



**Written Testimony Submitted by Ohio Peer Recovery Organizations (OhioPRO)
House Bill 58 | House Community Revitalization Committee
May 5, 2025**

Committee Members, my name is Megan Conkle, and I am the Program Director at Ohio Peer Recovery Organizations (OhioPRO). Thank you for the opportunity to offer testimony in opposition to House Bill 58 on behalf of OhioPRO and its member organizations.

OhioPRO is a statewide coalition that uplifts the voices of lived experience in behavioral health. Our membership is composed of peer-run organizations committed to advancing recovery through advocacy, education, and peer-led support. We promote self-efficacy, choice, and autonomy for individuals in recovery, and work to ensure that behavioral health systems are shaped by the wisdom and needs of those with lived experience. Recovery is not one-size-fits-all, and high-quality, voluntary, peer-led recovery housing is essential to the success of many individuals in Ohio.

While we recognize the concerns that led to HB 58—particularly those voiced by residents in southern Ohio—we believe this bill represents a premature, overly broad reaction to a localized issue. Most proponent testimony came from Scioto and surrounding counties, reflecting a narrow experience. It is neither effective nor wise to implement statewide structural changes to current recovery housing oversight based on the experience of a small sample of Ohio counties mere months after new statewide standards went into effect in January of this year.

In addition to applying a broad solution to a limited challenge, HB 58 fails to address the problem it seeks to fix. Crucially, the problematic operators that HB 58 appears intended to circumvent are not certified recovery housing providers. These are treatment-adjacent housing environments—spaces where individuals live while they engage in outpatient or medication-assisted treatment. Because these settings do not meet the definition or standards of recovery housing, they fall outside the scope of OhioMHAS certification and would not be impacted by HB 58. As such, the bill fails to address the very actors it is intended to regulate.

By transferring oversight responsibilities—such as inspections and complaint investigations—to county ADAMH Boards, HB 58 introduces duplication, inconsistency, and confusion. Many boards lack the staffing, resources, and expertise to effectively take

on these duties. This risks creating conflicting regulatory environments that burden operators and jeopardize residents' rights.

The bill's proposed Certificate of Need (CON) requirement is an outdated and ill-fitting model for recovery housing, which does not receive Medicaid reimbursement. The fiscal note clearly indicates that the proposed application fee will not generate sufficient revenue to fund the new responsibilities for state and county regulators. Rather than expanding access, this model may discourage new providers and create administrative bottlenecks in communities that desperately need recovery housing options.

HB 58 would increase compliance costs, likely forcing quality providers to raise rents or close doors—leaving residents with fewer, often lower-quality, options. There's a risk that individuals in recovery could be pushed into treatment-linked housing, even when these settings lack essential recovery-oriented support.

Ohio Recovery Housing already ensures compliance with building codes and zoning laws while protecting resident rights under the Fair Housing Act. Many municipalities continue to use zoning to restrict recovery housing, and HB 58 risks reinforcing such discriminatory practices by decentralizing enforcement and oversight.

It is clear to OhioPRO that HB 58, while well intentioned, is not the solution this body seeks. Rather, we recommend that OhioMHAS and the Attorney General's Office lead a focused awareness campaign and targeted enforcement effort in affected areas. OhioPRO would proudly support such a collaborative initiative. We also support legislative efforts to hold bad actors accountable—especially through criminal penalties for those violating current law.

In Conclusion, OhioPRO urges the committee to reject HB 58 in its current form. The bill does not regulate the bad actors it aims to target, while simultaneously undermining legitimate, peer-led recovery housing efforts. We support strong, coordinated enforcement and accountability measures that are grounded in lived experience, not burdensome red tape. Our coalition is ready to collaborate on meaningful solutions that protect residents, promote quality, and preserve access to this vital recovery support.

Sincerely,



Megan Conkle
Program Director
Ohio Peer Recovery Organizations (OhioPRO)

