

Aging Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No: HB-5141 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

AN ACT REQUIRING FEAR OF RETALIATION TRAINING FOR PERSONS PROVIDING ASSISTED LIVING SERVICES IN MANAGED RESIDENTIAL

Title: COMMUNITIES.

Vote Date: 3/5/2026

Vote Action: Joint Favorable

PH Date: 2/19/2026

File No.:

***Disclaimer:** The following JOINT FAVORABLE Report is prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and does not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose.*

SPONSORS OF BILL:

Aging Committee

REASONS FOR BILL:

This proposal would require assisted living services agencies to provide annual in-service training to employees concerning residents' fear of retaliation from their employees or others.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

Ms. Andrea Barton Reeves, Commissioner, Dept. of Social Services: They **support** this legislation and suggest that it is important that residents can report and voice concerns about their experiences without fear of retaliation. By requiring annual in-service training employees will be made aware of what constitutes or may be perceived as employee retaliation against residents. They believe that this training would help to prevent employee retaliation when a resident has a grievance and also it would alleviate residents' fear of retaliation.

Ms. Amy Porter, Commissioner, Dept. of Aging and Disability Services: They are in support of this proposal. A number of years ago studies were done which lead to training that was required of nursing home staff since 2013 concerning fears of retaliation and they think it should be required of assisted living residences as well.

Ms. Mairead Painter, Connecticut Long-Term Care Ombudsman: She is **supporting** this bill because fear of retaliation remains one of the most persistent barriers to residents exercising their rights across long-term care settings. She also suggests that managed residential communities are clearly included within the same framework that governs fear of retaliation training in nursing home facilities. Extending that existing framework would reduce

confusion and ensure on coordinated across settings. A new education video and training has been developed that is relevant to staff interactions with residents and the training is virtual and provided free to the industry. She hears from residents who are hesitant to raise concerns because they worry it may negatively impact how they are treated.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

Ms. Mag Morelli, President, LeadingAge Connecticut & Rhode Island: Nursing homes are already required to provide training and they have no objection to extending this to the assisted living setting. The states Long-Term Care Ombudsman recently produced an updated training video and curriculum for nursing homes, and they would be willing to collaborate with the ombudsman's office to tailor this to the assisted living setting.

Ms. Jeanette Sullivan-Martinez, President, Statewide Coalition of Presidents of Resident Councils: They are urging the Committee to pass this bill so that people in managed residential communities are protected from the silent pressure to stay quiet. We should never have to choose between our safety and our care.

Ms. Tonya Maurer, Care-partner to her mom: She testified in **support** of this bill. She had anecdotal evidence that she offered concerning the care of her mother and others at a memory care community.

Ms. Kat Ann: She offered some general comments concerning the issue.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

Connecticut Assisted Living Association: They offered comments in **opposition** to this proposal. They point out that assisted living service agencies are currently required to provide significant training to its staff on a variety of topics and they believe that additional training requirements would be duplicative.

Ms. Sarah Dzialo, She believes that this bill would impose state-mandated training requirements that would increase regulatory costs and would reduce staffing flexibility for community-based care providers.

Reported by: Richard Ferrari, Assist. Clerk

Date: 3/6/26