

~ Since 1959 ~



MYSTIC RIVER

RESIDENTIAL CARE

March 3, 2020

Thank you for this opportunity to speak etc.

The proposal to afford residents the same protection they would have in an apartment has multiple problems as follows:

1. The concern is only for residents who have protection, not for residential care homeowners who benefit from a 2-month security deposit required by apartment owners. It is clearly favoring the resident at the RCH owner's expense (literally & figuratively)
2. RCH owners are typically private individuals, not part of a large corporations. In my case, I am sole owner of a 25 bed RCH – a single older female with limited resources with a business heavily in debt. If I took in a resident who needed to be discharged and went to the length proposed – superior court – it is quite possible that would bankrupt us! There is NO safety net for owners! Many RCH's are on shaky ground because we have not had consistent rate increases in a decade and adding burdensome conditions could well cause homes to be forced out of business. Therefore, you would possibly be saving the home of one resident at the cost of losing a home to all 25 residents including the one going to court.

No matter how many conditions are made similar, RCH's are NOT apartment buildings. RCH's offer 24-hour care, protection, medication management. We have staff dedicated to the work they do. We are not long-distance owners but closely involved in supporting residents in every aspect of living so they can enjoy a meaningful life. Why don't the many benefits already in place in RCH's offset the need for additional protection in the discharge process?

The proposed addition to the already onerous discharge process could be the death knell of RCH's. It will most certainly cause owners to be more than cautious about who they accept into their facilities.

Respectfully

Elaine M. Cole

Elaine M. Cole MSW,BS, Executive Director

O (860)536.8854

C (860)574.4881

F (860)980.3970