

Nate Biscotti

From: Martin LaLonde
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2026 1:22 PM
To: Nate Biscotti
Subject: Fw: [External] In Support of H.589

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Please post

*Representative, Chittenden 12, South Burlington, VT
Chair, House Judiciary Committee
Chair, House Ethics Panel
martinlalondevt.com*

From: Jesse Remick <jesser@blackriverdesign.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 25, 2026 9:09 AM
To: Martin LaLonde <MLaLonde@leg.state.vt.us>; Tom Burditt <TBurditt@leg.state.vt.us>; Kevin Christie <KChristie@leg.state.vt.us>; jandriano@leg.state.vt.us <jandriano@leg.state.vt.us>; Angela Arsenault <angela.arsenault@vtleg.gov>; Ela Chapin <EChapin@leg.state.vt.us>; Karen N. Dolan <KNDolan@leg.state.vt.us>; Kenneth Goslant <KGoslant@leg.state.vt.us>; wnote@leg.state.vt.us <wnote@leg.state.vt.us>; Thomas Oliver <TOliver@leg.state.vt.us>; Barbara Rachelson <BRachelson@leg.state.vt.us>
Subject: [External] In Support of H.589

[External]

Thank you for considering H.589 and a Statute of Repose.

As a licensed architect I am keenly aware of this and feel Vermont should become the 49th state to have a Statute of Repose.

Without a statute, Architects, Engineers, and construction firms are at potential risk to be brought into unwarranted lawsuits long after substantial completion has been documented. This can happen after the building has changed ownership, been occupied for decades with little to no documentation of annual maintenance and care. There are many factors that contribute to building issues, that to hold the design and construction teams accountable for the lifetime of the building is simply unfair.

Without a Statute of Repose, it leaves design professionals open to spend tens of thousands of dollars on legal fees just to defend our standard of care. Decades can go by as many things change in the construction industry like building codes, energy codes, standard of care, all of which we are held to at the time of construction. Setting a reasonable limit on this is necessary.

As a homeowner of a home built in 1980 that we purchased in 2004, I currently have the right to file a suit against the contractor or design professional involved in the design/construction of our home 46 years ago. We are required at the time to pay for a building inspector, just to receive a mortgage. Even after a thorough inspection, we chose to purchase the home. Now, 46 years later, a deficiency has surfaced that—

while standard practice at the time of construction—is being called into question. This forces the design professional to defend their original work, often incurring massive legal fees only to be proven innocent or, unfairly, forced to settle simply because it is the most cost-effective path. As a homeowner, I could not imagine pursuing this, and yet as you heard during testimony, it happens. Why is our state 1 of 2 in our country to not prevent this injustice?

I recently learned from a licensed structural engineer we work frequently, that his Liability Insurance provider in deterring him from working on any residential projects because of the liability. As housing is critical to our state, this is a concern we cannot ignore.

I hope you will support moving the bill forward to a full vote so that Vermont can join the rest of the country in setting reasonable limits on liability in our industry.

Thank you,
Jesse Remick
Montpelier Resident, life-long Vermonter.

Jesse Remick, Architect, Partner

direct: (802) 223-2400 x114

cell: (802) 279-4210

BLACK RIVER DESIGN, ARCHITECTS

73 Main St., Suite 9 | Montpelier, Vermont 05602

main: (802) 223-2044

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.