

## SB 058 – Disabled Parking

HB 10-1019 made major reforms. Was necessary due to rampant abuse, e.g. 9-11 tags for every mobility impaired individual in CO.

One of the reforms was to require individuals renewing had to have a medical professional (MP) certify they were still eligible (and alive). Until then the MP only had to sign once. This was done after we found up to the third generation renewing deceased person's tags. We also recognized that while eligible today, as technology and medical science advances some would ultimately become ineligible in the future, e.g. the individual in the news last week who just got a double arm transplant and is in line for a double leg transplant. I am not saying he won't, but there is clearly the possibility.

001, this will allow someone whom the MP certifies as "permanently disabled" (a condition which is not expected to change within a person's lifetime, given the current state of medical or adaptive technology), to get a 3 year tag, when they renew the tag they can either get the MP to sign the renewal and can renew by mail, OR present themselves, with photo ID at the County Clerk's office, so we can verify they are still alive. If they use the in-person process every 3<sup>rd</sup> renewal (9 years) they would have to have an MP recertify their continuing eligibility. I should mention if the MP has an existing relationship with the person, the forms can be done by mail, and if the person is on Medicaid or Medicare it is illegal for the MP to charge for preparing the form. The disability community is all over the place on this issue, some want never having to have an MP recertify, some want it every year. I think this is a reasonable compromise, and hope we are not back here in a couple more years (*but probably will*) because people find a way to exploit this.

002, this will make it clear that disabled parking needs to be uniform throughout CO. We have a huge problem with implementation and enforcement of the 2010 reforms. A key component of the reform was an education program, funded by a portion of the fines, increased from \$100 to \$350. As some municipalities have failed or refused to implement parts of it (in one case has implemented the increased fine but not the provision to transfer the educational funds). The result is that it has made implementation problematic. OLLS memo of 11/30/10 says as the statute currently is written it *probably* is a matter of statewide concern, but for some local gov't's that is not good enough, so we need to clarify it. There is broad support in the disability community for this.