

House Health & Human Services

03/04/2026 01:30 PM

HB26-1147 Host Home for People with Intellectual & Dev Disab

Typed Text of Testimony Submitted

Name, Position, Representing	Typed Text of Testimony
Lisa Brenneman Against themselves	<p>HCPF already has the responsibility to provide oversight to PASAs in charge of Host Homes. And PASAs have the responsibility to provide oversight to their Host Homes. Why would "risk" criteria be needed at the cost of \$600,000 a year?</p> <p>Adding cost for Additional Oversight when there is already established oversight while funding is Already less than needed and funds are being taken away from Disabled Clients and their providers is Backwards.</p> <p>Where will this \$600,000 come from? Will you take additional care away from disabled clients in order to fund unnecessary oversight?</p> <p>Why is HCPF not expected to fulfill its current oversight responsibility within their current budget?</p> <p>I oppose this addition to oversight that already should be being fulfilled.</p> <p>Sincerely, Lisa Brenneman Parent and Guardian to a Disabled Adult on the DD Waiver</p>

<p>Jaime Santy Against themselves</p>	<p>There are a couple parts to this that are concerning. One is the amount of money allocated to support this when HCPF is already having to move around so much money within Medicaid waivers. Another is the the list will be made public. I don't understand the necessity of that. If someone needs this service service agencies can connect them to it quite easily.</p>
<p>Deana Watson Amend themselves</p>	<p>Subject: Concerns Regarding Inclusion of Family Caregivers in HB 26-1147</p> <p>Dear Representative Brown and Senator Cutter,</p> <p>I am writing to express concerns regarding the potential inclusion of family caregivers within the scope of House Bill 26-1147.</p> <p>While I appreciate the bill's intent to increase oversight and accountability within the host home system, extending its provisions to family caregivers would create significant unintended consequences.</p> <p>Privacy Risks to Vulnerable Individuals and Families</p> <p>Family caregivers provide 24/7 residential services within their private homes to their own loved ones with intellectual and developmental disabilities. Expanding the bill's public database and complaint provisions to include these homes would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase public exposure of private residences Risk disclosure of identifying information about individuals with disabilities

	<p>Create potential safety and privacy concerns for vulnerable individuals and their families</p> <p>Family homes are not commercial facilities. They are private residences where deeply personal care occurs. Public-facing transparency measures that may be appropriate for contracted provider networks are not appropriate for family caregiving settings.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact Concerns</p> <p>HB 26-1147 requires the creation and maintenance of a statewide database, a complaint process, and a risk-based survey structure. The Colorado Department of Health Care Policy and Financing has already indicated that resources are constrained.</p> <p>Increase administrative and oversight costs</p> <p>Require additional staffing and infrastructure</p> <p>Divert limited Medicaid resources away from direct services</p> <p>At a time when disability services funding remains strained, new administrative systems should be narrowly tailored and fiscally responsible.</p> <p>Requested Clarification or Amendment</p> <p>If the intent of HB 26-1147 is to regulate commercial host home providers operating as independent contractors under service</p>
--	--

	<p>agencies, I would request that the bill be amended to clearly state that:</p> <p>Family caregivers providing residential services to their own relatives are excluded from the definition of “host home provider” for purposes of public database inclusion and complaint publication.</p> <p>Clear language would prevent unintended expansion and ensure that private family homes are not subjected to regulatory structures designed for contracted provider agencies.</p> <p>Respectfully, Deana Watson Parent and Family Caregiver of adult son on DD Waiver</p>
<p>Maureen Welch Against herself</p>	<p>Thank you for chance to submit written testimony. I have friends whose adult children were harmed and killed in host homes.</p> <p>I also have friends who are good host home providers</p> <p>And I myself provide those services to my son on the DD Waiver</p> <p>HB26-1147 is framed as transparency and risk-based oversight reform.</p> <p>However there is potential risk in introducing a new task to HCPF and CDPHE during this budget crisis.</p> <p>I think it should be postponed indefinitely due to the cost and too much risk of issues with implementation when involving unintended consequences.</p>

	<p>As an adult residential family caregiver for son on DD waiver, I have concerns that these changes could impact personal privacy and start regulating those of us giving residential adult support to loved ones.</p> <p>For a Host Home Provider in Colorado, and that may include family caregivers who provide residential care on the DD waiver, the bill increases regulatory risk without increasing legal protections.</p> <p>However, as written:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">â€¢ It expands public exposure of private host homesâ€¢ It increases complaint-driven regulatory leverageâ€¢ It lacks due process protections for host home providersâ€¢ It creates reputational and contractual vulnerabilityâ€¢ It allows significant discretionary power without clear safeguardsâ€¢ It creates potential to regulate/post private information of family caregivers who provide residential 24/7 services similar to a host home provider <p>Thanks there has been a lot of traffic on many Facebook groups about how this is well intended but too risky and costly.</p>
--	---

	<p>Maureen Welch</p>
<p>Heather Wilson Against themselves</p>	<p>I agree with these issues listed here:</p> <p>HB26-1147 is framed as transparency and risk-based oversight reform.</p> <p>As an adult residential family caregiver for my own son on the DD waiver, I have concerns that these changes could impact personal privacy and start regulating those of us giving residential adult support to loved ones.</p> <p>For a Host Home Provider in Colorado, and that may include family caregivers who provide residential care on the DD waiver, the bill increases regulatory risk without increasing legal protections.</p> <p>However, as written:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">â€¢ It expands public exposure of private host homesâ€¢ It increases complaint-driven regulatory leverageâ€¢ It lacks due process protections for host home providers.â€¢ It creates reputational and contractual vulnerability.â€¢ It allows significant discretionary power without clear safeguards.

	<p>â€¢ It creates potential to regulate/post private information of family caregivers who provide residential 24/7 services similar to a host home provider.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Heather Wilson</p> <p>Mom, Guardian, Rep Payee, Host Home Provider, Advocate of Brian Thomas 29 years old with Severe Autism, Severe Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, as well as other various diagnoses.</p> <p>hbk687@aol.com</p>
<p>Mrs. Wiggs Amend themselves</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A public database is extremely distressing. Private homes should not have their information published for the public. 2. If host home specifics are a concern due to agency hopping and sinister intent then there needs to be secured private database to prevent... we already have the CAPS form--- it would be more appropriate to utilize a system similar or update this system to provide concerning information about potential host home providers. 3. When loved ones (recipients) of services are already loosing funding for services it is not appropriate to pull more money aside for this project. 4. Programs like this and EVV waste much needed dollars diverting funds from our loved ones. 5. If high risk is going to be taken into consideration then PASAs AND host home providers need to be compensated more based on such risk factors. 6. The wording that less as risk MAY be surveyed less but it's assumed they won't be is a pitfall. Don't jeopardize safety for someone who is 'easy', don't leave the window open for that. 7. If you want to make a difference here then this is what you do.

	<p>A. Invest in regional centers so that there is ALWAYS an immediate opening when any one of the residential clients needs one. Host homes are just people no matter how well trained they should not be expected by the state to support without STATE support, not PASA. PASAs are often just a collection of people and homes.</p> <p>B. Provide additional funding for our individuals, even the highest rate is still under minimum wage when calculated out over 24 hours. Make it separate from the daily rate (but do not decrease day rate when respite is used and don't decrease in general), add respite in so that host homes are encouraged to utilize outside supports. The more eyes and people our loved ones have the better but not an outside visitor with a clipboard, real day to day people who can really look out for their well being.</p> <p>C. Create a support line for providers.</p> <p>D. Create a database where forms, tools, for all things residential etc. can be accessed so that providers and PASAs have a clear cut guide to use to streamline compliance and enhance understanding of expectations</p> <p>E. Create conferences for support and education, take a page from the PEP conference. Host it 3 times a year and provide supports for loved ones to attend to. Get an idea of who we really are.</p> <p>p.s. If you want a worth while bill that will really support us work on a medicaid buy in for all. Let us pay in!</p>
<p>Julie Sparks Against themselves</p>	<p>I am writing as the parent of a young man with autism and IDD who will be transitioning to the DD waiver in about two weeks. I have serious reservations about this bill as written, particularly since there is no distinction indicated between "host homes" and "family caregivers" as a specific sub-category of host home. This bill creates the potential to regulate and post private information of family caregivers, and creates reputational and contractual</p>

	<p>vulnerability for host home families. It increases complaint-driven regulatory leverage and allows significant discretionary power without clear safeguards. As a family, we have already experienced the harm and disruption that can be caused by indiscriminate complaints in the way that mandatory reporting has been handled in the past; no protection or support was provided to our family by the complaints made through mandatory reporting and my son was not made safer in any way. This "risk rating" system sounds very much like additional expensive state oversight without due process protections for host home providers.</p>
<p>Jennifer Kalkhorts Against themselves</p>	<p>Hello, I am writing to share my NON-SUPPORT for this bill. As written, this potentially places my adult on the DD waiver at risk in the future. She currently resides with a family caregiver for residential care.</p> <p>My concern is that the bill increases regulatory risk without increasing legal protections.</p> <p>However, as written:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It expands public exposure of private host homes. • It increases complaint-driven regulatory leverage. • It lacks due process protections for host home providers. • It creates reputational and contractual vulnerability. • It allows significant discretionary power without clear safeguards. • It creates potential to regulate/post private information of family caregivers who provide residential 24/7 services similar to a host home provider. <p>The additional costs and oversight are also highly concerning. The DD waiver is highly regulated with oversight at the PASA, Community Center Board, and at the state level, not to mention housing and other agencies that provide further guidance. Another layer of management adds additional cost and</p>

	<p>unnecessary risk. A process is in place for high-risk or poor-performing agencies.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Jennifer Kalkhorst, Advocate, Mom, Concerned Colorado Resident.</p>
<p>Kelly George</p> <p>None</p> <p>themselves</p>	<p>Thank you for allowing written testimony.</p> <p>I support thoughtful oversight that protects the safety and well-being of individuals receiving services. However, I am concerned that certain provisions in this bill may create unintended consequences for families who sustain Colorado’s host home system.</p> <p>Host homes are private family residences, not facilities. Families open their homes so individuals with disabilities can live as members of a household and participate in everyday community life. Policies affecting host homes should recognize that these are private homes.</p> <p>My primary concern is the proposal to create a public database of host homes and providers. Public disclosure of identifying information about private residences raises significant privacy and safety concerns for both providers and the individuals living in those homes. Participation in a Medicaid waiver program should not require families to give up the basic expectation of privacy in their own homes.</p> <p>I am also concerned that the bill introduces a risk-based oversight framework without clearly defined and objective criteria. Without transparent standards, risk determinations may become subjective and inconsistently applied.</p> <p>Host homes represent one of the most community-integrated residential options in Colorado’s disability services system, particularly in rural communities. Policies that unintentionally discourage host homes could reduce placement availability and increase reliance on more congregate models of care.</p>

	<p>Oversight is important, but it can be achieved while protecting the privacy and safety of private homes. Limiting public disclosure of identifying information while allowing regulatory oversight would provide a more balanced approach.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted, Kelly George</p>
--	---



February 12, 2026

Honorable Members of the House Health & Human Services Committee
Colorado Legislature

RE: Support for HB26-1147, Host Home for People with Intellectual & Developmental Disabilities

Dear Chair Gilchrist and Members:

I write today on behalf of Autism Speaks, a nonprofit organization dedicated to creating an inclusive world for all individuals with autism throughout their lifespan. We do this through advocacy, services, supports, research and innovation, and advances in care for autistic individuals and their families. I am based in Denver while working in several states across the nation, and as an organization we have helped hundreds to thousands of Coloradans with information, resources and other services.

We applaud and support HB26-1147, which aims to enhance oversight, transparency, and accountability for host homes serving individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities (IDD) including autism.

Host homes are an important part of community-based living for adults with IDD, offering an alternative to institutionalization and allowing more independence for those seeking it, as well as for those without a family home option or with aging parents/caregivers. These are private residences where individuals live with a caregiver/"provider," who opens their home to give personalized care and daily support.

Current laws and regulations are not sufficient to ensure that individuals in host homes live free from abuse, neglect, and violation of their rights.

This bill would help close the gap by requiring the creation of a statewide, publicly accessible database containing detailed information about host homes and their associated service agencies. Additionally, HCPF would develop and make available a single point-of-entry complaint form and process, allowing individuals served in host homes or their legal representatives to submit complaints electronically, with protections against retaliation and a system for tracking complaint status and records.

HB26-1147 would also require HCPF and the Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) to more frequently monitor new provider agencies, those with previously identified deficiencies, and providers who had previously been terminated from other agencies.

We do not anticipate that this bill will have a fiscal note, because of work already underway at HCPF and an existing system this just modifies, rather than necessitating a whole new system.

Please consider me a resource for any autism policy-related questions, and I urge your yes vote. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kelly Headrick

Kelly Headrick

Senior Director, State Government Affairs & Grassroots Advocacy
kelly.headrick@autismspeaks.org
720-207-8102

cc: Representative Kyle Brown, Senator Lisa Cutter



COMMENTS ON HB 26-1147

We have reviewed the draft of the 26-1147 and we support the principle of greater oversight of Host Homes, but propose a number of amendments to this bill. We note at the outset that the fiscal note incorrectly characterizes how adults with IDD live in the community. We would welcome a brief discussion with the sponsors or their staff about current reality.

1. The definition of “Host Homes” is both over- and under-inclusive.

- a. **Over-inclusive.** The proposed definition of Host Home could include private family caregiver (FCG) residences. These are guardians and/or family members caring for their wards/adult relatives in their own home. There is no reason to include those homes in this bill, but the current definition is so broad it could be read to include them.

Family caregivers are not in the business of providing IDD services to the community – they are just providing care to an adult with IDD to whom they are related. Including them in this database is an unwarranted intrusion and unnecessary regulatory burden. If an FCG decided to serve as a Host Home to another adult with IDD, then (and only then), should they be subject to the requirements of 26-1147.

Our recommended amendment: FCGs are not Host Homes and there has been much confusion about this (e.g., HCPF’s proposed cut to the per diem rates for adults with IDD would cut FCGs and other settings down to the Host Home rate, for example). We recommend you define Host Home to exclude “a family caregiver” as already defined elsewhere in the code at CRS 25.5-10-202.¹ We also recommend excluding unrelated legal guardians based upon the same logic as excluding family caregivers.

¹ As defined in this section: “Family caregiver’ means a family member of the person with an intellectual and developmental disability who provides care to the person with an intellectual and developmental disability in the family home, who meets the requirements for a qualified family caregiver, as established by rule of the state board, and who is working through a program-approved service agency, as established by rule of the state board.”

Suggested language:

“Host Home **shall not include:** family caregivers as defined in CRS 25.5-10-202 (17) and legal guardians as defined in CRS 15-14-102 (4).

- b. Under-inclusive.** The proposed definition does not include homes with staff placed there by a Provider Agencies (“PASAs”). Some adults with IDD live in homes that are owned/leased by the PASA with staff. Other adults with IDD live in their own homes and have live-in or hourly staff. These are not technically Host Homes, and are often referred to as Personal Care Alternatives (PCAs). Unless the PASA is owned by the guardian or family member of the adult with IDD, PCAs are susceptible to the same problems as Host Homes and require the same level of oversight.

Suggested language: “In addition to Host Homes, this section applies to homes that are staffed as ‘Personal Care Alternatives,’ (PCAs) which are defined as homes that are owned/controlled by Provider Agencies and staffed by the Provider Agency. For the purposes of this section PCAs also applies to a home provided for an adult with IDD by other resources, but that is staffed by a PASA. This section shall not apply to a PCA that is owned/controlled by a Legal Guardian or by a Family member of the adult with IDD in services.”

- 2. There are serious risks to safety and privacy if this database is made available to the public.** Sexual predators and other people who prey on the vulnerable can use this database to find out the address and other detailed information about adults with IDD and use it to prey upon this highly vulnerable population. If FCGs are included in this database, it is also a violation of FCGs privacy to include them in a public database that provides information about them.

Our recommended amendment: If the committee adopts the definitional amendment above regarding FCGs and PCAs, that solves part of the problem. Adults with IDD are still at risk, however, so we recommend that the statute be amended to make the database **not** publicly available. Adults with IDD and their authorized representatives can be provided with a copy of the report about a particular Host Home or PCA upon request by HCPF or through CMAs. Licensed PASAs can have access to the database to query regarding potential Host Home/PCA providers.

- 3. The Increased Survey Requirement.** PASAs are required to regularly survey Host Homes with quarterly visits (except for three-person Host Homes – these require monthly visits). Provider Agencies and Host Homes are surveyed by CDPHE (as agent for HCPF) every three (3) years. The

development of “risk criteria” for PASAs that require them to be surveyed more frequently does not address concerns about Host Homes/PCAs.

Our recommended change: We recommend the section on risk stratification and additional review of PASAs be deleted from the bill. The request for more frequent surveys of PASAs based upon risk stratification is unlikely to provide improved Host Home quality. Many PASAs do not even provide Host Homes or PCAs. If the legislature feels it is necessary to do additional surveys of PASAs with Host Homes or PCAs, it would be possible to have CDPHE survey annually instead of every three years. The actual number of PASAs with Host Homes/PCAs² are few and no additional staff at CDHPE would be required.

During a time of dire cuts to the services of adults with IDD, an additional 5.5 FTE for CDPHE in FY 27-28 is not an expenditure that the state can afford at this point. The good news is that the State does not need to do this to achieve its stated goals.

² There are about 3500 Host Homes in the entire state. The number of PASAs providing Host Homes is even smaller. Of those, the number that are deemed high risk should be quite small – about 30 or so (1% of all HH). The fiscal note assumes 16% are high risk. That number is enormous. If it is accurate, than far more oversight is needed than is provided for in this bill.



Re: Registration Confirmation - House Health & Human Services

Sarah Norton-Kohn <snorton-kohn@outlook.com>
To: LCS Committees <committees.lcs.ga@coleg.gov>

Wed, Mar 4, 2026 at 4:54 PM

In addition to my below testimony, I would like to also add the below statement:

I would like to clarify a few things that seem to be misunderstood. I completely understand family concerns regarding Host home providers. I don't think it would put anyone at ease placing their loved one in an unfamiliar space. However, as noted in the hearing, there are many Host home providers that have been with her consumer for over 10 years. I am one of them. I'm a fierce advocate for my consumer, I stood up for her on many occasions when no one else would to include my agency and TRE. I have stood up for my consumer when it has been extremely unpopular. Any of this put a target on my back. I attempted to file complaints about my first agency on several different occasions. I filed with the police department. I filed with adult protection and I attempted to file with TRE, who told me that they don't take report reports. September 2024 I was finally given the guidance on exactly where to file because even though the agency say that the grievance policy is in the contract it's only to file against the Host home provider not the agency. After I was properly informed where to file I filed a complaint against my second agency for additional concerns separate from my first agency that complaint was substantiated.

I myself was discriminated against based on my disability. I had proof of this for over a year I requested a disability accommodation I was denied. The agency used filing incident reports against me after I had requested a disability accommodation and to complaint that I filed on behalf of my client was substantiated Clear retaliation. I filed with the OCR. I did not hear from them for many months. I was contacted about a month ago. They asked me for any proof that I had. I provided it to them. While I was waiting on the OCR I filled with the CCRD. They said that it lacked jurisdiction, even though retaliation covers all persons. I received the OCR decision just the other day and my complaint was substantiated. They chose to use the technical assistance requesting that they respondent voluntarily comply in retraining their staff on how to not discriminate against persons with disabilities. They encourage them to go over the records and figure out where they went wrong and corrected it and retrain their staff.

I agree that we need a process to track complaints, but my contract was terminated just four days after failed mediation in retaliation and me filing against the agency. I was left out of the discussion for two weeks treated as though I had done something wrong when I stood up for my client and myself. They noted in mediation and on several occasions that they had absolutely no safety or neglect concerns with my consumer under my care noting I take excellent care of her. I apologize for the long explanation, but I feel that it is important.

Please choose to listen to all sides. I believe that protection needs to exist in this field specifically. I want to be clear. I'm not saying the agencies should not exist because I think that it's important for checks and balances, but there needs to be a balance. I hope next time you do not skip over me for testimony.

Chair and Members of the Committee,

My name is Sarah Norton-Kohn and I am a Colorado host home provider serving an individual with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

I appreciate the intent of House Bill 26-1147. Transparency and safety matter. Oversight matters. The individuals we serve deserve protection.

However, as currently written, this bill increases regulatory exposure for host home providers without including necessary due process and privacy protections.

First, the statewide database requires publication of host home provider names and contact information. Host homes are private residences where vulnerable adults live. Publishing personal contact information raises safety and privacy concerns that are not addressed in the bill.

Second, the risk criteria incorporate complaint history, but the bill does not require complaints to be substantiated before affecting risk ratings. Without safeguards, unverified or retaliatory complaints could influence survey prioritization and agency decisions.

Third, the provision regarding providers “previously terminated for health, safety, or welfare concerns” lacks definition and does not require formal investigation or appeal rights. This creates potential for reputational harm without neutral review.

Other states, such as Oregon, combine oversight with clear licensing standards, notice requirements, and hearing rights. Colorado can strengthen accountability while also protecting fairness.

I respectfully request the committee consider amendments to:

- Limit public disclosure of private residential contact information
- Require that only substantiated complaints influence risk criteria
- Provide notice and appeal rights before adverse designations
- Clearly define what constitutes a termination for safety concerns

Transparency and safety should go hand in hand with due process and provider protections.

Thank you for your time and for your work supporting individuals with disabilities in Colorado.

Rebuttal version**Chair and Members of the Committee,**

Thank you for the opportunity to respond.

I have heard it said that House Bill 26-1147 already provides safeguards and is simply about transparency. Respectfully, transparency alone does not equal fairness.

The bill creates a public database that includes host home provider names and contact information. These are private residences where vulnerable adults live. Unlike licensed facilities, host homes are family homes. The bill contains no privacy protections, no redaction requirements, and no safety guardrails. That is not a minor oversight — it is a significant policy decision.

It has also been stated that complaints are part of accountability. I agree accountability is essential. However, the bill does not require complaints to be substantiated before influencing risk criteria. It does not distinguish between founded and unfounded allegations. It does not provide providers notice or an opportunity to respond before adverse designation. Oversight must be evidence-based, not allegation-based.

Additionally, the provision regarding providers “previously terminated for health, safety, or welfare concerns” is undefined. There is no requirement that termination be substantiated, no neutral review, and no appeal process. Without those protections, this could function as informal blacklisting.

Other states have demonstrated that you can have strong oversight and still protect due process. Oregon, for example, pairs licensing enforcement with notice and hearing rights. That balance is missing here.

I am not asking this committee to weaken oversight. I am asking you to strengthen it by ensuring it is fair, objective, and constitutionally sound.

Safety and transparency are important. So are due process, privacy, and protection against misuse.

Thank you for your consideration.

[Get Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Sarah Norton-Kohn <snorton-kohn@outlook.com>

Sent: Wednesday, March 4, 2026 4:35:10 PM

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

I am a family caregiver, caring for my 21 year old daughter, L, who has autism and bipolar in our family home. She is an accomplished swimmer, winning numerous gold medals in the Special Olympics. Leann is on the DD waiver, and I am paid Difficulty of Care payments to care for her in my home.

I appreciate the effort to provide much need oversight regarding regulating Host Homes.

However, I have a few concerns. As the bill is written, the current definition of Host Home provider is overly broad and includes the private family caregiver. Family caregivers, such as I, are not in the business of providing IDD services to the community. We provide care only for our own children. I recommend your definition of Host Home to exclude “a family caregiver”.

As written, individual family caregivers would be included in the proposed public database, leaving myself and this vulnerable population prey to sexual predators. I recommend that the family caregiver to not be included in this database, and that it not be publicly available. Instead, it can be made available upon request by HCPF or the CMAs.

Thank you for your time,

Vicki Krieger



James R. Potter
Legislative Advocate
1111 Red Feather Road
Cotopaxi, Colorado 81223
864-316-1058
jamesraymondpotter@gmail.com
February 15, 2026

Colorado House Health & Human Services Committee
Colorado State Capitol
200 E Colfax Avenue
Denver, CO 80203

RE: Support HB26-1147: Host Home for People with Intellectual & Developmental Disabilities

Dear Chair Gilcrest, Vice-Chair, Lieder and Members of the Committee:

I am writing today to urge you to support HB26-1147, which takes an important and needed step toward ensuring the safety, dignity, and high-quality care of Coloradans living in host home settings. Host homes are vital community-based options, but the current lack of centralized transparency and risk-based oversight leaves vulnerable individuals at risk. In addition, families and advocates currently struggle to find reliable information about host home providers and their associated agencies. This bill mandates a statewide database accessible to the public, providing the transparency necessary for informed decision-making regarding long-term care. It also requires the Department of Health Care Policy and Financing (HCPF) to establish risk criteria for service agencies, thereby ensuring that oversight resources are prioritized where they are needed most. Agencies with histories of non-compliance or safety concerns will receive the frequent, surveys necessary to protect residents and the bill provides a publicly available, electronic complaint form and a transparent tracking system. This legislation includes explicit protections against retaliation, ensuring that residents and their representatives can speak up about concerns without fear of losing their housing or services.

While host homes can provide the intimacy of a family setting, they also remain state-funded healthcare entities that require explicit and clear safeguards. For this and the above reasons we ask for a "YES" vote on HB26-1147.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "James R. Potter". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letters of the first and last names being capitalized and prominent.

James R. Potter, Board Member