

Aging Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No: HB-5142 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

AN ACT CONCERNING THE USE OF TECHNOLOGY FOR VIRTUAL VISITATION AND MONITORING IN NURSING HOMES AND RESIDENTIAL

Title: CARE HOMES.

Vote Date:

Vote Action:

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 bill would allow extend the law allowing virtual visitation and monitoring in nursing homes to cover residential care homes as well. It would prescribe a penalty for interfering or disabling the technology, restricting or delaying a resident's use of the technology and failing to process or keep and any required notice, consent form or documentation.

SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE (IF APPLICABLE):

None applicable

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

Ms. Amy Porter, Commissioner, Dept. of Aging and Disability Services: They are in **support** of this bill. They have received complaints for facilities and staff failing to comply with this law because there is no financial penalty to discourage violations. This bill would establish penalties for nursing homes and residential facilities.

Mr. Michael Werner, Lead Aging Policy Analyst, Commission on Women, Children, Seniors, Equity & Opportunity: They **support** this effort. The bill updates wording to extend this protection to residential care homes and provides accountability if a facility obstructs a resident's use of the technology.

Ms. Mairead Painter, Long -Term Care Ombudsman: She **supports** this legislation since it would support implementation across care settings and reduce disputes that can become barriers to residents who are exercising their rights. The standardized forms for use in nursing homes and residential care facilities will promote clarity, reduce confusion and support consistent implementation. It should help to reduce concerns about devices being moved, turned off, covered, unplugged or otherwise interfered with in ways that undermine the resident's protections the law was designed to provide.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

Mr. Christopher Carlson, Esq., Connecticut Legal Services: They are in **support** of this proposal. The Patients' Bill of Rights guarantees nursing home and residents the right to use the technology of their choice to facilitate virtual visitation but to enforce this right under existing law requires the resident to file a lawsuit in Superior Court, which is time consuming and can be difficult for poor and low-income people.

Ms. Mag Morelli, President, LeadingAge Connecticut and Rhode Island: They do not object to extending these rights to the residents of residential care homes, but they point out that they are very different settings from the nursing homes and are required only to provide attendant staffing and certified medication technicians and that most residents live independently. They believe that these two settings are licensed and regulated differently, and the statutory language should reflect those differences. They suggest that the reimbursement language should be revised to reflect the two different funding structures. They have concerns about the proposed penalties for interference with technology and suggest that "**unlawfully**" be included in line 151 – 159. Any facility that (1) unlawfully interferes with, disables, damages, removes, etc.

Mr. Scott Rosenberg, Attorney, Connecticut Bar Association, Elder Law Section: They offer **conditional support** for this bill with the caveat that the bill be amended to "require facilities to provide contact information of roommate representatives for consent proposes within 7 days or, at a minimum (b) require facilities to solicit consent of a roommate representative, and formally document efforts to the roommates medical record, in a manner which could be audited for legitimacy and compliance by appropriate authorities."

Ms. Jeanette Sullivan-Martinez, President of the Statewide Coalition of Presidents of Resident Councils: They are in **support** of this legislation. They point out that clear rules that respect privacy while affirming their right to use technology in their own rooms provides strength to their autonomy and this bill reinforces that these are their homes and that they have the right to stay connected and informed.

Ms. Tonya Maurer, Care-Partner to her mom: She offered testimony in **support** of this proposal. She had numerous examples of situations where she had been able to advise the facility her mother was in of situations, that they needed to be informed about. She believes that video technology should be in the main area of their loved one's rooms (excluding bathrooms) and cameras should be in all common areas of all residential and nursing home communities.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

Ms. Simona Dhanraj, Assistant Administrator, Westside Manor: They **object** to this bill. They have a population of people with various behavioral health conditions, and many experience varying levels of cognitive decline. A resident may express consent to monitoring at one point in the day and later withdraw that consent. Many of their rooms are double occupancy and if one roommate agrees with the monitoring and the other does not, they are unable to implement this without infringing on someone's privacy. They also point out that their insurance costs are increasing and the \$10,000 increase this year is mandatory that cannot be reduced or eliminated. They see these extra costs as an unfunded mandate.

Reported by: Elizabeth Aheart, Clerk

Date: 3/6/2026