

I am writing to ask for your support for H.184 (an act that would allow owners of rental properties to be certified (instead of licensed) to perform painting/minor repair work on their own properties). In October of 2022 the state Dept of Health adopted new regulations regarding renovation, repairs, painting and maintenance (RRPM) of rental properties in homes constructed before 1978. These regulations are in place to promote safety surrounding lead in our Vermont homes, and rightly so.

I am fortunate to own a modest duplex here in town at 56 W Spring St. It is the only property I own. I live on the first floor and I rent a one-bedroom apartment upstairs. I am a small-time landlord who cares about his home and the people I rent to. I work full-time as an RN, and on my days off I am often working on my home to make it a better place for myself and my tenants to live.

Prior to October 2022 the state allowed property owners and landlords like myself to take a course called “Essential Maintenance Practices” or “EMP” to teach us about safe removal of lead paint in our homes. The course was inexpensive and certified us for 5 years before we needed a refresher. It allowed us to do maintenance, painting, and remodeling ourselves. If you were up to date with your EMP certification you were exempted from having to obtain the required liability insurance with \$300,000 in liability coverage. This was all well because liability insurance is quite expensive.

With the updated Dept of Health RRPM regulations, the state is now requiring small-time landlords like myself to be licensed instead of certified. Requiring us to obtain RRPM licensing makes it seem as though I am a professional lead remodeler. I am not. I am a nurse and a small-time landlord. We are no longer exempted from obtaining the \$300,000 in liability insurance. The cost of this liability insurance is around \$2,500 per year.

In order to upkeep and paint my OWN house, I will now have to pay approximately \$2,500 a year in professional painter liability insurance in addition to a \$500 state licensing fee every 5 years. \$2,500 for the right to paint my own house! I am strongly considering taking my apartment off the market if this new regulation is not modified. My other alternative would be to raise rent significantly to cover the cost of this new regulatory requirement. We are facing a housing crisis and I am positive that I am not the only small-time rental property owner who is facing this dilemma.

I have worked so hard to make my home in Winooski a place to be proud of. As a landlord, I 100% support training to maintain knowledge surrounding lead safety. However, myself and many others just can't absorb these new regulatory costs.

Please support H.184 and the renters and small-time landlords the bill would help. I have attached a letter from a local landlord which was addressed to Commissioner Levine at the Department of Health.

Thank you for your time,

Michael Connolly, W Spring St, Winooski

I am a small-time landlord, and have been one for over 20 years. I am also a single mother. I am writing to ask that the H. 184 be passed. The Health Department's new proposed regulations will have a devastating effect on me and all other small landlords.

You will note that small landlords like me actually provide most of the work-force rental housing in the State. If I cannot work on my own properties without obtaining Contractor's Insurance (which I probably cannot get) at a cost of about \$3,000 per year, then I will necessarily have to pass this expense on to my tenants in the form of increased rent. There just is not enough "margin" between the costs of liability insurance, mortgage, taxes, repair costs, replacement costs, utility costs, etc. for me to absorb this added cost. It is getting tougher every year.

As a small-time landlord I have terrific, personal relationships with my tenants (which include 4 young couples, a single mom with 3 kids, and a group of young men just starting out). When it is time to renew leases, I look closely at my expenses and try to estimate any coming increases in taxes and insurance, and I ALSO look at the tenants and speak with them about what is affordable for them! Large landlords could probably get the Contractor's Insurance and spread the costs over their many tenants, but large landlords do not have the personal relationships and personal attention to their tenants' ability to pay that small landlords do.

While I understand the Health Department's desire to protect children from lead poisoning, this new regulation is too onerous and will drive rents upward when we all know that housing is already very expensive. And, it will be nearly impossible to comply with the regulation in any event, leading small landlords to try to cut expenses in other areas, leave properties vacant, turn properties in to AirBnB's, or sell...further reducing the supply of affordable housing in Vermont.  
Please pass H.184.

Many thanks,  
Suzanne M. Hebeler

I am writing to you to express my support of bill H.184.

As a small landlord with just one rental duplex the impositions placed on me and my husband by the Health Departments new lead regulation, especially in view of outlandish and hard to get specialty contractor insurance, deeply concern us. Further we think that fellow landlords like us will be forced to pass on the extra expenses to their tenants by increasing the rents in an already tight and high priced rental market.

We appreciate all your efforts with regards to this matter.

Sincerely,  
Silvia and Andrew Jope  
Pine St, Burlington, VT

House General & Housing Committee,

I am writing as a small scale landlord (single, two-unit property in Essex Junction) to express my hope that the House General & Housing Committee will pass bill H.184.

My family has been renting our property since 2017 and provide safe, affordable housing for two separate families. We are able to keep our units below market rate due to our own hard work and partnering with local contractors as needed.

As these lead law changes stand, they will provide a significant hindrance for us to continue providing the housing we do now. I ask that the committee work to pass H.184 and provide the common sense protections provided by the original EMP certification program, and help to mitigate the out-of-control housing market in Vermont.

Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,  
Kahlil Zaloom  
Linden Terrace, Burlington, VT 05410

I am writing to support the passage of H.184.

I own a building in Rutland with 6 apartments. All of my tenants are long term (at least 8 years). I was EMP certified, and did my own work for my compliance statements. I have always been EMP compliant. However, I have long felt that the regulations should be less onerous for buildings where there are no children, like my building.

I have done my best to help with the housing crisis in Rutland, by keeping rents as low as I can. I have not raised rents in 7 years, and have absorbed increases in taxes, insurance and fuel oil to do my part.

If H.184 is not passed, the new Health Dept. regulations will prohibit me from continuing my previous practices, and I will have to hire insured "experts" to do my job. This will result in a requirement that I raise rents, which my tenants can't afford.

In my view, the new department lead paint regulations are a regressive tax, which will convey no benefit, but will certainly exacerbate the housing crisis.

I would be pleased to testify, or to provide further information if the Committee like to have me.

Richard S. Bloomer  
Rutland VT 05701

House General and Housing Committee,

I am writing in support of passage of H.184. The regulations imposed by the Health Department in October for lead mitigation are onerous, ineffective, and will only exacerbate Vermont's housing shortage.

As owner of a safe, clean, and very affordable rental unit in Brattleboro I urge this committee and the full house to pass this bill.

I have not been able to find an email address for Tristan Toleno who represents the district where this property is located. I would appreciate it if either Mollie or Sara could share this with him. Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Arthur Pettee  
Guilford, VT

I am writing this email to express support for H.184 and ask that this letter be placed into the Committee's public record for consideration of H.184.

The Imposition of fees and excessive insurances, or mandating costs from hiring contractors is troublesome, unlawful, and does not address the safety concerns effectively.

In my opinion, a matter such as this needs proper legislative process and not a mandate from the health department.

Further, if H184 is not passed and the existing mandate stands as law, it is likely the following will be the outcome.

As a landlord, I foresee the following as the most likely outcomes.

1. Passing the financial burden of painting a rental property onto the tenant. The smaller the number of holdings the landlord has, the more expensive this burden will be to individual renters.
2. Increasing revenues from rental properties by transitioning down from long-term to short term. If the landlords real estate holding is no longer financially viable or able to be priced competitively with long-term rental market pricing, an obvious business strategy would be to transition from long term to short term vacation rentals. There is obviously increased revenues and thusly profits for a landlord to make this decision with their real estate holdings. Perhaps the state should cherish, incentivize and reward landlord, who remain in the long-term rental market and not create a burden that naturally pushes them from the business.
3. The financial burden of upkeep would be so great that differed painting maintenance on any scale would lower the quality and safety of properties being rented as homes. Maintaining the quality of paint on a building is not a task that is performed in it's entirety every time it is undertaken, it is a task that needs regular upkeep and maintenance in between complete paintings.

I thank the committee for acknowledging this and other letters and will conclude in expressing my support for H184.

Thank you,  
Jodi McLoughlin

House General & Housing Committee

I write to encourage your Committee and the Vermont Legislature to pass H.184. I own and manage residential apartments in a building constructed before 1978. I have dutifully followed the regulations required by landlords with regard to safe painting practices. I fear that burdening landlords with more onerous regulations as issued by the VT Health Department will have a negative impact on the availability of housing for pre-1978 buildings. With the state of Vermont facing a housing crisis as it is, there should be concern that the Health Department's regulations would have a chilling effect on those landlords willing to convert and maintain their properties for residential apartment use.

I ask that you would please place my letter into the Committee's public record for consideration of H.184.

Thank you.  
Sincerely,  
Mark A. Lenza  
Manchester Center, VT



I am writing in support of H.84.

As a small time landlord I am very concerned about the added expense and complications of the NEW rules regarding lead paint. Most small landlords like myself take pride in maintaining their own properties and do an excellent job of it. We understand the danger of lead paint and always do our best to keep our tenants SAFE. Most of us have been doing it since 1998 and do a very good job of it. It seems to me that we should be able to continue to do what we have been doing for many years. If code enforcement or other authorities find we are not doing a good job THEN perhaps those landlords should have this burden, but not the ones who have always done a good job.

Please add this letter to the Public Record and Pass this bill.

Thank you Gary Fenwick Small Time Landlord

House General & Housing Committee

I am writing to request your affirmation and approval of H. 184. This will allow small landlords such as myself remain fully compliant with the updated RRPM portion of the updated law - while keeping the public safe according to the law's intent as has been the case in the past. Thank you for your consideration.

Nathaniel Neider

South Burlington VT

House General & Housing Committee

I have been a landlord of 11 unit property in Barre, VT for 20 years. I have always followed regulations including the EMP Regulations becoming certified to inspect and clean my own property and file the yearly forms with the health department. The proposed regulations are overreach and extremely unfair to small landlords. Living in Barre, I already have to pay \$55 per unit for an annual inspection fee even though my property doesn't get inspected more than once every 5 years if that. I feel like we small landlords are getting punished for transgressions of a few. This regulations from the Health Dept will only put us out of business. Please vote to pass H.184.

Sincerely,

Dennis Aja

H 184: Lead Paint rules adopted on October 2022

Is asking for landlords to bear the burden of the costs of still more rules and regulations.

This is especially onerous for the small landlord who would have less income to cover these costs. As this applies to pre-1978 homes, which will already have ongoing repairs and maintenance . With the severe housing problem in VT, this will only add to the homelessness, with apartments remaining empty due to unnecessary regulations.

We ask that the Committee pass H.184 which will reduce the homeless population, and not have the small landlords bear the brunt of the work needed to be done to keep the apartments in good repair.

Please place this in the House General & Housing Committee's public record for consideration of H184.

With sincere thanks.

Christine and David Davison.

I am writing in regard to H.184 which is scheduled for review at a hearing on Tuesday 3/21.

I am a small landlord with two pre-1978 properties in Winooski. I take pride in maintaining these properties and went through the training process to obtain my EMP certification so that I could complete the required annual lead paint inspections for my units. When I documented issues with the paint those issues were promptly addressed by a lead-certified painter. The ability to complete these reviews myself has made compliance with this requirement both cost-effective and efficient. As you are aware, the legislature passed regulations requiring more advanced training/certification and insurance not only for lead remediation but for the inspections themselves. These new regulations took effect in the Fall of 2022. They did not distinguish between landlords who own just one rental unit and those who own many. For a small landlord such as myself, and being one who strives to keep my rental rates fair so as to retain my long-term tenants, this new regulation is both financially and practically burdensome. The requirement to attend lengthy training simply to complete the inspection and the requirement to obtain specific insurance makes this unattainable for me, however it will also increase the cost to have these services completed each year by someone who is certified and insured per the new requirements. Not only that, but it will be difficult to find such certified individuals/companies as contractors are overbooked and in short supply, and there are time constraints on completing the annual inspections. The new requirements will be a deterrent for contractors to obtain the proper certification and insurance and will make it difficult for landlords to find someone to complete the work in a timely and cost-effective manner. Ultimately these additional expenses will be passed through to tenants in the form of increased rent as landlords such as myself simply don't have the profit margin to absorb them.

In short, while this regulation may be well-intended in seeking to reduce the risk of exposure to lead paint and increase compliance with maintenance and repair requirements, in practice it will have a negative impact both on landlords and on tenants, while not reducing lead paint exposure/remediation for those properties where landlords have been following the rules to identify and repair lead paint issues under the former law.

I would respectfully ask that the Committee reconsider these new regulations and pass H.184. Please include this letter with the Committee's public record for consideration of H.184.

Sincerely,

Jami R. Bisson  
Landlord

Dear House General & Housing Committee,

I am writing to you today to write my support of H.184, and for you to know that as a landlord in Chittenden County I hope that you will join my support of this bill.

This bill will handcuff my ability to make the best choices for my rental property, and put me at the mercy of various contractors who may try to gauge my wallet for the basic upkeep of the property and EMP compliance.

Thank you for taking the time to read this, thank you for taking the time to discuss the merits of this bill, and thank you for serving our community.

Sincerely,

Joshua Green

My wife and own several rental properties.

We have always done much of the maintenance work ourselves...self reliance...saves us money and we are able to keep our tenants a long time because we don't have to raise their rent.

All three of the homes we own were built before 1978...yet I am quite sure that none of them have lead paint. ( one i participated in the construction...so I am positive that one has none....it was the firsthome I ever owned in 1974). Why can't we test a property and if it is lead free certify that ? By the early 70's lead paint was already phased out...only a small percentage of these 70's homes actually have any lead paint!

These Proposed new health department rules have already prevented us from purchasing another property and converting it to apartments.

These new rules will impose a hardship on small landlords , a decrease in building maintenance, and higher rents for tenants.

Please place email in the committee public records regards H.184

Thank you.

Dale Goddard

I am in favor of the passage of H.184.

This needs to be passed to keep small landlords, that offer affordable Burlington housing, in business.

I own 1 building in Burlington.

It is unacceptable that I am not allowed to paint the apartments in my duplex without 10 miles of red tape, and unnecessarily added expense/time.

Please bring some sanity back to this situation.

I ask that my letter be placed into the Committee's public record for consideration of H.184.

Thank you,  
Derek Mercury



House General & Housing Committee,

Please place my letter into the Committee's public record for consideration of H. 184.

My Name is William Gerlack I am a small landlord with a property that was built prior to 1978.

The rental property I own is a well maintained single family home. while I understand the hazards of lead contamination and have already taken the testing and licensing for annual lead paint inspection and have also taken the class for maintenance of lead painted surfaces I find it hard to understand why I would need to be licensed as a supervisor annually to maintain my own property I have no employees and do my own work. I work hard to keep my property safe and affordable but with the added cost of the Health Department reg. I will probably have hire the work if it is needed rather than keep paying fees to the State of Vermont and will have to adjust the rents up to cover the added cost.

I am writing this letter in support of H.184

Thank you for your consideration

William Gerlack

Landlord

I am writing as a small landlord in support of H.184, a bill that would make clear that small landlords who do not hire themselves out to perform Repair, Renovation, Painting and Maintenance (RRPM) are excepted from being required to obtain RRPM Firm and Supervisor Licenses.

My husband and I are retirees. We have one rental unit in the basement of our house in Montpelier. Our house was built before 1978 (although the apartment was built after 1978), so the apartment is subject to lead paint safety rules. When we bought the house in 2020, I took the Essential Maintenance Practice (EMP) training so that I could properly inspect for and take care of any painting or renovations to comply with all required safety procedures. I am happy to play this role for the safety of my tenants.

My understanding is that the Health Department, in issuing new lead paint safety standards and procedures for landlords in October of 2022, grouped small landlords in with ALL landlords in the new regulations, one of which is that we must obtain professional liability painter's insurance with at least \$300,000 in liability coverage. Our home insurance does not offer such liability. And I'm not sure what insurance company would offer it to us since we are not, in fact, professional painters. And even if they did offer it to us, it would cost upwards of \$2500/year. What small landlord can afford that?

If we decided not to try to get licensed ourselves, we'd have to hire such a specially licensed painter. I have been informed that as of this writing there is only one such licensed painter in all of Central Vermont, and it's Capstone Community Action, which does not hire itself out to private landlords. There are only about 70 such painters in all of Vermont — do you really think I could get one to come to my house and paint my one small rental apartment? (And I'm not even mentioning the cost to hire such a painter when I could do the job myself.)

Also please consider: This requirement for small landlords — if it stands — is going to have a seriously negative impact on the state's encouragement of people to create ADUs in their houses/on their property. If a homeowner suddenly has to also be or hire a professionally insured painter in order to have a rental unit in their house, you are going to see fewer people opting to create ADUs. This is NOT a way to expand the housing market. (I would add that we converted a mother-in-law apartment into a legal rental when we bought this house; I'm not sure we would have done that conversion if we realized what onerous expectations of us as landlords lay ahead.)

I also wonder about the impact of this regulation on small painting businesses. I understand that the EPA-certified house painter (i.e., he had undergone EPA training on how to safely renovate and paint in houses that are presumed to have lead paint) that we hired to repaint the house when we bought it would no longer be legally allowed to do such painting. How many small house-painting businesses will be put out of business because of this onerous licensing/insurance requirement?

I am not sure why the Health Department did not follow the guidance of the legislature in the first place and exempt small landlords from these new licensing requirements (as they did day care centers) but I ask you to please rectify this really unfortunate situation and do everything you can to see that H.184 gets passed by the legislature and signed by the governor.

Therese Mageau  
Montpelier, VT 05602

The new lead paint regulations are a tremendous burden to mom-and-pop landlords. My son and I have a small handful of units. We keep them in good repair and charge fair rents, despite the recent surge in property taxes. Please do not make our investments a zero-sum game by upholding laws that do not allow us to do our own work. If we have to hire someone for everything we are either out of the game or increase rents substantially.

Thank you.

Andrea Gray  
Burlington VT

To the Honorable men and women in The House General & Housing Committee in consideration of Bill H.184

I have owned a 5 unit apartment complex of which I live in one of the units in Dorset, Village, VT

If the present regulations are not replaced with Bill H.184 the impact will be felt by many. The tenants who are now renting and the landlord.

I have rented to great tenants. I have a renter that works at a seasonal job at a golf course. He has been with me for 9 years. He pays \$950.00 for his apartment with heat and electricity. FOR THE FIRST TIME IN 17 YEARS I WAS FORCED TO BILL MY TENANTS FOR HEAT USED. I HAD ANOTHER TENANT OLDER GENTLEMAN THAT LIVED IN AN EFFICIENCY APARTMENT FOR 10 YEARS. His rent was \$500.00 a month with heat and electricity. He was sickly and on S.S. and a great tenant his rent was never raised in 10 Years He moved last year to another state. I did not make any money on his rental, actually lost money. He passed last year. Another young lady with her husband pays \$900.00 a month with heat and electricity. She is going on 4 years. She pays half of her prorated share. Governed by electric clocks.

We are all living in tough times, with Covid and no apartments available in Dorset, Manchester, If VT Bill H.184 is not approved the bill as it is now in effect will have negative consequences to tenants and landlords.

Three of my tenants can not pay the heat increase on their rental units. I have not been charging two tenants for the increase and 2 others are paying half of what they should be paying. I am paying 75% of the Fuel Oil and all the electricity.

There is no way I can comply with the Vermont EMP requirements and maintain my property. I have taken the course and had no problem with complying with the older regulations. But the rules in effect if not overturned will force me in a corner along with many Vermonters.

I have 4 options,

Option 1: Raise all my rents of which none of my tenants can pay. ( Send Out 6 months notices that their current lease will not be renewed and will go up \_\_\_\_% to comply with the Vermont Regulations.  
Option 2: Convert my property to a licensed a B&B as I am in Dorset, Village and I am zoned commercial.  
Option 3: Sell the property as I am 83 years old and not going to be at the mercy of any licensed companies to charge whatever they can get.

The current regulations as now in effect are not possible. The current regulations are not helping the renters, Vermont as whole or the property owners.

For the few that will take all the courses and get the certificates and insurance, what will they charge us to paint a 3 room apartment to comply with the current regulations?  
They will charge whatever the people with a high income will pay. Can we ever get them ? How long will the apartment be empty waiting for them even if you can afford them?

If bill H.184 is not passed, In my opinion you will see more Airbnb listings and many apartments will not be available to the working class people .

Please let this letter be part of the record. Thank you, Frank A. Molgano Jr., Dorset, VT 05251

Dear Sirs,

I own two single family houses in Rutland that I rent out. They are in decent neighborhoods and I keep the rents low because I know how expensive it is to survive in Vermont these days. I don't make much on these houses, just a bit to help me get by. It is ridiculous what some people have to pay. Part of keeping the rent affordable is doing much of the maintenance myself. Since these houses were built before 1978 I use lead paint best practices protocols. The Health Departments new lead paint rules would make it impossible for me to keep the rents affordable. Please pass bill H. 184 so that the people who do most of the work in Vermont can afford to stay here.

Thank you, George Barbash

Please place my letter into the Committee's public record for consideration of H. 184

## **Small landlords and new lead rules**

We are writing as small-scale landlords in response to the new lead control regulations.

We purchased a duplex, built in 1902, on Charles St., in Montpelier in 2001 and have occupied one side of it since then.

To emphasize the small size of our investment, the duplex cost \$102K. We paid off the mortgage in 9 years mostly with the proceeds from the rental ;and since then have used its modest income (after expenses) to supplement our SS income and interest on our savings.

We charge our tenant, a single, working person, considerably below market rate and have not increased his rent for about 10 years. We consider this our contribution to affordable workforce housing.

My husband is 80, and I am 78.

We take the issue of lead control very seriously, as well as other environmental issues. For instance, this year we spent about \$6K to install a heat pump in the tenant's apartment, having bought one for our side several years ago. Also, we are starting a native pollinator garden.

We are in the minority of landlords who have complied with lead control regulations, faithfully submitting EMP forms annually for more than 12 years. In 2008 we had a lab analysis of dust and soil samples done by the Housing and Conservation Dept. and followed their recommendations.

**Our problem with the new IRC practice:** Unlike during the 12 or so years in which I, Robert, performed the annual EMP inspection, I can no longer perform or supervise safe lead removal practices (outside of installing window liners and cleaning in a lead safe way), but must either obtain an RRPM Firm and Supervisor's license or hire someone who is so credentialed in order to do any work that may disturb lead painted surfaces in our rental unit.

We are quite willing to hire a qualified service to fix any lead related problems I may discover in my annual inspection, but the way the rules are now, I would have to repair or at least mitigate any hazard that is discovered within 30 days, though I believe extensions may be granted. If the repair is not made within 30 days, a fine of \$5,000 would be charged for each day the repair is not made. Mitigation is required until the repair is made.

As I understand the way it is these days with painting projects and construction, one would be lucky to be able to schedule this sort of work as soon as this summer. For RRPM Firm and Supervisor licensed contractors (who have the required professional insurance) the wait might be far longer. I fear that \$5,000 a day fine.

For the dozen or so years I have been an EMP certified landlord for the rental unit in the duplex in which we live, I was trusted to do things the right way. I have come to understand that I am among the 3 thousand of 20 thousand landlords in the EMP program who performs inspections and reports to the Dept. of Health annually.

As I understand it, neither the Federal Government nor the State Legislature intended to remove that trust. Small-time trained landlords like myself were permitted to perform or supervise safe lead removal practices until the change this October.. Why weren't we considered stakeholders in the rule changes and only advised about them after the fact? I feel it is gratuitous and perhaps will have a negative effect for the Dept. of Health to abandon this trust and require landlords to take on the added expense and the challenge of hiring certified insured professional contractors to do the work they once were permitted to do or supervise. Not to mention the fine.

H.184 will remedy this situation.

Bob and Deborah Messing  
Montpelier



As a small landlord we cannot afford these extra fees and specialty contractor insurance requirements imposed by the new Health Department mandates. These mandate make no sense, especially the fact that daycares are exempt.

Please pass H.184

Please place this letter in the committee's public record for consideration of h.184.

Thanks and Regards,

Owner : Thomas C. Mckeon

Manager: James M. Fitzgerald

It has been brought to my attention, along with many other landlords in Burlington that this new bill would make us carry a \$3,000 Painter's insurance policy. Now, for some larger company like Bissonette's properties that may make sense, but we own one duplex on Park St. So please consider how this bill would make all the smaller guys who own one or two duplex's be run out of town! Burlington already makes it hard on landlords, and I hope that you strongly take into consideration how unfair this bill is. Thank you for your time.

Best Regards,  
Alex LaVigne

## House General & Housing Committee

My name is Jessica Vulte. This letter is in regards to bill H.184 and I request it be placed into the Committee's public record for consideration of H.184

I am writing to ask you to pass H.184.

As a small landlord in Brattleboro, Vermont, I used to be able to take a 2 hour Essential Maintenance Practices (EMP) training and test to become EMP certified, This certification not only authorized me to inspect and report to the state annually but also to use lead-safe work practices to make repairs, repaint walls and repaint an apartment between tenants.

In October, 2022, the Health Department issued new regulations concerning lead paint control.

Under these new regulations, the EMP certification no longer authorizes me to repair, repaint or disturb any surface in the rental unit of more than 1 square foot whether the unit is occupied or not. To perform these tasks, I will now need to obtain both a Repair, Renovation, Painting and Maintenance (RRPM) Firm license and a RRPM Supervisor license as well as professional liability insurance. This entails taking an 8-hour training class (cost \$250-\$300), pass a written test, pay a \$300 RRPM Firm licensing fee (5 yrs), pay an annual \$50 RRPM Supervisor licensing fee, and obtain professional liability painter's insurance with at least \$300,000 in liability coverage (cost ~\$2,500 /yr)

Originally, the Health Department proposed that small landlords as myself would be given the same exemptions from the costly licensing fees and professional contractor's insurance as owners of childcare facilities, but the new regulations only honor these exceptions for childcare facilities.

I am a new small landlord. I care about providing safe, affordable, quality housing in the two units within my own home. Because I live alongside my tenants I want us all to live in a safe environment. I interact with them daily so I am especially invested in having satisfied tenants. These new regulations actually hinder rather than ensure my ability to do this. The financial and logistical hurdles I now face, to ensure healthy lead-safe housing, are a hardship I am not confident I can manage without greatly increasing my rental rates. If I cannot afford the fees and insurance requirements, I will need to find a professional painter with the credentials who is willing to do this work for me. My past experience with this gives me concern for my ability to comply. Last year, I had to get an extension from the state for lead-safety work beyond my certification and, even after the extension, I barely found a painter in time. The properly certified contractors are already booked out for months and none of them want to take the time to set up for a job just beyond 1 square foot.

It is my understanding that neither the RRPM Firm and Supervisor licensing fees nor the minimum professional liability insurance are required by Federal or State law for landlords who only work on their own properties, and do not hold themselves out for hire to others. The previous inspection and lead safe work practices regulations already exempt landlords from lead poisoning liability by Vermont law, so what would be the purpose for the Health Department now putting such a costly and unnecessary burden on small landlords?

H.184 would preserve small residential landlords, such as myself, who do not hold themselves out for hire to perform RRPM activities exemption from licensure and mandatory insurance. This would be the same exemptions that owner operated childcare facilities maintain and what the Health Department originally proposed. Please pass H.184 and help landlords like myself continue to provide safe quality affordable housing.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jessica Vulte

In 2018, I inherited a family home in Winooski that was built in 1947. My 97 year old father and 93 year old mother had lived there their whole lives after World War II.

Winooski's Code Enforcement required \$7,000 in updates to the main floor in order to rent to tenants. Since then I have followed all the requirements for lead paint remediation , even getting licensed to do my own work with both apartments, updated all 11 windows, 3 outside and screen doors, cleaned and painted both apartments, worked in the flooding prone basement, etc. My rents are \$1,750, 3 bedrooms, \$850 for 2 bedrooms, below market value. Taxes are over \$7,000, water,sewer, heat and trash removal are also expenses I pay.

Winooski's Main Street renovation will cost me over \$10,000 for sewer line update. At this point you, like my family, think I should sell since I am barely making a \$4,000 to \$5,000 profit. Add the Health Department's imposition of hundreds of dollars in fees and thousands in specialty contractors insurance requirements for landlords who paint and maintain their own units. This is unreasonable!

Please overturn the Health Dept.'s new lead paint rules that were adopted on October, 2022.

Thank you for your efforts on my behalf.

Sincerely,

Susan R. Flahive

Hello, I own a duplex in Burlington, VT. My disabled adult daughter lives in one side. Tenants live in the other side. I need to be able to paint my own property. I bought the house so that she could receive services and live on the bus line. It's become almost unaffordable to maintain.

Basically, it's nearly impossible to get any kind of contractor unless you have a major project. I only have 1 building. I'm a very small time landlord just trying to secure housing for my daughter. I need to be able to repaint a porch railing or touch up walls between tenants. I value safety, but the new law that requires me to find a licensed contractor is a huge burden.

It's not realistic or affordable to take out special insurance. So for me, the only way I can comply is to turn a small job into a large project. Either option will cause me to have to raise rent in a tight market. I just want to be able to do basic things myself when the apartment is vacant. My other option is to sell, resulting in less rental properties in Burlington, and no home for my daughter. It's the last straw in an already very restrictive town to own rental property.

Thanks for your consideration,  
Amy Bradford

Dear VT Legislature,

I'm asking you to please consider passing H.184. Many small landlords like myself who only have one rental unit just cannot afford the costs associated with lead paint removal after the recent regulation changes.

I also ask that my letter be placed into the Committee's public record for consideration of H.184.

Thanks very much,  
Andrew Larsen

I would like to express my support for House bill .184. I own two apartment houses that are pre-1978 properties.

I have owned and maintained these properties in excess of 25 years. I took the course the Department of Health instituted on September 21, 2022, passed the course, got my certificate number R-I-99273-22-03542 and was told I would receive the State certification for a fee of \$50.00 and I would be able to continue my maintenance procedures under the new guidelines. I contacted the State and was directed to a website that wants me to register as a firm (\$500.00) then as a supervisor (\$50) if I want to do this type of work I was trained for. I have no employees, as I basically work on only my units.

Most of my tenants are long term renters some in excess of twenty years and I keep my rents reasonable because I do a lot of my own work to keep my costs down. Under this new rule by the Health Department I can no longer do any work on my apartments that may disturbed paint unless I register as a firm, pay my fees and secure insurance that as an individual would be very costly if I could get it at all. If I have to do this, become a professional painting firm which is not realistic, my rents would have to go up considerably and would be a hardship for these people most on fixed incomes. I request the small landlord be exempt from the licensing part of the regulation so we can continue to provide affordable housing to our tenants and would ask you and your committee members to support H.184.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully

Craig Lantagne

Newport, Vermont 05855



To Whom It May Concern,

My name is Giovanna Peruzzi (formerly Zaccaria). I am an organizer with the VSEA during my business hours and a small-time landlord during my personal time.

Last year, requirements changed dramatically for small-time landlords such as myself. We are now being asked to take on exceptionally burdensome requirements for lead paint repair and to hold the same licence as professional painters to work on our own properties.

I purchased my duplex in East Hardwick, which was built in 1880, on my own in 2020 at the age of 28. It took me nearly a year to find a home in livable condition that I could afford and I viewed dozens of properties. Before I met my husband, my plan was to reside in one portion of the house and rent the other out at an affordable rate to both help defray my personal living expenses (I am sure you all know that VT is an expensive state to live in especially as a single person), and to provide safe, clean housing to members of my community. Recently, I was able to rent out one side of the home to two female roommates who work lower income positions while I work to renovate the other side. One of these women was actually living at her place of employment and was a member of the hidden homeless population of VT before renting from me, and the other is a young woman just starting out in life who had no landlord references and could not find another place willing to rent to her. When I rented this apartment out, there were very few rentals available in the Northeast Kingdom, and most were priced beyond what working class people are able to afford. These rental market conditions remain the norm throughout the state.

I want to be able to continue being a landlord and to help provide housing to Vermonters and to remain a homeowner in this state. I moved to Vermont at the age of 20, and at the age of 21 began working with some of the most vulnerable people in this state as a counselor with a program aimed at reducing recidivism rates of moderate/high risk incarcerated individuals at Northern State Correctional Facility. After that, I was promoted to managing that same program in the community at Probation and Parole Offices in the SE Region of VT, then became a caseworker with the Department of Corrections, and finally became an Organizer. I have spent nearly my entire career providing meaningful services to the people of Vermont, and after more than seven years of careful saving and financial management was able to become a homeowner as well as a landlord. I saved every tax return, every mileage check, and every extra bit of income from my second jobs that I could for nearly a decade to be able to afford my home, and I made that money honestly by working jobs that not many other people are willing to do.

Though I acknowledge I am fortunate to be in this position, I want to express that I am not a rich woman and that I worked hard to get here. Steve Howard, who I am sure you all know, can tell you what my salary is and I can assure you it is not exorbitant. There is a stigma that all landlords are greedy individuals who inherited their wealth, and profit off those who are less fortunate. That is not the case with me. These new requirements will force me to raise rents on my tenants to even be able to afford any necessary repairs to my property, or will force me to sell my property which can easily be converted to a single family home thus further reducing the amount of available rentals in this area.

Please think of me when you vote on Bill H. 184 and please support this bill to provide small residential landlords, such as myself, who do not hold themselves out for hire to perform RRPM activities with the same exemption from licensure and mandatory insurance that owner operated childcare facilities enjoy. I am already EMP certified; I have no problem taking courses to make sure the work I do on my property is safe, but these new requirements will make it impossible for small time landlords like me to remain in business.

Here is additional information on how these requirements impact small time landlords: <https://www.sugarhousevt.com/lead/>

Here is the bill itself: <https://legislature.vermont.gov/bill/status/2024/H.184>

Please feel free to call, text, or email me with any questions. My cell phone number is 802-636-7358, and I believe some of the representatives on this committee also have my business card. I am more than willing to meet with any of you to discuss this further in person.

Thank you for considering this.

Giovanna Peruzzi

My husband and I are owners of three multi-family buildings for a total of 8 apartments. We have owned these buildings for well over 30 years.

We are what has been referred to as a Mom & Pop operation. We do all the work with the exception of carpets and flooring. Because we can do the work we have managed to keep our rents well below the going market rates. Our tenants live in our apartments for a long time. One tenant who recently bought his own home rented an apartment from us in Williamsville for 42 years. The Vermont Health Department's proposal that was adopted by the legislation is complicated and it will be expensive for the landowners. If my understanding is correct, my husband will have to obtain a RRPM license and in order to get the license we will have to maintain at least \$300,000 in professional painter's liability insurance. Yikes! In my opinion, if H.184 is not passed rents will go up, small operations will sell to big operations, and the housing shortage will be exacerbated. We urge you to pass H.184.

Sincerely yours,

John & Linda Walker

This letter is to Vermont House General & Housing Committee regarding bill H.184. Please pass this bill. The changes that the Health Dept implemented on small landlords who own apartments that are pre-1978 are costly and unworkable.

My husband and I have owned a 4-unit apartment house in Burlington since 1999. We have always maintained these apartments to the highest standards. We have both taken our Essential Maintenance Practice training course that allowed us to annually inspect our property and file the EMP report with the State. We could also use lead-safe work practices to make small repairs or repaint apartments between tenants.

These new regulations from the Health Dept are unfair to small landlords. Besides being able to conduct the annual inspections and file reports, we should also be able to repair or repaint using lead-safe work practices. My husband is a licensed Master Plumber with the State of Vermont. He works at the VT Air Guard Base as the Military Master Plumber. He is careful and meticulous with his work, and certainly it's no different when he works on our apartment house.

There is a serious shortage of painting contractors, especially those with this new certification. Plus, this is going to drive up the cost to tenants. We have always tried to keep our rents fair and reasonable, even in the Burlington market.

There was an article in Seven Days this week about contractors and home improvement fraud. It's rising in the State of Vermont and there's basically no restitution for those who have been cheated. If you're able to do your own work, it's much better and less expensive and we shouldn't limit this option for small apartment owners.

Please pass bill H.184. Many other states allow small landlords to paint and repair their own apartments and Vermont should too.

Please place this letter into the Committee's public record for consideration of H.184.

Thank you.

Gill Daudelin and Sheryl Felty

Owners of North Ave in Burlington VT (4 units)

Hello

I am a landlord, I have taken both the online course and the full day of class required to paint my property, however, as you will see below, there is no insurance available to me as a landlord. The email below is after a months of waiting since I obtain both of my certificates. It notes that I am unable to obtain insurance that is required to get to get Liability Coverage. I have applied online for my Lead-Safe RRPM Supervisor license months ago in January and I have not received any reply on my application? Also, the agency first noted in an earlier email that there is no insurance available at the state minimum of \$300,000 ("As an agency we do not offer quotes with limits lower than \$2,000,000 aggregate & \$1,000,000 occurrence") ... see the email from February 6 below on this email.

Paul Leclair

House General & Housing Committee:

I am writing to support the passing of H.184. I am the owner of four buildings in the Rutland area which contain a total of 10 Units. My husband and I originally began purchasing buildings in 1975 with the purchase of a two family that I still own. We lived in one apartment and rented the other unit. This arrangement allowed us to pay a mortgage, taxes and insurance and maintain the property. Over the years we purchased other properties hoping that this was an investment we could use in our retirement. We have always kept our properties in good repair for a reasonable rent. My husband died in 2015 and I have continued to manage the properties. I was very distressed when I became aware of the totality of the recent Lead Law regulation put in place by the Department of Health. I believe the new regulations are onerous.

I understand the purpose to limit lead exposure in children. However, the regulations appear to put all the responsibility for lead exposure on landlords and relieve the parents of any responsibility. Under the prior regulations the landlords were responsible for informing tenants of the possibilities of lead in an old building and to inform the tenants to report any problems to the landlord. Also, the landlords were required to do inspections on a yearly basis and report those inspections to the State. These requirements were reasonable. Any repair and repainting was required to be performed by a contractor who was certified to do such work.

The new regulations appear to place an extreme burden on landlords who own a small number of rental units. I believe that much of the rental housing in the state is owned by small landlords. For instance: The insurance requirements alone add significant cost to maintaining units, if the insurance can be obtained. In essence, the new regulations will require landlords to hire large painting contractor firms to perform the necessary maintenance on their buildings. It is already difficult to secure the services of a contractor for repairs or painting. The new regulations will create a back log for the repairs and maintenance to be performed as many of the contractors are individuals or small companies that cannot afford the fees and insurance required of the regulations. These increased costs will be passed on to the landlords and in turn to the tenants. Affordable housing in the State is a problem now and if some relief is not given through legislation of the lead law regulations, I believe the problems will only get worse.

H.184 gives some relief to landlords and I urge the committee to review the lead law regulations and come up with solutions which will permit landlords to maintain their properties reasonably and at the same time protecting the children of the state. Perhaps, if the committee feels that there is not time to properly review the current regulations and come up with reasonable modifications, legislation can be enacted to put the current regulations on hold and reinstate the prior regulations while the ramifications of the new regulations can be properly considered and modifications implemented.

Thank you for consideration of these issues.

*Stephanie A. Lorentz*

House General & Housing Committee

I am writing to ask that you support H.184.

I have been a landlord since 1996 and became EMP certified shortly after purchasing my first multi-family. Later when I became a Realtor, I was already knowledgeable of the lead disclosures and requirements of Vermont's lead law and have been able to coach many new landlords over the years on how to comply with the law. I have often explained how Vermont has done a great job of handling lead by requiring procedures that were common sense, practical and easily attainable by small landlords.

I am particularly dismayed that we will now not be able to perform painting in our own units without obtaining painting contractor's liability insurance. Will such insurance even be available to most small landlords? And at what cost? What was wrong with the prior requirements?

I'd like to be able to continue to support Vermont's common sense approach to managing lead in target housing and I am hopeful you will support H.184.

Please place my comments into the Committee's public record for consideration of H.184.

Thank you.

Rebecca Woodard, Broker  
Blue Ridge Real Estate  
Rutland VT 05701

## House General & Housing Committee

I am a landlord with nine residential apartments and four commercial rentals and have been in business for over 50 years in the Town of Poultney, Vt. I received notice that the lead law had changed effective last October 2022, and I understand that the law as now written will require me to get a license for inspecting and maintaining my apartments and also get liability insurance that is very expensive. I have taken the EMP training . I am asking you to support H-184 which I believe will correct this law that was passed last year. The change will change the requirements back to what they were before the change was made last year. H-184 would allow landlords to inspect their apartments' for peeling paints and also paint their apartments if necessary. This right was always there before but the new law changed the wording such that provision was left out, possibly by error.

Thank you  
Bob Williams  
165 College Street N.  
Poultney, Vermont, 05764



Hello, Representative Stevens,

I hope that H.184 will pass. Have you ever googled “ Most difficult states to be a landlord?” Vermont is a consistently within the top five most difficult. Small Vermont landlords do not need more punishing regulations that tip the business model to “untenable” - but I fear that’s the track we’re on. It's easier to sell , and be done with it than to soldier on with landlords seen as the " bad guys” by many legislators and tenant advocacy groups who target the profit in housing, as inhumane.

I follow EMP guidelines very closely. We do it by the book and by keeping the small repairs "in house”, we maintain a sustainable business model that keeps the buildings safe, looking clean, painted and taxes paid. Drastically higher maintenance costs will show more signs of dilapidation- and housing stock that just barely passes inspection. We are proud of our historic buildings and the homes they provide our tenants. We want to continue to be hands- on-responsible in their care while following EMP rules.

Private landlords supply the most rental housing stock in the state. For this reason alone all housing and tenant advocates should share some solidarity with landlords, especially if we are to attract private housing creation / housing management to Vermont. Management of housing must not be overburdened or there will be fewer units.

Thank you,

Steve Heim

## House General & Housing Committee

I am writing to you to request that H.184 be passed. I'm a landlord of one basement apartment in my own home. That i started renting out about 2 years ago. If H.184 is not passed that means the hundreds of dollars in fees and thousands of dollars in specialty contractor insurance requirements for landlords of pre-1978. Would make me have to raise the rent on my one apartment by \$300.00 a month. I would be better off not to rent it at all then trying to find one pay that much more. When the state and health department been talking about affordable housing adding thousands of dollars that landlords have to pay is not going to help with it.

Please place my letter into the Committee's public record for consideration of H.184.

Sincerely,  
Stephen Martin

I just wanted to drop you a note urging you to pass H.184. I am a landlord in Burlington of an owner-occupied home and then the duplex that I used to owner-occupy. These are my nest eggs, I am keeping them for the long haul, updating them regularly, and renting for below market rates in very good condition. To keep costs down for my renters, I like to take care of as much as I can within my skill set (e.g. I haul the trash with my car to CSWD to keep costs down and pay for internet for the whole house so that each unit doesn't have to double up on an internet subscription or coordinate with other tenants).

Another way I can keep costs down is by painting myself within the current lead paint regulations and guidelines and H.184 would allow me to continue to do so. The cost of either being insured or hiring an insured painter would negatively affect the workforce-priced housing I aim to provide. Being able to put a fresh coat of paint that I can get from ReSource makes it easy and clean for my tenants to move into a refreshed space. And being able to spot-repair my exteriors when it is a small enough fix is also a savings that helps me keep rent down.

Please pass H.184 and encourage your colleagues on the House Committee on General and Housing to do the same.

Please place my letter into the Committee's public record for consideration of H.184.

Thank you!  
Dan Kirk  
Burlington

Please place this letter into the committee's public record for consideration of H.184.

I would encourage you to please pass this bill. The burden, both in time and money, by the Health Department's new lead paint rules is onerous.

Everyone agrees that lead causes damage to anyone exposed to too much of it. It is especially tragic when a child is affected by this. However, the fees associated, and especially the insurance requirement, make it unreasonably expensive for landlords who do their own maintenance to continue to do so. But their only alternative will be to hire a professional, that has incurred these same expenses to become licensed, and therefore will need to charge more to recoup the expense. Either way, the expense will be borne by the landlord, and in the end, passed along, in higher rent, to the tenant.

The owners of these pre 1978 buildings did not build them, or paint them with lead paint. Nonetheless, these owners maintain them as best they can, and provide housing for the people that need it. The new lead rules amount to a punishment meted out to landlords and tenants, neither of which is to blame for the situation caused a long time ago, by the use of, previously legal, lead paint.

Citizens' health needs to be protected by limiting exposure to lead dust. The Health Department's new lead paint rules are a terrible way to try and achieve this. Please do all you can to pass H184.

Thank you,

--

Douglas G. Boyden  
Cel (802)363-8084

To whom it may concern:

Implementing additional requirements and expense on small landlords is wrong and missing the mark completely.

I agree that lead contamination is a serious issue, but to "paint" everyone with the same brush and create more government oversight that cannot be effectively monitored, is foolish and expensive.

You just need to review Section 8 housing in this state. The countless abuses of that system with virtually no oversight, is a perfect example of what this proposed bill will create. If you cannot properly administer it, you should not put in place.

In my own case, I have complied annually with has been required of me concerning my property and have done so in a timely manner. I am sure there are hundreds or maybe even thousands of folks like myself. If someone is doing what they are supposed to do, then continue them on the same path. If it isn't broke, don't try to fix it.

Focus your efforts on those who have not complied with the law / rules as written and get them to do as expected.

That is where your manpower and dollars will be best spent. As current offenders are brought on board and over time demonstrate they will be compliant, more rental units will become safer and the issue less overwhelming to take care of.

Thank you for considering my thoughts and opinion on this matter.

With regards,

Michael J. Boulerice  
St. Albans City Taxpayer.

It sounds as if HB 184 would make common sense and get rid of burdensome paperwork and costs for small landlords. My family spends vacations in Jamaica, Vermont, in a house which has been in our family since the 1950s. The rest of the year we live in California. When we are not using the house, I rent it out, on and off through VRBO. The language in the message about the bill from Sugar House Holdings says that the bill affects apartments, owner-occupied duplexes, condominiums and ADUs, so I don't think it applies to us, but it still sounds like the kind of thing that might make a small landlords say "Enough is enough." There are already plenty of reasons to want to stop renting; last year the man who had been doing our annual lead inspection (and charged \$100 for doing it) quit doing it, and when I finally found someone to come and do it, I paid him \$595 for the same walk-through.

When there is a chance to simplify something and make it less burdensome, please do so.

Thank you,

Helena Worthen  
Berkeley, CA and Jamaica, Vermont 05343



The Vermont House General & Housing Committee

Please pass H.184. My wife and I own a small 500 square foot cottage that we rent out. I have followed all past lead practices that have been required and maintained my certification with the lead class. We are in the middle of a housing crisis in this state. If this bill does not pass, and relieve this burden off of us small landlords than expect one less rental in Dummerston. The Legislature did not create this problem, the Health Department did. We want the Legislature to fix the problem.

Thank You  
Paul Chapman  
Dummerston VT.



House general and Housing Committee

Please Consider passing H.184 which reverses the Health Department's decision requiring authorized people to repaint apartments in buildings built before 1978. I purchased this building in 1985 and we repainted the entire internal structure with latex paint after stripping all the original paint that was present and hired a contractor to remodel the entire building. I attended the class for landlords who had buildings that dated before 1978 and attained my certificate. Now 37 years later I am told I can not repaint my two apartments and would need to hire a licensed contractor. This is an unnecessary expense and would cause a significant delay in turning over the apartment between tenants. There has been no lead paint for sale since 1978 and we are now 44 years later so there is no reason to tighten the requirements for painting apartments to protect the tenants from lead paint toxicity. Please place this email in the public record for consideration of H.184.

Sincerely,  
James W McIntire  
Windsor, Vt 05089

My purpose in writing you is in regard to the Vermont Health Departments (lead paint regulations) that will put an excessive burden on smaller owners of rental properties in Vermont. The regulations are excessive and unwarranted as most owners do not have any children that live in their rental properties. These regulations so not apply to any owners that own less than 100 or more rental units.

Thanks for your anticipated cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely

Paul G Mayer  
Schoolhouse Road  
South Burlington, Vt 05403

I am writing this email to express support for H.184 and ask that this letter be placed into the Committee's public record for consideration of H.184.

The Imposition of fees and excessive insurances, or mandating costs from hiring contractors is troublesome, unlawful, and does not address the safety concerns effectively.

In my opinion, a matter such as this needs proper legislative process and not a mandate from the health department.

Further, if H184 is not passed and the existing mandate stands as law, it is likely the following will be the outcome.

As a landlord, I foresee the following as the most likely outcomes.

1. Passing the financial burden of painting a rental property onto the tenant. The smaller the number of holdings the landlord has, the more expensive this burden will be to individual renters.
2. Increasing revenues from rental properties by transitioning down from long-term to short term. If the landlords real estate holding is no longer financially viable or able to be priced competitively with long-term rental market pricing, an obvious business strategy would be to transition from long term to short term vacation rentals. There is obviously increased revenues and thusly profits for a landlord to make this decision with their real estate holdings. Perhaps the state should cherish, incentivize and reward landlord, who remain in the long-term rental market and not create a burden that naturally pushes them from the business.
3. The financial burden of upkeep would be so great that differed painting maintenance on any scale would lower the quality and safety of properties being rented as homes. Retain maintaining the quality of paint on a building is not a task that is performed in it's entirety every time it is undertaken, it is a task that needs regular upkeep and maintenance in between complete paintings.

I think the committee for acknowledging this and other letters and will conclude in expressing my support for H184.

Thank you,

Eric

Eric McLoughlin  
Stellar Construction, LLC

I am writing to ask for your support and consideration of H.184 to allow small, independent property owners to maintain our rental properties under a certificate instead of a license.

My name is Christian Wideawake. I live on Edgerton St in Rutland City. My wife, Darlene and I, along with my parents Gil and Judy Wideawake own 110 Woodstock Avenue in Rutland City. We purchased the property 15 years ago to provide a better retail space for our business, Phototec. My father and I have owned and operated Phototec in Rutland for almost 30 years. The property is deemed part of the Gateway Business District. We have worked hard to maintain the appearance of this property. To not only maintain our investment in the property but to present a professional image of our business and our community.

In addition to our business the building has a 2 bedroom apartment upstairs. Currently we rent to 2 employees of the Rutland Regional Medical Center. Our family does most of the labor of maintaining our property. This helps reduce our cost of operating the property and allows us to keep rents for all tenants affordable. For 15 years we have had a certificate to perform Essential Maintenance Practices to handle repairing peeling and cracked paint that potentially is lead paint because a portion of our building was built before 1978. Recently, I upgraded my certificate to the new (IRC) Inspection, Repair and Clean. However, now I can not do a repair if the area is bigger than 1 square foot. I now need the (RRPM) license for Renovation, Repair, Painting and Maintenance. I am told I can paint without the license but I can not do any of the proper preparation that I have done for 15 years without the new license.

I have looked into the base cost of the license which could start at \$250 for the class offered in Montpelier plus \$300 for the license plus \$50 every year for 5 years (\$250). So, \$800 for 5 years of license to do the same thing I have been doing for 15 years. In addition, I am now learning that I need special insurance to even get the license. Insurance that cost over \$2000 and is for painting contractors. If I am not a painting contractor I am not sure I will be able to get the insurance.

So, I am forced to hire a contractor to prep the area for painting. I will also be forced to increase rent to cover the additional cost. However, if I list the apartment has an Airbnb I am not required to do an IRC and can prep and paint my building using the same lead safe practices that I have for 15 years without needing a license. I could only allow people to stay for less than 30 days as an Airbnb. Meanwhile across the street from me at the Rodeway Inn (built before 1978) the State of Vermont has been housing homeless people for far greater than 30 days in facilities that do not require an IRC or RRPM licenses for work done on the building.

I struggle to see how this helps make housing more affordable. In Rutland county we have a population decline. Yet, rentals are hard to find and the cost is rising. Landowners are converting properties to Airbnb to avoid the hassle. This in turn reduces the inventory of rentals which drives up the cost of rentals. Coupled with greater overhead for landowners, rents will increase even more.

Thank you for your consideration,

Christian Wideawake  
92 Edgerton St.  
Rutland, VT 05701

3/21/23

Hello, my name is Wilder Wheelock. I am a small landlord in Colchester with two old houses built in the early 1800s. I provide naturally affordable housing without subsidies to seven people.

The new Vermont lead paint regulations imposed in October of last year are having a major impact on my ability to provide affordable rents. My tenants are retired and working poor who have already endured several consecutive years of rent increases.

Having to obtain two licenses to do the same job I have been doing for 10 years is an undue burden. It also raises my costs significantly because the state of Vermont's laws are much more strict than the Federal EPA'S. The EPA allows up to 20 square feet of deteriorated paint on the exterior of a building before repainting is required. The state of Vermont allows only 1 square foot. On a 200 year old house there is always at least a square foot of deteriorated paint somewhere. The new rules are unachievable. I will need to paint my property every other year in order to stay in compliance. There is no way my tenants can afford that and neither can I.

Landlords, and tenants need relief from out of control regulations that are driving up costs of housing. There is an enormous double standard regarding lead paint in housing. Homeowners of pre-1978 housing do not have to follow the same rules as landlords; They don't have to file annual lead paint reports, and they can repaint their own homes on their own schedule, regardless of how many square feet of paint is deteriorated. I believe this double standard is immoral and elitist due to the way it burdens poor people with regulations that homeowners do not have to bear.

H.184 is a small step in righting this wrong. Relief from needing two licenses to paint my property, (which I have been doing already for many years) would be a step in the right direction. I would go further than H184: the state of Vermont should not exceed the EPA's rules. We should return to the EPA's rules as we followed them before October of 2022. With some of the oldest housing stock in the country, why are we shooting ourself in the foot? Please pass H.184

Sincerely,  
Wilder Wheelock

I would respectfully like to encourage the House of Representatives to act on and pass bill H. 184.

As a resident and landlord living in the Northeast Kingdom I understand how critical the housing situation is in regards to a housing shortage. I live in Saint Johnsbury and own an apartment house in Lyndon VT. Quantity and affordability of housing here is in very short supply and more regulation and more fees are just going to make the problem worse. Just to give an example, I advertised an apartment in February within 36 hours. I had to take the add down because of the number of applicants. There is a great need for affordable housing that is not subsidised. There is a large segment of the rental community that do not qualify for subsidized housing and I believe that without H184 their situation is only going to get worse.

Respectfully  
Michael Sherburne  
Saint Johnsbury VT.

Rep. Thomas Stevens, Chair  
House General and Housing Committee  
Montpelier, Vermont

Dear Representative Stevens,

Please enter this letter into the committee's public record for consideration of H.184, which is impacting small landlords all over the State with the imposition of additional fees and requirements for pre-1978 rental units.

The original intent of the Lead Paint legislation was to make housing safer for renters of older houses and apartment buildings, especially renters with children.

From my understanding, the goal of the original legislation was to strike a balance between having safe housing and to keep housing affordable for the most vulnerable population. However, the reality is that the new regulations that went into effect in October, 2022, have made it much more difficult for landlords to comply with them. We are expected to provide safe, well maintained housing at a reasonable rate, which we always have. However, with the rise of insurance, utilities, and everything else, please don't make it impossible to do so.

As landlords since the late 60's, my experience is that most landlords I know already do everything we can already to improve our properties and keep our tenants safe. Additional regulations such as those that went into effect in October make us want to give up and get out of the business altogether.

Please support small landlords in Vermont by supporting H.184.

Thank you,

Sandy Bender  
Johnson  
Vermont

Dear Committee Members:

Please support passage of H. 184. As an owner of a one apartment house in Montpelier for 38 years, onerous regulation by VT Dept. of Health threatens to make ownership by my family and other small landlords impractical. Many are already selling to LLCs, who sharply raise rents or convert rentals to short-term housing.

Landlords with few rental units typically perform their own maintenance and provide safe, affordable housing for families. Over-regulation is driving this niche owner from the rental ownership market to the detriment of housing affordability.

Thank You,  
Chris Owen  
Worcester VT



March 18, 2023

House General & Housing Committee

I am writing for your support of bill H.184, as it comes before the House General & Housing Committee for consideration this week. Why? As small landlords with Winooski properties, my wife and I know first-hand the challenges of maintaining a pre-1978 Dutch Colonial rental house. Years ago I became certified for EMP in dealing with stripping, scraping and repainting. As a result, we have put a great many hours of our own time to keep the property well-maintained and EMP compliant.

The new lead paint rules of last October essentially prevent us from maintaining our own rental property, which is problematic as the number of certified painting contractors in Chittenden County is low. I am willing to undertake the training to be newly certified but am not willing to pay the rather significant premiums in order to be insured. It's simply not worth it. As such, what would we do in that case when the paint starts to fail? Wait for an expensive contractor to come (maybe the following year?) or just let the paint start to flake off? That is certainly not a desirable outcome nor would it be good for overall community health. In our situation, my wife and I would actually consider taking the house off the rental market and thereby reduce the available rental stock by one house, in a market that is severely lacking in rental housing stock, let alone quality rental houses.

Additionally, if landlords are going to have to spend a solid month (or more) of their gross rental income on outside insurance, it seems likely that rents will also increase to cover this additional cost. This would price out families and individuals who are already feeling incredible pricing pressure in the rental market. And frankly, if the goal is to get rid of small landlords, which has to be the bulk of Vermont's rental suppliers, I feel like the State and its residents are going to be really unhappy when they are dealing with large, corporate landlords who have bought up the properties previously owned by smaller operations like ours. Corporations with minimal or no ties to the towns and counties, and who have no interest in real community. They certainly will not be interested in supporting the network of local suppliers and vendors we and others have used for the last several decades as independent rental property owners. Our trash and compost haulers, lawn care providers, plumbers and electricians, and the other myriad local tradespeople who work with us to keep our properties in good shape are just as important to landlords like us as our tenants are! Bill H.184 has the ability to continue this network of local ownership and positive relationships, and I strongly encourage you to support it.

Given a choice we would like to continue to maintain the property as we have done in the past- I paint the interior, and lower external areas of the house and hire out for the really significant heights. Again, I urge you to support this bill so that small landlords like us can reasonably and affordably care and maintain our properties.

I am happy to discuss this with you and members of your staff, and other interested committee members at your convenience, if that would be helpful in this process. My contact information is below.

I would appreciate this letter being placed in the Committee's public record. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely, [Chris Williamson](#)

House General & Housing Committee

I wanted to let you know that I'm very supportive of H.184. As a small-time, hands-on landlord, I have always taken the State's lead safety courses and done interior painting work myself. Doing it myself has two advantages - it keeps my costs down, which helps me keep rents lower, and the work gets done much faster. Getting a qualified painter takes months!!! To give you an idea: I booked exterior painting by a lead-certified contractor last January, with the plan for the work to be done last May. He couldn't find enough labor last year, so painting my duplex is now on his schedule for *this* June. I couldn't get anyone else, because everyone else is facing the same labor shortages.

If landlords are able to continue to afford to do painting work themselves (after being trained in lead-safe practices, of course), it will make housing safer for everyone because lead remediation will be done more quickly. Letting mom-and-pop landlords paint their own places also gives them an opportunity to build some financial security through sweat equity. It seems really silly to put bureaucratic obstacles in the way of all these benefits, and I appreciate the Legislature's efforts to remove those hurdles.

Respectfully,  
Elizabeth Allen

To Rep. Thomas Stevens and Housing Committee,

Please add my letter to the Committee's public record for consideration of H.184.

I'm the Landlord of a single 2 unit duplex in Wilder Vermont.

As a Landlord who takes the real lead paint concern in Vermont seriously, I spent the last half of 2022 preparing and researching what I would need to do to remain compliant with the new state rules.

I've since updated my training with the state and attended the EPA's RRP course in person. As I got closer to completing more of the state's requirements and completing the RRPM requirements, cost mounted, but the larger issue was the problem of attaining separate liability insurance.

I feel this leaves small landlords like myself in too much of a grey area in terms of liability and at the same time I see a severely short staffed market of painters and renovators who could be hired to meet the mandates if I cannot be covered to do so.

I hope this can be resolved in a way that keeps renters safe and also allows vital work to continue.

To be clear, I have considered selling this property to alleviate this concern.

As someone who has resisted selling my property at the height of the market so four tenants would not be displaced during a pandemic; as someone who has resisted chasing the rent spike; AND as someone who cares deeply about the problem of lead paint--the new rules should not have me in this position!

Thank you for any efforts which may bridge this large financial and liability gap for small scale Landlords in Vermont.

Michael Cannon  
Wilder, VT

General & Housing Committee

I sincerely hope the your committee will move H.184. As one of a handful of remaining small rental owners I will have to be in the position of removing or selling long term rentals if I am forced to comply with the new Dept. of Health regulations concerning lead paint abatement.

Just an FYI my average rent is less than \$700 a month. Please help me keep rents affordable for working Vermonters.

I ask this letter be summited to the public record.

Sincerely,

Mark Woodward  
Johnson

From: Adam Lipa  
Sent: Sunday, March 19, 2023

Dear Rep. Thomas Stevens,  
Chair House General & Housing Committee

I am writing in support of passing H.184.

Thank you for taking the time to review my concern. My name is Adam Lipa and I live in the town of Georgia. I recently became aware of a new requirement in VT relating to working on rental properties, specifically built before 1978 in regards to lead paint. My wife and I own 3 properties which we rent to some hard working Vermonters. We do our best to provide safe and comfortable housing to our tenants at a reasonable price. We have two great foster kiddos who we are hoping to adopt soon and our hope is once they are college age we can sell two of the properties to reduce that financial burden.

We have recently been informed that soon we would no longer be allowed to do any work on our properties to keep them in good condition without jumping through numerous (costly) hoops relating to painting and painted surfaces bigger than 1 square foot. My understanding is for me to continue being able to work on these I would need to obtain a firm license, and a supervisor license (about \$350) plus have commercial painters insurance, which appears to be about \$3,000+ a year if it's even available to a non-commercial painter such as myself. In my research it appears that small landlords who did the work themselves, but did not hire out their services were supposed to be exempt from this requirement, but that got missed when the health department enacted the regulation.

In addition to the increased cost of repairs, I'm concerned about the lack of available contractors who are certified to do this work. We generally try to do the work ourselves because that keeps our costs down, which in turn keeps rents lower. We would also be significantly less likely to do any improvements such as replacing older wood windows if the costs continue to be out of our control, causing less desirable units. If contractors are needed, there will be significant delays that will likely lead to vacant units, not helping us or the lack of affordable housing.

It appears bill H.184 would meet the goal of lead safe practices without placing unreasonable requirements on small landlords. I appreciate your time and attention to this matter and hope you will continue to support H.184.

-Adam

Adam Lipa  
Georgia

From: Betsy Braden

Sent: Sunday, March 19, 2023

Subject: Support for Passage of H. 184

Dear Rep. Thomas Stevens

Chair of the House General & Housing Committee.

I am a single older woman of limited income who owns her home in Bellows Falls Village. I rent a small apartment in my home to one adult. The income from this rental is steadily decreasing due to increased fuel oil, water/sewer, and other costs. The fuel oil cost more than doubled this year. Any more significant costs such as for specialized licensing and insurance would make it not worth renting. The Vermont Landlord's Association and others can speak to this much better than I can, but I wanted to add a voice from an older person who is trying to make ends meet from odds and ends of income. Please support passage of H.184. Thank you.

Yours truly,

Betsy P. Braden

Bellows Falls, VT

From: laura  
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2023 7:54 AM  
Subject: [External] Bill H 184

As a very small landlord, I implore you to pass bill H-184. The effects of the lead law passed last year are already devastating. The cost of house painting will rise so high that one of 3 things will happen. 1) rents will go higher than they already are, 2) small landlords will simply stop offering rental units, 3) more buildings will go into disrepair and bring down property values.

**From:** Joyce  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 19, 2023  
**Subject:** H 184

Rep. Thomas Stevens, Chair House General & Housing Committee

Without the passage of H. 184 (which reverses the Health Department's imposition of hundreds of dollars in fees as well as thousands of dollars in specialty contractor insurance requirements):

- 1, all rents in Vermont will be increased to cover the cost of fees and insurance
  2. affordable rental units will become less affordable or even unaffordable
  3. some rental units will be taken off the market because landlords with only a few units will be unable to raise the rent enough to offset the cost of fees and insurance
  4. ADU conversion will stop for pre 1978 structures and existing units may be taken off the market due to the cost of fees and insurance
  5. rather than spend hundreds in fees and thousands in insurance some landlords will just let their properties deteriorate, and when they are no longer habitable, they will be torn down
- Vermont's current housing shortage and lack of affordable housing will only get worse if H. 184 is not passed.

The Legislature did not create this problem, but you have the ability to fix it, which is why I implore you to pass H.184.

Please place this email into the Committee's public record for consideration of H.184.

Respectfully submitted,

Joyce George  
Shelburne, VT

House General & Housing Committee:

I am a small landlord being crushed by regulations in Vermont. My single property has shown a loss for years now due the overwhelming and strong support of tenants in Vermont, and also by regulations. This property was my family's home since the 1940's and was my father's and grandmother's home, and I am just trying to maintain it.

I have worked as an affordable housing advocate for many years and I unfortunately I have learned the hard way how it is almost impossible to be a small landlord in VT as I cannot pay my bills except through holding multiple jobs to support myself and pay the bills for a single rental property.

I maintain the house myself and this bill would reverse the Health Department's imposition of hundreds of dollars in fees and thousands of dollars in specialty contractor insurance requirements for landlords of pre-1978 rental units who paint and maintain their own units like myself.

I am in danger of losing the property and this more badly needed affordable housing in Bellows Falls. I am asking you to please pass H.184.

And please place this letter into the Committee's public record for consideration of H.184.

Thank you for your consideration.

Karol Kawiaka

White River Junction



Dear Representative Stevens:

I am sharing with you below a letter I wrote to my local legislators, urging them to support H. 184, a bill to certify rather than license the owner of rental housing performing renovation, repair, painting, and maintenance work (RRPM) on rental property that they own. I ask that you place my letter into the Committee's public record for consideration of H.184.

- Claudia Harris
- Weston, VT
- \_\_\_\_\_

Hello Windsor and Bennington County Legislators:

I'm writing to urge your support for H.184, a bill to certify rather than license the owner of rental housing performing renovation, repair, painting, and maintenance work (RRPM) on rental property that they own. The legislation is before the House Committee on General and Housing and, should it make it out of committee for cross-over, I hope you will support this effort.

I live in Landgrove (Bennington County), and my husband and I own a four-unit apartment building in Weston (Windsor County) that houses my real estate office and three small but lovely apartments. The building was built in the 1860's, and in an effort to reduce the possibility of exposure to lead-based paint, we've had the building sided in an attractive vinyl siding and replaced most of the windows. It's unlikely but not impossible that there may be any lead-based paint remaining, but we are still required to comply with the state of Vermont's new Inspection, Repair and Cleaning (IRC) licensure requirements for any renovation, repair, painting, and maintenance work.

In the case of a landlord working on their own pre-1978 building, the State requires that we must be IRC certified AND obtain both a RRPM Firm License (\$300 /5yrs) and a RRPM Supervisor License (\$50 /yr.). In addition to the licensing fees, those licenses will also require us to have appropriate insurance coverage for the act of working with lead-based paint, which will be at a significant additional cost. Landlords who are IRC-certified should be allowed to work on their own properties provided they are doing so for no compensation.

Requiring small-scale landlords to hire out basic RRPM work will result in increased rents . . . surely an unfortunate and unintended consequence in this time when Vermont is facing a severe shortage of affordable rental housing. H. 184 is a common-sense approach to encouraging landlords to maintain their properties in a safe and healthy manner consistent with the goals of the IRC and RRPM requirements.

Thank you for your service and attention to matters affecting affordable rental housing.

- Claudia Harris

I am writing to encourage you to support the adoption of **Bill H.184**, now under consideration. The bill retains new, reasonable training and testing standards for those small

residential landlords who maintain their own buildings but who do not paint or repair professionally; however, it importantly and beneficially removes the newly mandated requirements of very expensive RRPM licensing and professional liability insurance.

As the many-decades owner of a Victorian building in Burlington, where I myself lived for ten years, I have found it a rising challenge to keep rents modest (usually a bit below market) and yet fully maintain the condition of the building and its three apartments. City inspectors have evaluated my building as excellent, and given me 5-year certifications. On the occupancy front I frequently have had tenants rent for long periods of time, and--valuing reliable occupants so hoping to retain them--I've always taken pains not to raise rents more than 1%-2% per renewal, if at all. I observe all regulations, make repairs and improvements promptly, and take pride in a harmonious, happy building whose tenants are in turn proud of their accommodations.

During the years, especially the Covid years, I have received many unsolicited offers to purchase my building, at increasingly tempting prices. Those who were interested in it for renovation and personal occupancy obviously would represent a drop by 2 units of housing stock. Those on the other hand who hoped to buy the building as a three-rental investment were almost certain to raise rents, perhaps drastically given rising mortgage rates and government fees. Neither scenario boded well for my current tenants, to whom I feel a loyalty, so I decided to hang on for a few more years. Bill H.184 would make an important, positive impact on my deliberations about whether to retain the building.

All of this is to ask you to consider closely and to lend your support to Bill H.184, which helps, rather than damages, the prospects for small rental landlords in Vermont. Please do not make it overwhelmingly logical for residential landlords to sell their properties and turn instead to no-hassle safe investments. Please continue to include small landlords with childcare operators; both entities work hard, serve the state and our towns in obviously important ways, and should not be pushed any further toward withdrawal from the market.

Finally, I respectfully request that my letter be placed into the House General & Housing Committee's public record for consideration of H.184.

Sincerely yours,  
Lee Thompson  
Underhill, VT 05489

I am writing to you as a concerned owner / landlord of just one duplex in the Old North End of Burlington. I am asking that H.184 pass when it comes up for a vote this week. It is becoming increasingly difficult for small, independent landlords to provide affordable housing for Burlington residents. I know how tough it is to find a reasonably priced and safe place to live in the city, as I was a renter for 10 years. I keep the property up to code at all times, and do not charge an arm and a leg for the 2 - 2 bedroom units at the duplex. I'm guessing I'm way under market average at \$1,400 / month per unit. I do not want to have to raise rent - on young adults just getting by - to cover even more expenses if this bill fails. (the property reassessment 2 years ago took my property taxes from \$3,000 to over \$8,000 year. Commercial insurance is now over \$1,500 per year for the duplex.) I don't want to be "squeezed" into paying more to keep the place looking presentable and up to code. I am still young enough where I (and a friend or two) can paint and do repairs without contracting it out. Please pass H.184.

Sincerely,  
Dave Marshall

Please advise the committee studying H 184 that we strongly advocate for the passage of this bill to prevent our landlord costs from going up exponentially. If we find we need to do painting of our home due to the new Health Department regulations, the costs for having that done by a certified painter are highly prohibitive. We own a home in Burlington and have a small apartment in the basement. We strive to remain affordable--having H 184 passed will help us sustain this goal.

We can be reached for any questions!  
Frances and David Mount  
Burlington VT 05401

Greetings,

My wife and I own 4 rental properties with a total of 15 apartments . They are located in Barre ,Waterbury Center and Morrisville Vt .

The buildings are all pre 1978 and require EMP procedures.

We presently do all the maintenance we can to the properties including painting.

A number of years ago I went and completed my VT department of health EMP certificate .

Last year when the rules changed I also participated in a "renovation Initial" program in Burlington.

Unfortunately it has come to my attention that we would be required to have special insurance to paint our buildings under these new rules .

We find ourselves stuck between a rock and a hard place. It will be a significant burden to us to secure and maintain this specialized insurance (\$ 2500) simply to maintain our properties. Properties that consist of 3, 4 plexes and 1, 3 plex. It is simply not possible to hire this work done and keep our apartments rentable at reasonable rates.

We work to provide safe and affordable apartments to our tenants and H.184. passing has become very important to us and our tenants.

Very respectfully yours,  
Anderson Leveille

Dear Representative Stevens,

I am writing as a property owner and retired contractor to ask that you pass H. 184. I have been lead certified to work as a contractor and homeowner since approximately 2010. I have certification from the EPA as a contractor and have taken the courses and paid the fees 3 times since my first certificate. I obtained the RRP, the EMP (which was supposed to be a lifetime certificate) and have recently updated that with the IRC which Vermont mandated to replace the EMP. I have 3 properties and would like to continue maintaining them without having to continue to replace and pay exorbitant rates for certificates just to keep up with repairs on my properties, as I am no longer working as a contractor on other projects. The courses and refreshers have been hashing over the same material for nearly 15 years. There has been little to no variation in lead safe procedures. I am careful and care about our children and community and have been able to keep my rental prices well below market. I would like to continue to do so. I believe that passing H.184 will be a step in the right direction. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,  
Tom Freiheit  
Burlington, VT 05401

House General & Housing Committee:

My name is Matthew DeDiana. I own a two unit, pre-1978 building in Burlington. My property was fully renovated in 2010, and both units of my property have been through the CEDO's Lead Abatement Program in 2014. I file EMP inspection reports every year, and follow EMP guidelines when necessary. Occasionally, I've had to repaint small areas of the interior due to some minor peeling - mostly in the bathroom. My property is in great condition with very little lead paint risk due to the abatement work. I'm a "small-time" property owner, and I take pride in keeping it up.

Without the passage of H.184, the cost of training/licensing/insurance and possibly contracting would GREATLY outweigh the time and cost to make small repairs/repaints to keep my property in great shape. While I support ways to reduce lead paint exposure and hold property owners accountable, I believe the Health Department's new regulations are a leach on small property owners. It dramatically increases the cost-of-entry for new property owners. It may be such a burden that it works as a reverse incentive, where property owners don't make repairs, or ignore the regulations all together.

Please consider passing H.184 to revise the Health Department regulations such that it eliminates the licensing fees and the professional painters liability insurance requirement for small property owners who maintain their own buildings.

Thank you.  
Respectfully,  
Matthew DeDiana

House General & Housing Committee

As a landlord of an owner occupied duplex house in St. Albans town I was dismayed the Health Department was changing rules regarding potential lead paint remediation. The rule changes seem to have the potential for increasing costs to maintain my property. As a retiree living on a fixed income and financially strained due to inflation and a downturn in the economy more costs and red tape will only make matters worse. I am happy to hear H. 184 will address this situation. I ask that this letter be placed into the Committee's public record for consideration of H.184. And thank you on your efforts on my behalf.

Sincerely yours,

Jonathan Belcher



**Please consider passing H.184. As a landlord with a pre-1978 Victorian home I am able, at present, to provide apartment homes for several working families in Vermont Upper Valley businesses. They either work from home using the Internet or walk to their work.**

**I have access to a Certified inspector for lead and asbestos abatement and follow regulations of the Health Department. But I can not continue to meet the increasingly costly regulations.**

**Please support H.184 in this time of need for housing, escalating living expenses, and continuing public health concerns. Thank you.**

**David Davison**

I'm writing this letter to inform you how you're making the cost of renting go up. You are making my cost for painting and a cleaning almost double. This cost will be pushed down to the tenants. Making it even more expensive to rent here in Vermont. I'm not sure why you want to change the system you already have please explain where the flaws are? If you have flaws then what are they and why do you have them? I'm not for this law and feel you are pushing it through no matter what people say and speak out. I'm set against it.

Mathew Gadbois

House General and Housing Committee,

I am writing to ask you to please pass H. 184. I own a local Real estate company and have a number of apartment buildings and I know that we need this bill passed. The negative impact financially it would have not on only landlords but tenants to ultimately fund this requirement by the Health department is significant. Please help pass H.184 to rectify this situation. We can not keep talking about having affordable housing and continue to pass legislation that is detrimental to landlords and tenants.

Thank you.  
Brian French  
President/Owner



I am requesting that you place my letter in the committee's public record for consideration of H.184

I have been a landlord for more than 18 years in Rutland City. I complied with the EMP and IRC. I report to the state after inspection of my rentals. These inspections have been easy enough to comply with and did not add any extra cost to me.

The state is desperate for housing and the H. 184 will add tremendous expense to the landlord. If the landlord is able to hire specialty contractor, it will add waiting times to the process. Vermont needs housing now and can't afford to delay the process. Landlords are left with no income while waiting to hire contractors. Vermont has always been a do-it-yourself state and people here are willing to put the work in to better themselves. H.184 will add cost and time to getting the rentals ready.

The insurance is another issue. If you can't get insurance, you are out of business. The landlords will find other ways to invest and who will improve the houses that could be much needed rentals.

Lets be realistic and keep Vermont investors able to improve property without the extra wait and cost.

Sincerely,  
Geraldine Adams  
Dorr Drive  
Rutland, Vt 05701