 50 percent of elder abuse or neglect reports were substantiated after investigation. This does not mean that the reports were false, but rather that the level of proof required by the state was not sufficiently met, despite indications that abuse or neglect may have occurred. Therefore, state resources are spent to investigate many reports that end up not being substantiated.

Under current law, certain professionals are urged to report suspected incidents of mistreatment, self-neglect, or exploitation of at-risk adults. However, these professionals are not required to report anything to authorities. Colorado is only one of four states that does not require the reporting of suspected at-risk elder abuse or exploitation. Some national studies have shown significant underreporting of elder abuse/neglect by physicians and other health care professionals (NRC 2003).

In the 2012 legislative session, SB12-078 was introduced to require at-risk elder abuse reporting, but was subsequently amended to only create a task force to further study the issue. Though SB12-078 was amended to only create a task force to further study the issue of mandatory reporting of at-risk elder abuse, a fiscal note was created for the full mandatory reporting bill. Legislative Council staff estimated that mandatory reporting would increase general fund expenditures by more than \$3.3 million, largely for staff in the Department of Human Services to

¹ Dong X. Advancing the field of elder abuse: future directions and policy implications. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2012 Nov;60(11):2151-6

² http://www.aoa.gov/AoARoot/AoA_Programs/Elder_Rights/Elder_Abuse/docs/ABuseReport_Full.pdf

investigate more cases. Further, it was estimated that the legislation would increase county expenditures by nearly \$1 million for additional investigations. These figures were determined by estimating that investigations of elder abuse would increase by approximately 15 percent.

CURRENT LEGISLATION – SB13-111

The current legislation is similar to the original mandatory reporting bill from 2012, though it has a few changes to reflect the findings of the elder abuse task force created by that year's final amended legislation. Under this bill, certain professionals who observe the abuse or exploitation of an at-risk elder (those 70 years and older) or who reasonably believe that an at-risk elder is being abused are required to report that fact to law enforcement within 24 hours. Failure to report within 24 hours, under the amendment passed by the Senate Judiciary Committee, would be a Class 3 misdemeanor if the person willfully violates the mandate to report.

As opposed to the 2012 bill, SB13-111 does not require that the mandatory reporter follow up the first report with a written report, which makes compliance with the requirement easier. Further, this bill makes those who report suspected abuse or exploitation in good faith immune from civil suit or criminal action for the reporting (unless that person is the abuser or exploiter).

SB13-111 adds certain professions to an existing list of professionals currently urged to make reports. With the additions, the following professions are considered mandatory reporters (additions to list by SB13-111 are in italics):

- Physicians, surgeons, PAs, osteopaths, podiatrists, *occupational therapists and physical therapists*
- Medical examiners and coroners
- Nurses and nurse practitioners
- *EMS providers*
- Hospital and long-term care personnel
- *Chiropractors*
- Psychologists and other mental-health professionals
- Social work professionals
- *Clergy members*
- Dentists
- Law Enforcement Officials and Personnel
- Court-appointed guardians
- Fire protection personnel
- Pharmacists
- Community-centered board staff
- Personnel of banks and other financial institutions
- Staff or volunteers of a care facility, agency, or home (including home health providers)

These newly added professionals are also added to the list of those urged to report self-neglect or mistreatment of all at-risk adults.

To ensure that reports of at-risk elder abuse are handled effectively, SB13-111 also requires the Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) Board to establish a training curriculum to recognize and address incidents of abuse or exploitation of at-risk elders. Beginning in 2015 each local and county law enforcement agency must employ at least one person who has completed this new training.

This bill increases funding to county adult protective services (80% state/20% county cost-sharing) to fund the increased workload at the current high caseload that is seen to be inadequate. The governor has additionally asked

for funding to increase the number of caseworkers to attain a caseload of 25:1, at an additional cost of \$2.7 million. This increase is not included in SB13-111, but is requested in the 2013-14 budget.³

AMENDMENTS TO SB13-111

The bill was amended in the Senate Judiciary Committee. The primary changes were:

1. **Clergy sometimes exempt** - [Reporting requirements] shall not apply to a person who acquires reasonable cause to believe that an at-risk elder has been mistreated ... during a communication about which the person may not be examined as a witness pursuant to section 13-90-107(1) (c),c.r.s., unless the person also acquires such reasonable cause from a source other than such a communication

This change allows clergy to not testify if they learned of the abuse in a communication that they could not be required to testify in court regarding.

2. **Require willful violations** - Insert “willfully” in the sentence: A person who WILLFULLY violates paragraph (a) of this subsection (1) commits a class 3 misdemeanor.

This change makes means that accidental or negligent failures to report are not a crime. The term willful requires that the non-reporter knew or should have known that he must file a report and intentionally does not do so. This amendment conforms the requirements and penalties for mandatory reporting of elder abuse with existing Colorado law regarding mandatory reporting of child abuse.

3. **If someone else reports** - A [mandatory reporter] is not required to report the abuse or exploitation of an at-risk elder if the person knows that another person has already reported to a law enforcement agency the same abuse or exploitation ...
4. **Civil Liability immunity and protections for non-reporters** – The amendment strengthens the immunity of mandatory reporters for failure to report. Specifically, the non-reporter is immune from damages in any civil action as opposed to the original bill’s limiting immunity to related civil actions. Additionally, the amendment states that the reporting requirement “Shall not be interpreted as creating a civil duty of care or establishing a civil standard of care.”

IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS IF SB13-111 PASSES

In addition to the statutory changes in SB13-111, the bill includes a number of declarations, including an expectation that “either the current general assembly or a future general assembly will take further actions” that include:

- Implementing new data systems to measure the impact of mandatory reporting;
- Appropriate money to decrease caseworker caseloads to 25 per social worker;
- Increase funding to county social services departments;
- Implement a public guardianship and conservatorship program;
- Study financial exploitation of elders; and

³ See SB13-111 Fiscal Note, February 18, 2013:

DHS requests \$5,585,076 and 1.0 FTE to implement this bill. Its costs include funding to implement all of the Elder Abuse Task Force recommendations, including funding to reduce county caseloads, implement mandatory reporting, increase discretionary funding available to counties, and provide training and quality assurance activities. The department assumes that because the language in the legislative declaration indicates sponsor intent, all of the costs should be included. The fiscal note concurs with the majority of the department's assumptions on the costs to implement the task force's recommendations. However, because the portions of the bill that speak to reducing county caseloads and increasing discretionary funding for counties are within the legislative declaration and have no force of law, the fiscal note only includes costs to implement mandatory reporting within counties, provide training and quality assurance activities within DHS, and address P.O.S.T. training requirements in the Department of Law.

- Find sustainable funding for mandatory reporting enforcement.

However, these suggestions do not have the force of law, so there would need to be adequate regulations, policies, and/or funding to implement them. In support of these legislative suggestions, the Governor included in his FY2013-2014 budget request funding for a new database system and funding to decrease the caseload ratio for adult protective services workers (see below). Also, see below for a discussion of the importance of adequate funding for adult protective services programs with the expected increase in the number of reports.

SUPPORTERS

- Governor Hickenlooper
- Attorney General Suthers
- Colorado Centers For Hospice & Palliative Care
- AARP
- Denver Human Services
- Colorado Dept. of Human Services
- Women's Lobby
- National Association of Social Workers
- Boulder county
- Many other organizations

REASONS TO SUPPORT

Colorado is one of only 4 states that does not require reporting of elder abuse by certain professionals. National research on elder abuse estimates that for every reported case of elder abuse, there are 5 incidents that go unreported. By some estimates, Colorado's population of persons aged 70 and older is expected to increase 28% by 2017 and 142% by 2032. With a growing elder population, even more incidents of abuse will go unreported without additional efforts.

Supporters of mandatory reporting note that these laws are associated with higher report rates and higher investigation rates by authorities. Proponents may believe that the act of reporting will lead to investigation and interventions that will increase the chance that abuse will be stopped. They may believe that it is important to have mandatory reporting because victims may not always be able to advocate for themselves: they may not recognize they are abused, may have cognitive challenges, may be unaware of services, or may be too afraid or physically unable to seek help on their own. Mandatory reporting laws may also serve to remind professionals of their obligation to report and create opportunities for training on abuse issues.

A significant concern with increasing reports of elder abuse is the capacity of adult protective services at the state and county levels to handle existing workloads. A fiscal analysis in 2012 estimated that effectively handling the increased workload would require additional staff and infrastructure, costing a minimum of \$4.1 million in the first year — \$3.3 million in state funds and \$829,000 in county funds. Governor Hickenlooper supports the increase in these services (and a mandatory reporting requirement) and included a \$5 million increase in his FY2013 budget request.

OPPOSITION

There appears to be little or no organized opposition to SB13-111. In the Senate Judiciary Committee, only one Senator voted against referring the bill onto the Committee on Appropriations: Senator Lundberg. His opposition was largely based on concerns about harming communications between clergy and their congregation. His concerns may have been somewhat addressed with an amendment allowing some exemptions from reporting if the communication would be protected by a privilege that would prevent the reporter from testifying in court.

The Colorado Competitive Council is the only lobbying group listed as opposing the bill in the Secretary of State's databases. From C3's website: (Position changed to neutral) "We are neutral on the elder abuse bill because it has

been neutered by: explicit provision that no civil liability is created by the bill and a higher standard “willful” for failure to report elder abuse before violation of the statute.”

REASONS TO OPPOSE

In 2012, SB12-078 (creating the Elder Abuse Task Force) passed with broad bipartisan support. Concerns by opponents of the legislation were largely focused on the effect mandatory reporting requirements would have on relationships between those over 70 and professionals they go to for assistance. In particular, there were concerns about how reporting requirements might interfere with doctor-patient confidentiality and relationships between clergy and their congregations. SB13-111 includes many health care workers in the list of mandatory reporters and adds clergy to the list, so these concerns are still relevant.

Some of those opposed to mandatory reporting may believe that adult victims who are competent and not in immediate danger should have the right to decide if they want assistance and from whom. Some may argue that it is “ageist” to treat someone differently under the law simply because they are 70 years old or older. As with domestic violence reporting, it is also argued that mandatory reporting may risk retaliation by the perpetrator. Further, some professionals worry that victims will not return to get help if they know a report will be made.⁴

Critics have also noted that mandatory reporting assumes that supportive services are in place with necessary resources. Without these, interventions may lead to revictimization or lack of resolution. In fact, the SB12-078-Task Force reported that, “Without adequate funding, many task force members would not be in a position to support changing “urged” reporting to mandatory reporting because they simply do not have the resources, both financial and personnel, to handle the increased reports expected as a result of this policy change.”

Opponents may also be concerned about the costs of providing the additional resources..

DISCUSSION

In looking at the potential reasons to support or oppose a mandatory reporting law, we sought evidence that might help a decision-maker weigh the issues. The final report of the Elder Abuse Task Force (created in 2012) stated that “Mandatory reporting is an effective deterrent to non-reporters and perpetrators, and also creates important mechanisms for law enforcement and prosecutors to address the perpetrator’s activity.” Further, it stated that “Mandatory reporting will identify additional elders in need of help.” These are common assumptions, and the question arises as to whether there is evidence to support them.

We sought to answer three key questions: 1) Is mandatory reporting effective in increasing the rates of reporting and consequently, the identification of cases of elder abuse? 2) Does reporting lead to improvements in safety and well-being for this population?, and 3) Do the benefits of mandatory reporting outweigh any adverse effects or harms?

Unfortunately, we found that the research base to inform this policy is very limited.

Identifying Cases - Does mandatory reporting increase the identification of cases of elder abuse?

Research on whether mandatory reporting laws actually increase the number of verified cases of abuse is limited. The landmark report by the National Research Council, Elder Mistreatment: Abuse, Neglect, and Exploitation in an Aging America (2003) noted that the policy of mandatory reporting of suspected elder abuse or neglect was borrowed from child abuse laws with no research demonstrating its applicability to the elderly.⁵ At the time of that report, virtually no research had been conducted on how these laws affect the behavior of mandated reporters or the

⁴ Brandl B. Mandatory Reporting of Elder Abuse: Implications for Domestic Violence Advocates. National Clearinghouse on Abuse in Later Life (NCALL), A Project of the Wisconsin Coalition Against Domestic Violence (2011).

⁵ National Research Council, Elder Mistreatment: Abuse, Neglect, and Exploitation in an Aging America (2003), p.121.

consequences of reporting on the victims of abuse, the perpetrator and the families affected by them. The NRC called for well-designed studies comparing responses to suspected mistreatment in jurisdiction with and without mandatory reporting as well as before-after studies among the six remaining states without these laws that subsequently pass them.

Very little has been published on this question since 2003. We identified just one published study examining the impact of state elder abuse legislation and it was published the same year as the NRC report. Jogerst, Daly, Brinig, et.al. reviewed all 50 states' adult protective services related statutes and regulations to measure the effect on rates of reports, investigations and substantiations of non-institutional elder abuse and neglect. They found large differences in rates between states. Statutory requirements for mandatory reporting correlated with increased numbers of reports and investigations. The presence of a statute clause regarding penalties for failure to report was also associated with increased rates of investigation. The overall rate of substantiations of abuse was also higher in states mandating reporting, but this difference did not reach statistical significance. No difference was found in the substantiation ratio (the proportion of investigated cases that were substantiated) between states with and without mandatory reporting.⁶

In its 2012 report, the Colorado Legislative Council provided some statistics of annual increases in reports after various states passed mandatory reporting laws in the 80s and 90s: 25% increases in Minnesota, Oklahoma, California, Texas, Kansas and New Mexico and a 15 percent increase in Illinois. In 2005, the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority published a 5 year review of its mandatory reporting law and found that between 1998 when the state's mandatory reporting law passed and 2003, the number of reported cases increased 85%, from 4,142 to 7,672.⁷ In 2009, the number of reports increased to 10,830.⁸ As a comparison, in FY10-11, Colorado data showed a total of 10,846 new reports.⁹

Since the NRC report was published in 2003, two additional states have passed mandatory reporting laws. Wisconsin's law (2005) only requires reporting if an elder or adult at risk is in imminent danger. New Jersey's law (2010) is targeted at "vulnerable adults" 18 and older rather than all elders. It has been reported that New Jersey's adult abuse report rate increased 9% the year after implementation. We did not find published studies comparing elder abuse responses before and after statutory changes in either of these jurisdictions.

It is worth noting that the National Academies Committee on Statistics—the same entity that produced the 2003 NRC report, convened a meeting on research issues in elder mistreatment in June 2010. The summary of that meeting does not raise the issue of mandatory reporting impact or identify it as a research gap.¹⁰

In the absence of well-designed studies, expert opinion may be informative. A 1991 U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) survey of state officials in agencies on aging and adult protective services found that state officials thought reporting laws were effective in identifying cases of elder abuse, but much less than awareness and education among professionals. A high level of public and professional awareness of what elder abuse is and how to report it was ranked as the most important factor in identifying elder abuse by 23 of 40 respondents. This compared to just 8 who found reporting laws to be most effective. Officials indicated to the GAO that awareness is the most crucial, because before anyone can report an instance, they must understand better what elder abuse is and what can be done to report it.

⁶ Jogerst, G.J., Daly, J.M., Brinig, M.F., Dawson, J.D., Schmuck, G.A. & Ingram, J.G. (2003). Domestic elder abuse and the law. *American Journal of Public Health*, 93, 2131–2136.

⁷ <http://www.icjia.state.il.us/public/pdf/Bulletins/Elderabuse2.pdf>

⁸ http://www.icjia.state.il.us/public/pdf/JFacts/Elder%20Abuse%20Trends/2000-2009/9elder%20abuse_2000-2009.pdf

⁹ It is interesting to note that, adjusting for total and elderly populations in Illinois and Colorado, Colorado's elderly abuse report rate per capita in 2010 was 2.9 times higher than Illinois's rate in 2009, even though Illinois mandates reporting. It is unlikely that abuse rates between the two states would vary substantially, however, the accuracy of Colorado's adult protection services data has been called into question both by the 2003 Jogerst study and the SB12-78 task force.

¹⁰ http://www.nia.nih.gov/sites/default/files/meeting-report_1.pdf

It is likely that mandatory reporting will increase reports of elder abuse, but it is possible that many of these reports will not be substantiated, based on experiences of other states, especially if education and awareness efforts are insufficient.

Better Outcomes - Do mandatory reporting laws create better outcomes for the elderly?

One criticism of studies of mandatory reporting is that they focus on numbers of reports, prosecution, and substantiated and unsubstantiated cases, but little research focuses on safety and overall wellness outcomes for at-risk elders.¹¹ It seems important to consider whether the law would result in improved health and safety for the victim.

Reporting and adult protection services are the basic elements of our current system to address elder mistreatment. Adult protection services generally deliver three functions. First, they assess and triage abuse and neglect reports to determine whether an emergency need for services or referrals exists. The second function is to investigate reports of mistreatment—some agencies are heavily investigative, others are focused on providing social services. Finally, a protective services plan aimed at assuring safety is developed.

In order for mandatory reporting to result in good outcomes for the victim, these services must be in place, however, according to the 2003 review by the National Research Council, reporting and adult protection services have not been subjected to rigorous evaluation (NRC 2003). The NRC was unable to find evaluations of any of the adult protection service activities, including triage, investigation and service planning and delivery. The committee called for research into each of these areas, suggesting designs that compared outcomes in cases provided services with those who refused them.

Over the past decade, there have been no systematic evaluations of the current system but a number of studies on specific elder abuse interventions have been conducted. A rigorous systematic review of elder abuse interventions out of McMaster University found that the risk of recurrence of abuse either failed to decrease or actually increased after the intervention.¹²

If mandatory reporting laws prevent elder abuse from occurring through a deterrence effect as suggested by the summary statement of the 2012 Elder Abuse Task Force, this would also contribute to the safety of vulnerable seniors. The 2012 Elder Abuse Task Force did not focus on this issue in its report but did briefly mention one type of first-instance prevention that mandatory reporting theoretically addresses: preventing perpetrators from committing serial offenses on multiple at-risk elders.¹³ We did not find studies examining the impact of these laws on prevention of elder abuse. In the 1991 GAO survey, state officials list reporting laws as second to last in importance in preventing the first occurrence of abuse. Of primary importance was in-home services for the elderly (home health care, meals-on-wheels, and homemaker and chore services), and second important was listed as public and professional awareness. Respondents in that survey indicated they did not see any direct relationship between the reporting laws and prevention.

Potential harms – Do the benefits of mandatory reporting laws outweigh the potential harms?

Some elder advocates find mandatory reporting of elder abuse victims to social services or law enforcement complicated and/or controversial. This may be particularly the case among domestic violence advocates.

Domestic violence programs have strong policies on confidentiality to enhance victim safety and support a trusting relationship between advocates and victims. Some feel that reporting

¹¹ See EAPU Position statement on Mandatory Reporting of Elder Abuse, <http://www.eapu.com.au/Portals/0/75-EAPUPositionStatement.pdf>

¹² Ploeg, J, Fear J, Hutchison B, MacMillan H, Bolan, G.A Systematic Review of Interventions for Elder Abuse. Journal of Elder Abuse & Neglect; 2009, Vol. 21 Issue 3, p187-210.

¹⁴ Brandl B. Mandatory Reporting of Elder Abuse: Implications for Domestic Violence Advocates. National Clearinghouse on Abuse in Later Life (NCALL), A Project of the Wisconsin Coalition Against Domestic Violence. (2011).

requirements may impede the advocate's relationship with the victim. Others are concerned that reporting may not be beneficial to the victim and in some cases may increase the risk of danger.¹⁴

Many professions on the list of mandatory reporters (doctors, clergy, etc.) require frank communication from their clients. Critics argue that if a person over the age of 70 could no longer depend on confidentiality of communications, they might be discouraged from seeking assistance or being truthful in their communications. Discouraging elders from seeking medical attention or from being 100% open with their doctors could result in poorer health outcomes. A 2006 study sought to look at physicians' perspectives on mandatory reporting of elder abuse to identify why physicians in California have low rates of reporting despite statutory requirements. The physician interviews suggested a difficult paradox, "when that relationship leads to disclosures, which, if acted on by reporting to an agency, can threaten the relationship." Some indicated that they did not follow the strict letter of the law in reporting, instead they considered "the broader context of the consequences to the patient." Interestingly, almost all of the interviewed physicians expressed support for mandatory reporting, while discussing how their experiences varied.¹⁵

Other critics note that individuals defined by mandatory reporting statutes as at-risk by virtue of their age may have the ability to make their own clear and rational decisions. SB13-111 defines at-risk elder as any person who is seventy years of age or older. Mandatory reporting of child abuse rests on the assumption that children are helpless and unable to act or make decisions in their own best interests. Making these same assumptions about all persons over 70 years is seen by these critics as reinforcing ageist perspectives. "Ageist perspectives would reinforce the mentality that older people are weak and incapable of making well educated and rational decisions." On the other hand, a guiding principle of adult protection services is that the duty to protect the safety of the older person must be balanced with that person's right to self-determination. In fact, competent elders can refuse services if they choose.

Risks of mandatory reporting, borrowing from the domestic violence literature, could include risk of retaliation by the perpetrator. Those who are concerned that reporting may not be beneficial to the elder victim or even increase the risk of danger are able to cite anecdotal evidence for their position, but there do not appear to be well-designed studies to corroborate or quantify the frequency of these risks of harm in the elderly.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Funding

Mandatory reporting laws, alone, would be likely to increase reports and stress already limited resources for thorough investigations and services for adults. Without also increasing resource for triage, investigations and the treatment of the conditions that lead to abuse and exploitation, mandatory reporting might exacerbate the issues facing a state's at-risk elders. The 2012 Fiscal Note for SB12-78, which created the Elder Abuse Task Force, estimated that with mandatory reporting the number of cases of elder abuse that would require investigations would increase by 15 percent per year.

The 2013 Fiscal Note for SB13-111 estimates the increased workload on counties for investigations and caseworkers would cost an estimated \$1.7 million per year (with an additional \$2.5 million required to lower caseloads from 34:1 to 25:1). The bill funds county adult protective services to accommodate the anticipated increased workload at the current high caseload and the governor has requested funding to reduce adult protective service workloads to 25 to 1, which would likely improve the treatment services provided to abused elders.

Training and education

The importance of education and training of mandatory reporters such as health care providers and first responders, as well as human service providers, attorneys and law enforcement officers has been stressed by many experts as

¹⁴ Brandl B. Mandatory Reporting of Elder Abuse: Implications for Domestic Violence Advocates. National Clearinghouse on Abuse in Later Life (NCALL), A Project of the Wisconsin Coalition Against Domestic Violence. (2011).

¹⁵ "Mandatory Reporting of Elder Abuse: Between a Rock and a Hard Place," *Annals of Family Medicine* (2006)

well as both advocates and critics of mandatory reporting. SB13-111 includes provisions for a statewide awareness campaign about at-risk elder abuse generally and more specifically among those required to report abuse. The bill also requires the Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) Board to establish a training curriculum for law enforcement. Beginning in 2015 each local and county law enforcement agency must employ at least one person who has completed training.

About this Analysis

This analysis was prepared by Health District of Northern Larimer County staff to assist the Health District Board of Directors in determining whether to take an official stand on various health-related issues. Analyses are based on bills or issues at the time of their consideration by the Board and are accurate to the best of staff knowledge. It is suggested that people check to see that a bill has not changed during the course of a legislative session by visiting the Colorado General Assembly web page at www.state.co.us/gov_dir/stateleg.html. To see whether the Health District Board of Directors took a position on this or other policy issues, please visit www.healthdistrict.org/policy.

About the Health District

The Health District is a special district of the northern two-thirds of Larimer County, Colorado, supported by local property tax dollars and governed by a publicly elected five-member board. The Health District provides medical, mental health, dental, preventive and health planning services to the communities it serves.

For more information about this analysis or the Health District, please contact Dan Sapienza, Policy Coordinator, at (970) 224-5209, or e-mail at dsapienza@healthdistrict.org.