



Chair Schomacker and Members  
House Human Services Finance and Policy Committee  
Minnesota House

March 24, 2026

Dear Chair Schomacker and Members,

The Consumer Advocates Coalition writes to express our qualified support for sections 2 and 3 of **HF 4338**, which aim to provide some flexibility for how residents, particularly those with a cognitive impairment, summon assistance when needed.

We recognize that the requirement to provide a particular type of summoning device, such as a pendant or emergency pull chord, for a resident who has trouble using that device is illogical. A person-centered plan that ensures a resident has the ability to request assistance when needed in a manner that best suits them is best practice. We support the aim of providing an alternative that works for each resident and is thoroughly documented in the resident's record.

Section 1 of the bill is confusing, however. It is unclear to our Coalition why licensees of the Minnesota Department of Health would be treated differently than licensees of the Department of Human Services or Direct Care and Treatment for contested cases adjudicated by the Court of Administrative Hearings for matters related to licensing, reimbursement rates, procedures, or methodology of services provided. Further clarification is needed to understand the intended and unintended impacts of this portion of HF 4338.

We appreciate the Long-Term Care Imperative's willingness to discuss this bill to meet the goals of residents, families, and providers.

Thank you for your leadership on behalf of older adults and vulnerable Minnesotans.

Sincerely,

Consumer Advocates Coalition