

Roberta DiMezza

From: Nancy DeSocio <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Sunday, March 16, 2025 4:48 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: SUPPORT H5917, H5918, & H5906

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I am writing in support of H5917, H5918 and H5906.

I fully support providing safe homes for tenants, but the registry that has been made available is riddled with bugs and inaccuracies. It took 19 emails and 3 weeks for the DOH to update my address as requested. It has become a second job to comply with maintaining this database, entering all of my information (which is accurate) and then looking at the Public Database to see the information I entered is either not there or not correct.

Thank you for taking the time to consider these much-needed changes outlined in the proposals mentioned above.

I am writing to you to express my concern for the current rental registry and lead law. I fully support changes being made so that this law does as it is intended and reduces the burden and cost on the housing market. I fully support the proposed changes of The Rhode Island Coalition of Housing Providers.

It is essential to guarantee that the state cannot use AI technology to generate information for any public-facing registry, now or in the future. The use of AI during the registry rollout was deeply concerning, as it produced numerous errors, including incorrect property details, inaccurate status designations (rental vs. owner-occupied), misclassification of in-state and out-of-state landlords, and incorrect categorizations of landlords by size. While AI can be a useful tool, it is far from 100% reliable. Furthermore, the information that was published was neither required nor authorized by law. The law explicitly states that the registry should only contain information provided directly by landlords. This misuse of AI should never have been allowed.

As a landlord, I fully support lead-safe housing for at-risk occupants. However, data indicates that approximately 15% or fewer rental households include children under six—the group most vulnerable to lead exposure, as defined by multiple state lead laws. Efforts should be targeted toward this specific segment rather than implementing a broad, all-encompassing approach that is unrealistic and unattainable. Overloading an already strained system with additional requirements will not effectively protect children.

Although the state has doubled its inventory of lead inspectors, the majority are from out of state—some traveling as far as two hours. Understandably, inspection costs have also doubled in many cases. Despite these changes, the system remains overwhelmed, with landlords experiencing months-long wait times for inspections. There is still no efficient system in place to facilitate timely lead inspections, further complicating compliance efforts.

Thank you for taking the time to consider these much-needed changes outlined in the proposals mentioned above.

Sincerely,

Nancy DeSocio
165 Kimberly Ln
Cranston, RI 02921
nancydesocio@yahoo.com