TEMPLATE COMMENT TABLE

Citation	Title	Proposed Rule Language	Comment
1324.400	Eligibility for	To be eligible for funding under 42 U.S.C. 1397m-	
	funding	1(b) State entities are required to adhere to all	
	J	provisions contained herein.	
1324.401	Definitions	As used in this part, the term —	
	2 0 111110	Abuse means the knowing infliction of physical or	
		psychological harm or the knowing deprivation of	
		goods or services that are necessary to meet	
		essential needs or to avoid physical or psychological	
		harm.	
		Adult means older adults and adults with disabilities	
		as defined by State APS laws.	
		Adult maltreatment means self-neglect or abuse,	
		neglect, exploitation, or sexual abuse of an adult at-	
		risk of harm from a perpetrator with whom they have	
		a trust relationship.	
		Adult Protective Services (APS) means such	
		services provided to adults as the Assistant	
		Secretary for Aging may specify in guidance and	
		includes such services as:	
		(1) Receiving reports of adult abuse, neglect,	
		exploitation, sexual abuse, and self-neglect;	
		(2) Investigating the reports described in paragraph	
		(1) of this definition;	
		(3) Case planning, monitoring, evaluation, and other	
		case work and services, and;	
		saco work and sorvious, and,	
		(4) Providing, arranging for, or facilitating the	
		provision of medical, social services, economic, legal,	
		housing, law enforcement, or other protective,	
		emergency, or supportive services.	
		Adult Protective Services Program	
		means local Adult Protective Services providers	
		within an Adult Protective Services system	
		Adult Protective Services (APS)	
		System means the totality of both the State entity and	
		the local APS programs.	
		Allegation means an accusation of adult	
		maltreatment associated with each adult in a report	
		made to APS. There may be multiple allegations in	
		an investigation.	
		At risk of harm means the possibility that an	
		individual will experience an event, illness, condition,	
		disease, disorder, injury, or other outcome that	
		is adverse or detrimental and undesirable.	
		Assistant Secretary for Aging means the position	
		identified in section 201(a) of the Older Americans	
		` '	
		Act (OAA), 42 U.S.C. 3002(7).	
		Case means all activities related to an APS	
		investigation of, and response to, an allegation of	
		adult maltreatment.	

Citation Title	Proposed Rule Language	Comment
	Client means an adult who is the subject of an	
	investigation by APS regarding a report of alleged	
	adult maltreatment.	
	Conflict of Interest means a situation that interferes	
	with a program or program representative's ability to	
	provide objective information or act in the best	
	interests of the adult. A conflict of interest would arise	
	when an employee, officer, or agent of APS, any	
	member of their immediate family, their partner, or an	
	organization which employs or is about to employ	
	any of the parties indicated herein, has a financial or	
	other interest in or a tangible personal benefit from	
	their affiliation with APS systems.	
	Dual relationship means relationships in which an	
	APS worker assumes one or more professional,	
	personal, or volunteer roles in addition to their role	
	as an APS worker at the same time, or sequentially,	
	with a client.	
	Emergency Protective Action means emergency	
	use of APS funds to purchase goods or services,	
	immediate access to petitioning the court for	
	temporary or emergency orders, and emergency out-	
	of-home placement.	
	Exploitation means the fraudulent or otherwise	
	illegal, unauthorized, or improper act or process of a	
	person, including a caregiver or fiduciary, that uses	
	the resources of an adult for monetary or personal	
	benefit, profit, or gain, or that results in depriving an	
	adult of rightful access to, or use of, their benefits,	
	resources, belongings, or assets.	
	Inconclusive means a determination that there was	
	not sufficient evidence obtained during an APS	
	investigation for APS to conclude whether adult	
	maltreatment occurred.	
	Intake or pre-screening means the APS process of	
	receiving allegations of adult maltreatment and	
	gathering information on the reports, the alleged	
	victim, and the alleged perpetrator.	
	Investigation means the process by which APS	
	examines and gathers information about an	
	allegation of adult maltreatment to determine if the	
	circumstances of the allegation meet the States's	
	standards of evidence for a finding of a	
	substantiated, unsubstantiated, or inconclusive	
	allegation.	
	Mandated Reporter means someone who is	
	required by State law to report suspected adult maltreatment to APS.	
	Neglect means the failure of a caregiver or fiduciary	
	to provide the goods or services that are necessary	
	to maintain the health or safety of an adult.	
	Perpetrator means the person determined by APS to	
	be responsible for one or more instances of adult	
	maltreatment for one or more victims.	
	That outlient for one of more viculity.	

Citation Title	Proposed Rule Language	Comment
	Post-investigation Services means the activities	
	undertaken by APS in support of a client after a	
	finding on an allegation of adult maltreatment has	
	been made.	
	Quality assurance means the process by which	
	APS programs ensure investigations meet or exceed	
	established standards, and includes:	
	(1) Thorough documentation of all investigation and	
	case management activities;	
	(2) Review and approval of case closure; and	
	(3) Conducting a case review process.	
	Screening means a process whereby APS carefully	
	reviews the intake information to determine if the	
	report of adult maltreatment meets the minimum	
	requirements to be opened for investigation by APS,	
	or if the report should be referred to a service or	
	program other than APS.	
	Self-neglect means an adult's inability, due to	
	physical or mental impairment or diminished	
	capacity, to perform essential self-care tasks	
	including:	
	(1) Obtaining essential food, clothing, shelter, and	
	medical care:	
	(2) Obtaining goods and services necessary to	
	maintain physical health, mental health, or general	
	safety, or;	
	(3) Managing one's own financial affairs.	
	Sexual abuse means the forced and/or unwanted	
	sexual interaction (touching and non-touching acts)	
	of any kind with an adult.	
	State entity means the unit of State, District of	
	Columbia, or U.S. Territorial Government designated	
	as responsible for APS programs, including through	
	the establishment and enforcement of policies and	
	procedures, and that receives Federal grant funding	
	from ACL under section 2042(b) of the EJA,	
	42 U.S.C. 1397m–1(b).	
	Substantiated means APS has made an	
	investigation disposition that the allegation of	
	maltreatment meets state law or agency policy for	
	concluding that the adult was maltreated.	
	Trust relationship means the rational expectation or	
	belief that a relative, friend, caregiver, or other	
	person with whom a relationship exists can or	
	should be relied upon to protect the interests of an	
	adult (as defined above) and/or provide for an adult's	
	care. This expectation is based on either the willful	
	assumption of responsibility or expectations of care	
	or protection arising from legal or social conventions.	
	Unsubstantiated means that APS has made an	
	investigation disposition that the allegation of	
	maltreatment does not meet State law or agency	
	policy for concluding that the adult was maltreated.	
	policy for constituting that the adult was mailteated.	

Citation	Title	Proposed Rule Language	Comment
		Victim means an adult who has experienced adult	
1001 100	T _	maltreatment.	
1324.402	Program Administration	(a) The State entity shall create and implement policies and procedures for APS systems to receive and respond to reports of adult maltreatment in a standardized fashion. Such policies and procedures, at a minimum, shall:	
		(1) Incorporate principles of person directed services and planning and reliance on least restrictive alternatives, as well as other policies identified by the Assistant Secretary for Aging;	
		(2) Define the populations eligible for APS services;	
		(3) Define the settings, locations, and types of alleged perpetrator for each adult maltreatment type that are subject to APS investigations in the State;	
		(4) Define processes for receiving, screening, prioritizing, and referring cases based on risk and type of adult maltreatment consistent with §1324.403, including:	
		(i) Creation of at least a two-tiered response system for initial contact with the alleged victim based on risk of death, irreparable harm, or significant loss of income, assets, or resources.	
		(A) For immediate risk, response should occur in person no later than twenty-four hours after receiving a report of adult maltreatment.	
		(B) For non-immediate risk, response should occur no more than seven calendar days after report of adult maltreatment is received.	
		(5) Define investigation and post investigation procedures, as identified in § 1324.403.	
		(b) At first contact APS systems shall provide to potential APS clients an explanation of their rights, including:	
		(1) The right under State law to confidentiality of personal information;	
		(2) The right under State law to refuse to speak to APS;	
		(3) The right under State law to refuse APS services, and;	
		(4) Such other explanations of rights as determined by the Assistant Secretary for Aging.	
		(c) Information shall be provided in a format and language understandable by the individual, and in alternative formats as needed.	
		(d) The State entity shall establish policies and procedures for the staffing of APS systems that include:	
		(1) Staff training and on-going education, including training on conflicts of interest;	
		(2) Staff supervision, and;	
		(3) Staff to client ratios.	

Citation	Title	Proposed Rule Language	Comment
		(e) The State entity shall establish such other	
		program administration policies and procedures and	
		provide other information to APS clients as	
		established by the Assistant Secretary for Aging.	
1324.403	Investigation	The State entity shall adopt standardized and	
	and post-	systematic policies and procedures for APS	
	investigation	investigation and post-investigation activities across	
	services.	and within the State including, at a minimum:	
		(a) Screening, triaging, and decision making criteria	
		or protocols to review and assign adult maltreatment	
		reports for APS investigation, and to report to other	
		authorities;	
		(b) Tools and/or decision-making processes for APS	
		to review reports of adult maltreatment for any	
		emergency needs of the adult and for immediate	
		safety and risk factors affecting the adult or APS	
		worker when responding to the report and;	
		(c) Practices during investigations to collect	
		information and evidence to inform allegation	
		disposition and service planning that will:	
		(1) Recognize acceptance of APS services is voluntary, except where limited by State law;	
		(2) Ensure safety of APS client and worker;	
		•	
		(3) Ensure the preservation of an adult's rights;	
		(4) Integrate principles of person directedness and	
		trauma-informed approaches; (5) Maximize engagement with the APS client, and;	
		. ,	
		(6) Permit APS to seek emergency protective action	
		only as appropriate and necessary as a measure of	
		last resort to protect the life and wellbeing of the client from self-harm or harm from others.	
		(d) Methods to make determinations on allegations	
		and record case findings, including:	
		(1) Ability for APS programs to consult with	
		appropriate experts, other team members, and	
		supervisors;	
		(2) Protocols for the standards of evidence APS	
		should apply when making a determination on	
		allegations.	
		(e) Provision of APS post investigation services, as	
		appropriate, that:	
		(1) Respect the autonomy and authority of clients to	
		make their own life choices;	
		(2) Respect the client's views about safety, quality of	
		life, and success;	
		(3) Hold perpetrators accountable for the adult	
		maltreatment and for stopping the abusive behavior;	
		(4) Develop any service plan or referrals in	
		consultation and agreement with the client;	
		(5) Engage community partners through referrals for services or purchase of services where services are	
		not directly provided by APS, and;	
	I	I not unectly provided by AFS, and,	

Citation	Title	Proposed Rule Language	Comment
		(6) Monitor the status of client and services, and the impact of services.	
		(f) Case handling criteria that:	
		(1) Establish timeframes for on-going review of open cases;	
		(2) Establish length of time by which investigations should be completed, and determinations be made;	
		and	
		(3) Documents, at a minimum:	
		(i) The APS interventions and services delivered;	
		(ii) Significant changes in client status;	
		(iii) Assessment of the outcome and efficacy of intervention and services;	
		(iv) Assessment of safety and risk at case closure; and	
		(v) The reason or decision to close the case.	
1324.404	Conflict of interest.	The State entity shall establish standardized policies and procedures to avoid both actual and perceived conflicts of interest for APS. Such policies and procedures must include mechanisms to identify, remove, and remedy any existing conflicts of interest	
		at organizational and individual levels, including to:	
		(a) Ensure that employees and agents engaged in any part of an APS investigation do not also provide direct services to, or oversee the direct provision of services, to the client;	
		(b) Ensure that employees and agents administering APS programs do not have a personal financial interest in an entity to which an APS program they refer clients to services recommended by the APS program;	
		(c) Ensure that no APS employee or agent, or member of an employee or agent's immediate family, is subject to conflict of interest;	
		(d) Prohibit dual relationships unless unavoidable and ensure appropriate safeguards are established should such relationships occur;	
		(e) Establish robust monitoring and oversight, to identify conflict of interest, and;	
		(f) Remove and remedy actual, perceived, or potential conflicts that arise.	
1324.405	Accepting reports.	(a) The State entity shall establish standardized policies and procedures for receiving reports of adult maltreatment 24 hours per day, 7 calendar days per week, using multiple methods of reporting to ensure accessibility.	
		(b) The State entity shall establish standardized policies and procedures for APS to accept reports of alleged adult maltreatment by mandatory reporters that:	

Citation	Title	Proposed Rule Language	Comment
		(1) Shares information regarding a report to APS with	
		the mandated reporter which shall include, at a	
		minimum:	
		(i) Whether a case has been opened as a result of the report, and;	
		(ii) The disposition or finding of the allegation in the	
		report.	
		(c) The State entity shall establish and adhere to standardized policies and procedures to maintain the	
		confidentiality of reporters and information provided	
		in a report.	
1324.406	Coordination	(a) State entities shall establish policies and	
	with other	procedures, consistent with State law, to ensure	
	entities.	coordination and to detect, prevent, address, and	
		remedy adult maltreatment with other appropriate	
		entities, including but not limited to:	
		(1) Other APS programs in the state, when authority	
		over APS is divided between different jurisdictions or	
		agencies; (2) Other governmental agencies that investigate	
		allegations of adult maltreatment, including, but not	
		limited to, the State Medicaid agency, State nursing	
		home licensing and certification, State department of	
		health and licensing and certification, and tribal	
		governments;	
		(3) Law enforcement agencies with jurisdiction to	
		investigate suspected crimes related to adult	
		maltreatment; State or local police agencies, tribal	
		law enforcement, State Medicaid Fraud Control	
		Units, and Federal law enforcement agencies;	
		(4) Organizations with authority to advocate on behalf of individuals who experienced the alleged adult	
		maltreatment, such as the State Long-Term Care	
		Ombudsman Program and/or investigate allegations	
		of adult maltreatment such as the Protection and	
		Advocacy Systems;	
		(5) Emergency management systems, and;	
		(6) Banking and financial institutions.	
		(b) Policies and procedures must, at a minimum:	
		(1) Address coordination and collaboration to detect,	
		prevent, address, and remedy adult maltreatment	
		during all stages of an adult maltreatment	
		investigation conducted by APS or by other agencies	
		and organizations with authority and jurisdiction to	
		investigate reports of adult maltreatment;	
		(2) Address information sharing on the status and	
		resolution of investigations between the APS system and other entities responsible in the state or other	
		jurisdiction for investigation, to the extent permissible	
		under applicable State law, and;	
1	<u> </u>	1 Lh	<u> </u>

Citation	Title	Proposed Rule Language	Comment
		(3) Allow for the establishment of memoranda of	
		understanding, where appropriate, to facilitate	
		information exchanges, quality assurance activities,	
		cross-training, development of formal	
		multidisciplinary and cross agency adult	
		maltreatment teams, co-location of staff within	
		appropriate agencies, and other activities as	
		determined by the State entity.	
		The State entity shall develop policies and	
		procedures for APS for the collection and	
		maintenance of data on investigations conducted by	
		APS systems. They shall:	
		(a) Collect and report annually to ACL such APS	
		system-wide data as required by the Assistant	
		Secretary for Aging.	
		(b) Develop policies and procedures to ensure that	
		the APS system retains individual case data obtained	
4004 437	400	from APS investigations for a minimum of 5 years.	
1324.407	APS program	The State entity shall develop policies and	
	performance.	procedures for APS for the collection and	
		maintenance of data on investigations conducted by	
		APS systems. They shall:	
		(a) Collect and report annually to ACL such APS	
		system-wide data as required by the Assistant	
		Secretary for Aging.	
		(b) Develop policies and procedures to ensure that	
		the APS system retains individual case data obtained	
		from APS investigations for a minimum of 5 years.	
1324.408	State plans.	(a) State entities must develop and submit to the	Is this an operations plan or a formal state
		Director of the Office of Elder Justice and Adult	plan?
		Protective Services, the position designated by 42	
		U.S.C. 3011(e)(1), a State APS plan that meets the	
		requirements set forth by the Deputy Assistant	
		Secretary for Aging. (b) The State plan shall be developed by the State	
		entity in collaboration with APS programs.	
		Criticy in conductation with At 6 programs.	
		(c) The State plan shall be updated at least every five	
		years but as frequently as every three years.	
		years but as frequently as every tiffee years.	
		(d) The State plan shall contain an assurance that all	
		policies and procedures described herein will be	
		developed and adhered to by the State APS system;	
		<u> </u>	
		(e) State plans will be reviewed and approved by the	
		Director of the Office of Elder Justice and Adult	
		Protective Services. Any State dissatisfied with the	
		final decision of the Director of the Office of Elder	
		Justice and Adult Protective Services may appeal to	
		the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Aging within 30	
		calendar days of the date of the Director of the Office	
		of Elder Justice and Adult Protective Services' final	
		decision and will be afforded the opportunity for a	
	<u> </u>	hearing. If the State is dissatisfied with the final	

Citation	Title	Proposed Rule Language	Comment
		decision of the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Aging,	
		it may appeal to the Assistant Secretary for Aging	
		within 30 calendar days of the date of the Deputy	
		Assistant Secretary for Aging's decision.	
Summary		Compared to the baseline scenario wherein APS	
of Costs		systems continue to operate under State law with no	
and		Federal regulation, we identify several impacts	
Benefits		of this proposed rule. We anticipate that the	
		proposed rule will: require the revision of State	
		policies and procedures, require training on new	
		rules for APS staff, require the submission of new	
		State plans, require data sharing agreements	
		between APS systems and other State entities,	
		require APS systems create a feedback loop to	
		provide information to mandatory reporters, require	
		data reporting to ACL, inform potential APS clients of	
		their rights under State law, and require new or updated record retention systems for certain States.	
		We anticipate that the final rule will result in improved	
		consistency in implementation of APS systems within	
		and across States, clarity of obligations associated	
		with Federal funding for administrators of APS	
		systems, and will result in better and more effective	
		service delivery within and across States with better	
		quality investigations in turn leading to more	
		person-directed outcomes.	
		This analysis describes costs associated with issuing	
		APS regulations and quantifies several categories of	
		costs to grantees (State entities) and subgrantees	
		(APS programs), collectively referred to as APS	
		systems, and to ACL under the proposed rule.	
		Specifically, we quantify costs associated with APS	
		systems (1) revising policies and procedures, (2)	
		conducting trainings, (3) implementing policies and	
		procedures (3) reporting data to ACL (4) maintaining	
		records retention system (5) developing State plans.	
		The proposed effective date of this rulemaking is	
		three years from the date of final publication.	
		This is to allow for variation in the timing of State	
		legislative sessions. We anticipate that all States will	
		have fully implemented the rule by its effective	
		date and impacts will be measurable by that time. We conclude the proposed rule would result in a cost of	
		\$3,532,916.99 to fully implement. This cost will be	
		offset by improved investigations and better	
		outcomes for the victims of adult maltreatment. This	
		represents significant value, particularly given the	
		widespread and egregious nature of adult	
		maltreatment in the United States.	
		The analysis also includes a discussion of the	
		potential benefits under the rule that we do not	
		quantify. We request comments on our estimates of	
		the cost and benefits of this proposed rule, including	
		the impacts that are may not be quantified in this	
		analysis. A detailed discussion of costs and	

Citation	Title	Proposed Rule Language	Comment
		benefits associated with the rulemaking follows.	
a. Costs	1. Revising	This analysis anticipates that the proposed rule	
of the	Policies and	would result in one-time costs to State entities and	
Proposed	Procedures	APS programs to revise policies and procedures. The	
Rule		majority of APS systems currently maintain policies	
		and procedures, often based on State statute. Data	
		from our National Process Evaluation Report of	
		Adult Protective Services (OMB Control Number	
		0985–0054) and State experiences incorporating	
		concepts from the Consensus Guidelines suggest	
		our proposed rules will establish a minimum standard	
		that may reflect current practice in many States. For	
		example, while all States currently require a	
		screening process for intake, there is no uniformity or	
		standardization in this process across or within	
		States and detail contained in policies and	
		procedures (if present) varies. Therefore, in requiring	
		standard policies and procedures for APS systems, ACL anticipates that all APS programs may create	
		new or revise their current policies and procedures	
		under the proposed rule; however, the level of	
		revision will vary by State. There is currently no data	
		on the total number of APS programs. Our estimates	
		reflect our understanding of the structure of State	
		APS systems and the assumption that there is one	
		program per county in local-level systems, totaling	
		928 APS programs nationwide 57 We estimate that	
		roughly half of these entities will require more	
		extensive revisions, with the rest requiring limited	
		revisions to their current policies and procedures. We	
		estimate that programs with more extensive revisions	
		will spend twenty (20) total hours on revisions per	
		entity. Of these, fifteen (15) would be spent by a mid-	
		level manager equivalent to a first-line supervisor	
		(Occupation code 43–1011), at a cost of \$30.47	
		unadjusted hourly wage, \$60.94 per hour adjusted for	
		nonwage benefits and indirect costs (15 × \$60.94),	
		while an average of five (5) hours would be spent by	
		executive staff equivalent to a general and operations manager (Occupation code 11–1021), at a cost of	
		\$55.41 per hour unadjusted hourly wage, \$110.82	
		per hour adjusted for non-wage benefits and indirect	
		costs (5 × \$110.82). For programs with less	
		extensive revisions, we assume fifteen (15) total	
		hours spent on revisions per entity. Of these, ten (10)	
		hours would be spent by a mid-level manager	
		equivalent to a first-line supervisor (Occupation	
		code 43–1011), at a cost of \$30.47 per hour	
		unadjusted hourly wage, \$60.94 per hour adjusted for	
		non-wage benefits and indirect costs (10 × \$60.94),	
		while an average of five (5) hours would be spent by	
		executive staff equivalent to a general and operations	
		manager (Occupation code 11–1021), at a cost of	
		\$55.41 unadjusted hourly wage, \$110.82 adjusted for	
		non-wage benefits and indirect costs (5 × \$110.82).	

Citation	Title	Proposed Rule Language	Comment
		We monetize the time that would be spent by APS	
		programs on revising policies and procedures by	
		estimating a total cost per entity of \$1,468.02 or	
		\$1,163.50, depending on the extent of the revisions.	
		For the approximately 464 programs with less	
		extensive revisions, we estimate a cost of	
		approximately \$539,864. For the 464 programs with	
		more extensive revisions, we estimate a cost of	
		approximately \$681,244.80.28. We estimate the total	
		cost associated with revisions with respect to the	
		proposed rule for APS systems of \$1,221,108.80.	
		The above estimates of time and number of State	
		entities or APS programs that would revise their	
		policies under the regulation are approximate	
		estimates based on ACL's extensive experience	
		working with APS systems, including providing	
		technical assistance, and feedback and inquiries	
		that we have received from State entities and APS	
		programs. Due to variation in the types and sizes of	
		State entities and incomplete data on local programs,	
		the above estimates of time and number of entities	
		that would revise their policies under the regulation is	
		difficult to calculate precisely.	
	2. Trainings on	Cost to conduct trainings (ACL staff and contractors):	
	New	ACL estimates that the Federal Government will incur	
	Requirements	a onetime expense with respect to training or	
		re-training State entities under the proposed rule.	
		Senior ACL staff will train State entities by the ten	
		(10) HHS regions assisted by its technical assistance	
		provider the APS Technical Assistance Resource	
		Center (TARC). We assume for each of the ten (10)	
		regions that trainings will take three (3) hours of	
		staff time for one Federal GS-14 equivalent at a cost	
		of \$63.64 unadjusted hourly wage, \$127.28 adjusted	
		for non-wage benefits and indirect costs (3 ×	
		\$127.28), three (3) hours of staff time for one GS-13	
		equivalent at a cost of \$53.85 per unadjusted hourly	
		wage, \$107.70 per hour adjusted for non-wage	
		benefits and indirect costs (3 × \$107.70), and (3) and	
		three hours of staff time for five (5) contractors	
		equivalent to training and development managers	
		(U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) Bureau of Labor	
		Statistics (BLS) Occupation code 11–3131) at a cost	
		of \$61.92 per hour unadjusted for non-wage benefits,	
		\$123.84 per hour adjusted for non-wage benefits and	
		indirect costs (3 × 5 × \$123.84). This is inclusive of	
		time to prepare and conduct the trainings.	
		We monetize the time spent by Federal employees	
		and contractors to prepare and conduct trainings for	1
		State entities by estimating a total cost per regional	!
		training of \$2,562.54. For ten trainings a total of	
		\$25,625.40.	

Citation	Title	Proposed Rule Language	Comment
		Cost to conduct training (State entity to local APS	
		program): We further anticipate in each of the 15	
		local-level systems the State entity would incur a	
		one-time expense to conduct a training on the new	
		policies and procedures for the State's local APS	
		programs. For each State entity to prepare and	
		conduct a training (15 trainings total) we anticipate	
		two (2) employees per State entity each equivalent to	
		a first-line supervisor (BLS Occupation code 43–	
		1011), would spend two (2) total hours	
		(one (1) hour per employee) at a cost of \$30.47 per	
		hour unadjusted hourly wage, \$60.94 per hour	
		adjusting for nonwage benefits and indirect costs (2 ×	
		\$60.94). We monetize the time spent by State	
		entities to prepare and conduct trainings for local	
		APS programs at \$121.88 per training. For 15 State	
		entities we anticipate a total of \$1,828.20.	
		Cost to conduct training (APS programs to APS	
		J ,	
		workers): We anticipate each of the 928 local APS	
		programs will incur a one-time expense to conduct a	
		training for APS workers on new policies and	
		procedures. For each program to prepare and	
		conduct a training we anticipate three (3) hours to	
		prepare and conduct a training of one mid-level	
		manager equivalent to a first-line supervisor (BLS	
		Occupation code 43–1011), at a cost of \$30.47 per	
		hour unadjusted hourly wage, \$60.94 after adjusting	
		for non-wage benefits and indirect costs (3 × \$60.94).	
		We monetize the time spent by APS programs to	
		prepare and conduct trainings at \$182.82 (928 ×	
		\$182.82). We monetize the time spent by APS	
		programs to train their workers at \$169,656.96.	
		Cost to receive training: There is no data on	
		individual local APS program staffing. However,	
		NAMRS does track an aggregate number of APS	
		staff at the State and local level, from State	
		supervisors to local APS workers: 8,287. We assume	
		5 percent of these workers are executive staff	
		equivalent to a general and operations manager	
		(BLS Occupation code 11–1021), at a cost of \$55.41	
		unadjusted hourly wage, \$110.82 per hour adjusted	
		for non-wage benefits and indirect costs (414 ×	
		\$110.82), 15 precent are first-line supervisor	
		(Occupation code 43–1011), at a cost of \$60.94 per	
		hour adjusting for non-wage benefits and indirect	
		costs (1,243 × \$60.94) and 80 percent are Social and	
		Human Service Assistants (Occupation code 21–	
		1093) at a cost of \$19.45 per hour unadjusted hourly	
		wage, and \$38.90 adjusted for non-wage benefits	
		and indirect costs. (6,629 × \$38.90). We monetize	
		the time spent by APS staff to receive a one-hour	
		training at \$379,496. We monetize the total amount	
		of time spent to give and receive trainings at	
		\$576,606.56. Of this, \$550,981.16 is State expense	
		and \$25,625.40 is Federal expense.	
	1	מווע שְבַט,טבט. אינו ווּד ויבעבומו בגףבוופנ.	

Citation	Title	Proposed Rule Language	Comment
	3.	The proposed rule requires several changes in APS	
	Implementing	practice which may represent a cost to States.	
	New Policies		
	and	Cost to implement a two-tiered, immediate vs. non	
	Procedures	immediate risk, response system: Forty-nine States	
		currently have a two-tiered (or higher) system. Forty-	
		nine States currently respond to immediate need	
		intakes within 24 hours. After consulting former	
		APS administrators, we have determined that we cannot fully quantify how much it would cost a State	
		to develop and implement a new two tiered system.	
		However, given that most States currently already	
		maintain such a system, we anticipate it would be a	
		very minor on-going cost in total.	
		Cost to implement mandatory staff to client ratios:	
		The provision requiring States to establish a	
		minimum staffing ratio is intended to better enable	
		States to ensure long-term continuity of programs.	
		We anticipate that this will be an on-going, cost	
		neutral provision; States have the discretion to set	
		minimum staffing ratios consistent with current practice, and therefore currently available resources.	
		We do not anticipate that States would commit to	
		increasing staffing ratios without a commensurate	
		increase in Federal or other funding. Consequently,	
		we anticipate that this provision will not result in	
		increased cost to APS programs. We invite comment	
		as to whether our analysis of the potential financial	
		burden of this proposal is accurate.	
		Cost to implement a mandatory reporter feedback	
		loop: According to 2021 ACL Evaluation survey and	
		NAMRS data, of all reports nationally which resulted	
		in an investigation, 255,395 (59 percent) were made by professionals. However, not all professionals are	
		mandated reporters and who is a mandated reporter	
		varies by State. For example, a home and	
		community-based service provider or other social	
		service provider would be considered a professional	
		but may not be a mandated reporter. For this reason,	
		we assume 75 percent of reports resulting in an	
		investigation made by professionals were made by	
		mandated reporters (191,546). One such response	
		an APS program could make to a mandated reporter	
		is to send an email. If for each report leading to an investigation received by a mandatory reporter, an	
		APS program sends an email in response, we	
		anticipate a Social and Human Service Assistants	
		(Occupation code 21–1093) at a cost of \$19.45 per	
		hour unadjusted hourly wage, and \$38.90 adjusted	
		for non-wage benefits and indirect costs would spend	
		ten (10) minutes sending the email. We monetize the	
		on-going cost for all 56 systems to send an email for	
		each report of maltreatment from a mandatory	
		reporter to be \$1,241,856.57 annually.	

Citation	Title	Proposed Rule Language	Comment
		81 percent APS programs do not currently require a feedback loop for mandatory reporters. To bring all States into compliance (.81 × \$1,241,856.57) with the proposed rules would amount to \$1,005,903.82 annually.	
		annually. Cost to implement data sharing agreements: Anecdotally we know very few States currently have data sharing agreements with other maltreatment investigatory entities in place. We have estimated 50 APS systems currently have no data use agreements in place while six may have one or more. For illustrative purposes we assume each State without a data sharing agreement will establish three (3) MOUs (with, for example, the Medicaid agency, the Longterm care ombudsman, and the Protection and Advocacy System). Each MOU will take one midlevel manager equivalent to a first-line supervisor (Occupation code 43–1011), at a cost of \$30.47 per hour unadjusted hourly wage, \$60.94 after adjusting for nonwage benefits and indirect costs three (3) hours to draft (3 × \$60.94). It will take a privacy officer equivalent to a lawyer (Occupation code 23–1011) at a cost of \$78.74 unadjusted hourly wage, \$156.80 per hour adjusted for non-wage benefits and indirect costs one (1) hour to review and approve (1 × \$156.80). It will take an executive staff equivalent to a general and operations manager (Occupation code 11–1021), at a cost of \$55.41 unadjusted hourly wage, \$110.82 per hour adjusted for non-wage benefits and indirect costs two (2) hours (2 × \$110.82) to review and approve. We monetize the cost for one (1) State APS system to develop one (1) MOU to be \$561.26. For a State APS system to establish three (3) MOUs, we monetize the cost to be \$1,683.78. For fiffy (50) State APS systems to develop one MOUs we monetize the cost to be \$84,189. We likewise assume that each of the three (3) entities the APS entity is entering into an MOU with will incur substantially similar costs. We monetize the expense of three (3) entities in fiffy (50) states to enter into MOUs with the APS system	
		in their State at \$84,189. We monetize the one-time total cost of establishing data sharing agreements to be \$168,378.	

Citation	Title	Proposed Rule Language	Comment
		Cost to inform individuals of their rights under State	
		law: We do not currently have data on the number of	
		States informing individuals of their rights under State	
		law. We know anecdotally some States offer potential	
		clients a paper brochure informing them of their	
		rights. We anticipate costs of producing and	
		distributing such brochures to be one new pamphlet	
		per State system or 56 pamphlets total. It will require	
		three (3) hours of staff time by a Social and Human	
		Service Assistants (Occupation code 21–1093) at	
		a cost of \$19.45 per hour unadjusted hourly wage,	
		and \$38.90 adjusted for non-wage benefits and	
ļ		indirect costs (3 × \$38.90) and one (1) hour for a	
		first-line supervisor (Occupation code 43–1011),	
		at a cost of \$30.47 per hour unadjusted hourly wage,	
		\$60.94 to review and approve (1 × \$60.94) for a total of \$177.64 per State in staff time to develop each	
		pamphlet. We monetize the one-time staff cost for 56	
		State systems to develop a pamphlet (56 × \$177.64)	
		at \$9,947.84. According to our NAMRS data, 806,219	
		client investigations were performed in FFY 2022.	
		Each pamphlet will cost 23 cents to print and	
		produce. Assuming a pamphlet is provided for every	
		new client at the initiation of an investigation	
		(806,219 × .23) it would cost \$185,430.37 annually to	
		produce and distribute pamphlets nationwide. In	
		total, to develop a new pamphlet in all 56 States and	
		distribute them at the beginning of all investigations	
		would cost \$195,378.21 in staff time and materials	
ļ		the first year the policy is in place. Subsequently,	
		States would incur \$185,430.37 annually to	
		implement this provision.	
ļ	Data Reporting	In our proposed regulations, we require States to	
ļ	to ACL	collect and report specific data to ACL. As in our	
ļ		NAMRS data collection system, this data collection	
		uses existing State administrative information	
ļ		systems. Therefore, States will not incur new data	
ļ		collection costs as the result of this rulemaking. Most	
ļ		of the data collected are standard data used by the	
		agency. Operating costs of the information systems	
		are part of State agency operations and would not	
ļ		maintained solely for the purpose of submitting data in compliance with the proposed rules. For data	
ļ		reporting from the State to ACL under the proposed	
		regulations, we anticipate a similar system as	
		NAMRS case component data currently reported	
		voluntarily by States. We performed a burden	
		estimate prior to launching this reporting system. We	
		estimated for 35 States staff cost would be a total	
		annual burden of 675 hours at \$46.00 per hour	
		(675 × \$46.00) for a total of \$31,050. IT staff total	
		annual burden was estimated at 3,075 hours at	
		\$69.00 (3,075 × \$69.00) per hour for a total of	
		\$212,175. Using this measure as a proxy, we	
		estimate the proposed rule's data reporting	

Citation	Title	Proposed Rule Language	Comme	nt	
		requirements will cost a total of \$339,480 annually for all 56 State entities.			
	Record Retention State plans and NAMRS	The proposed rule imposes a new requirement that APS programs retain case data for five years. Many, but not all, programs currently retain case data for a number of years, but comprehensive information does not exist on State retention policies. We can extrapolate from data reporting in the NAMRS that most States retain case data for an average of two years. NAMRS is a comprehensive, voluntary, national reporting system for APS programs. It collects quantitative and qualitative data on APS practices and policies, and the outcomes of investigations into the maltreatment of older adults and adults with disabilities from every State and Territory. All but one State currently maintains an IT infrastructure that supports the retention of electronic APS data and maintains it for one year. For this reason, the cost to further store it for five years will create a de minimis cost for APS. This will be the first times State entities are required to develop and submit State plans under section 2042 of the Elder Justice Act, 42 U.S.C. 1397m–1(b). However, States develop spending plans under 45 CFR 75.206(d) every three to five years and, based on our extensive experience working with APS systems and OAA grantees on their State plans, we do not anticipate a significantly greater level of detail for the development of State plans. We anticipate for each State the equivalent of two (2) hour of executive staff equivalent to a general and operations manager (Occupation code 11–1021), at a cost of \$55.41 per hour unadjusted adjusted hourly wage, \$110.82 adjusted for non-wage benefits and indirect costs (2 × \$110.82), and four (4) hours of a first-line supervisor (Occupation code 43–1011), at a cost of \$30.47 per hour unadjusted hourly wage, \$60.94 adjusting for non-wage benefits and indirect costs (4 × \$60.94). State plans will be updated every three to five years. We monetize the cost of drafting one			
One Time ()	State plan at \$465.40. We monetize 56 State plans at \$26,062.40.			
One-Time (
Policies and	d Procedures Update			\$1,221	108.80
Policies and	d Procedures Implem	entation		State	Federal
Training				\$550,981.16	\$25,625.40
Policies an	d Procedures Implem	entation: Data Sharing Agreements		\$168,3	378.00
Policies an	d Procedures:	r Dighta Under State Law			
Inform	ing individuals of Thei	r Rights Under State Law		SO 0/	17.84

Citation	Title	Proposed Rule Language	Comment	
Ongoing Cost	ts (Annual)			
Item of Cost:				
Policies and ^r	Procedures Implemen	ntation:		
Two-Tiered Response System\$0				
Policies and ^r	Procedures Implemen	ntation:		
Staff to Client Ratios0			0	
Policies and ^r	Procedures Implemen	ntation:		
Mandatory Reporter Feedback Loop				
Policies and ^r	Procedures Implemen	ntation:		
Informing Individuals of Their Rights Under State Law				
Data reporting to ACL				
Record Retention				
State plan				
(renewed every three to five years)				
Total				