

**House Judiciary**

**02/12/2025 01:30 PM**

**HB25-1028 Modifications to Address Confidentiality Program**

**Typed Text of Testimony Submitted**

<b>Name, Position, Representing</b>	<b>Typed Text of Testimony</b>
Jered Morgan Amend themselves	<p>I'm in a unique position for supporting and amending this bill as I've moved through several different States and been enrolled in various Address Confidentiality Programs, you can read a good synopsis of what works and doesn't work in my article in Unredacted Magazine Issue 006 on page 12. ( <a href="https://inteltechniques.com/issues/006.pdf">https://inteltechniques.com/issues/006.pdf</a> )</p> <p>I noticed you have made some exceptions for "welfare checks" for law enforcement. I'm advocating to strike that, the only people doing welfare checks on victims of crime who don't have that victims address are their perpetrators. I'm literally in this program because I got swatted. I don't need people swatting me by making hoax calls where ACP gives law enforcement my address to continue such a swatting.</p> <p>Before I bought my house I needed to be in ACP with a Colorado address first in order to use it at the end of the home purchase transaction. ACP let me in using my work address since I own a business and am employed out here (which I suspect might be why the bill drafter is trying to now delete that language? Because ACP really wants a Colorado residence address, they said they would only let me use my work address for 90 days pending the residence address). I think this is the wrong approach (and honestly don't think their 90 day policy is grounded in law since a work address IS an actual address as defined in the statute currently) we should welcome perspective residents regardless of an out of state address since ACPs are not like licenses that have reciprocity, we should allow non residents to enroll BEFORE they move out here. Pennsylvania and New Jersey allow non residents in their programs and apparently don't have any significant cost burden.</p>

	<p>I just moved back to Colorado and in my county, they actually now have a process for ACP property purchases now that works well. They kept me (i.e. both my address AND name) out of the grantee index, GIS maps, assessor website, county treasurer's office etc. I showed them the existing law about written demand to not display on the internet and basically they've suppressed it everywhere. This bill would essentially make this process the standard, which would be nice since Arapahoe USED to do this but after I sold my house they informed me they no longer keep the name out of the grantee index, which is dangerous because then you can just lookup the seller's name to find the actual address as it's not redacted on the previous title of the seller obviously. I would hope that the bill is amended to shield ALL county records regarding the property AND the name of the participant, not just the clerk and recorder's office or the tax assessor.</p> <p>I'm not sure why you would do this in the bill: "Removing work and school addresses from the definition of actual address, such that an actual address only covers a residential address"; And in the same breath acknowledge why that language they are striking is relevant: "Clarifying that entities and agencies must use a substitute address in the place of the name of a school or employer or for a program participant's home-based business, if requested."</p> <p>I think this should be left alone, I own a business in Colorado and used that to enroll before moving BACK to Colorado so that I was ALREADY enrolled prior to making my house purchase from out of state, which they should also fix this too for people moving they should get a grace period to enroll before becoming a resident. Some States (like Pennsylvania and NJ) don't even require residency to enroll, perhaps that should be considered too.</p> <p>The bill also now applies to private parties which is great! But they need to spell out 3rd parties can not share or sell this information when a ACP Real Estate request is made, because unfortunately the realtors, mortgage company, homeowners insurance, house inspectors, appraisers(remember it has to get inspected and appraise to qualify the mortgage), title insurance and title plant companies will sell and share it everywhere and report it to credit bureaus and C.L.U.E.(a homeowners insurance database managed by lexisnexis) if it's not taken care of from the get go.</p> <p>(15) "UNIQUE LOCATION INFORMATION" MEANS INFORMATION 10 THAT CAN BE USED TO LOCATE A PROGRAM PARTICIPANT,</p>
--	--

	<p>INCLUDING THE 11 PROGRAM PARTICIPANT'S PHONE NUMBER, EMAIL ADDRESS, SOCIAL 12 SECURITY NUMBER, DRIVER'S LICENSE OR STATE IDENTIFICATION NUMBER, 13 AND ACTUAL ADDRESS. "UNIQUE LOCATION INFORMATION" ALSO 14 INCLUDES A PROGRAM PARTICIPANT'S NAME WHEN THE NAME IS USED IN 15 CONNECTION WITH A LOCATION IDENTIFIER, SUCH AS A COUNTY OF 16 RESIDENCE.</p> <p>Great definition in the bill, but I didn't see the phrase used much in the actual bill, I would also add to it that includes "Real Estate property legal descriptions, Assessor Parcel Numbers, Voter Precinct, City and County of residence, GPS coordinates and any other location identifying information (much like "Actual address" is already defined, so I don't know maybe redundant?) that could be used to locate a participant. Once the definition is updated, prohibit local, County and State governments as well as any person upon request of a participant from displaying on the internet or in public places "unique location information" of the participant.</p> <p>Oh, and permits! Don't forget permits ugh, you can't even MOVE to your new house because you have to get a permit for the PODS. You can't fix anything at the house without a permit that then becomes public record with the county. I've just been using an alias name since they can't even check my property record against the permit information, but it would be nice to codify that permits should have names redacted. Which brings me to my next point, need to apply this to HOAs and special districts too to hold them accountable, even if the public record is shielded and everyone in the house buying process agrees not to sell or share your information if the HOA or special district puts your information in a directory you're cooked.</p> <p>Thanks for taking the time to hear my testimony and I hope you will consider amendments to address these concerns.</p>
--	--