

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Dennis Vieira <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Monday, May 4, 2026 2:58 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSED RENT CONTROL - H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I am writing to respectfully oppose the proposed rent control ordinance and to urge the State House to reconsider this policy in light of its well-documented and unintended consequences.

While housing affordability is a serious concern, rent control ultimately reduces the supply of housing and worsens the very problem it seeks to solve. When rents are capped, developers are far less likely to build new housing, and existing property owners are forced to delay improvements or exit the rental market altogether. The result is fewer available units, aging buildings, and increased competition for housing—driving prices up for everyone not fortunate enough to secure a regulated unit.

This is especially concerning in Rhode Island, where much of the housing stock is older and requires constant reinvestment to remain safe and livable. Rent control limits the ability to keep pace with rising costs such as taxes, insurance, utilities, maintenance, and repairs—none of which are capped. Over time, this leads to deterioration of existing housing and declining neighborhood conditions, ultimately harming tenants.

Rent control also carries significant fiscal consequences for the state. When property values decline, municipal tax revenues fall as well. Because local governments rely heavily on real estate taxes to fund essential services, these losses directly impact public schools, public safety, public works, transportation, libraries, and other critical services. When revenue declines, the tax burden shifts to single-family homeowners and owner-occupants who are least able to absorb additional costs.

Equally important, rent control is not an equitable solution. It does not reliably reach those most in need. Instead, it often benefits higher-income households who secure regulated units, regardless of financial need, while lower-income renters face fewer options and longer waits in an increasingly constrained market. By discouraging new construction, rent control also reduces housing mobility, limiting the natural process by which new housing creates opportunities throughout the market.

Although a small number of tenants may experience short-term relief, the long-term effects are fewer housing choices, higher rents for unregulated units, reduced maintenance, and greater inequity. These outcomes have been consistently observed in cities that have adopted similar policies.

Rhode Island would be better served by solutions that expand housing supply and provide targeted assistance to residents who truly need help. Investing in housing production, reducing unnecessary regulatory barriers, and strengthening direct rental assistance programs offer a more effective and sustainable path toward affordability—without the harmful side effects of rent control.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the state to oppose the proposed rent control ordinance and pursue policies that promote long-term housing stability and opportunity for all residents.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Dennis Vieira
130 Dexterdale Rd Apt 2
Providence, RI 02906
dennisvieira@icloud.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of joseph furtado <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Opposed -Rent Control H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

use common sense

Rent control has been studied extensively, and over 94% of economists conclude it creates more housing problems than it solves. A few of the key reasons are below.

First, rent control distorts the housing market by holding rents below the level set by supply and demand. When prices are capped, some owners choose not to rent units or delay improvements, and fewer new apartments get built in the first place. Lower allowable rents reduce the projected value of new housing, which often cannot offset rising construction costs driven by inflation and higher interest rates.

Second, restricted rental income affects upkeep. When revenue cannot keep pace with expenses, maintenance is reduced and buildings gradually decline. Owners who purchased recently may only be able to afford basic repairs, while others with lower mortgage costs may still avoid major upgrades because they know they cannot recover the investment through future rents.

Finally, rent control interferes with normal housing mobility. Households who could afford market-rate housing often remain in regulated units, while those with the greatest need struggle to find available apartments. Because the policy discourages construction of new rental and multifamily housing, fewer affordable options open up over time.

In practice, rent control locks tenants into place, limits reinvestment in aging housing stock, and significantly reduces new development by weakening the financial viability of building housing.

Research and policy analysis in Rhode Island, including recommendations discussed by the Rhode Island Public Expenditure Council (RIPEC), instead emphasize approaches that directly address affordability without suppressing housing production. These include expanding housing supply through zoning and permitting reform, encouraging new construction and redevelopment, supporting rehabilitation of existing units, and providing targeted assistance such as rental subsidies or income-based support for households most in need.

For these reasons, policymakers should pursue solutions that increase housing availability and target aid effectively, rather than adopt rent regulation policies that risk reducing supply and housing quality.

Sincerely,

joseph furtado
99 1st Ave
Woonsocket, RI 02895
jovette77@yahoo.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Zilla Docanto <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE RENT CONTROL H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I am writing to express opposition to House Bill 8108.

This legislation should be understood as a policy detrimental to the state economy, not a landlord-tenant disagreement. Policies that regulate housing prices alter incentives across the entire housing market — influencing investment, maintenance, lending, insurance underwriting, and ultimately whether additional housing is created in Rhode Island. Analysis from the Rhode Island Public Expenditure Council (RIPEC) consistently emphasizes two realities about our state's housing and municipal finance structure: Rhode Island faces a structural housing shortage, and municipalities rely heavily on stable property values to fund core public services. Policies that discourage reinvestment or reduce property values directly undermine both of these conditions at the same time.

By limiting the financial viability of rental housing, this proposal risks reducing reinvestment in existing units and slowing new development. RIPEC's research has highlighted that increasing supply is essential to improving affordability. Measures that restrict returns on housing do the opposite — they discourage production and delay rehabilitation, worsening long-term affordability rather than improving it.

The bill would also require an extensive regulatory framework to administer compliance, hearings, and enforcement. This type of permanent oversight structure carries substantial cost while producing no new housing units. Rhode Island's limited public resources would be more effectively directed toward targeted assistance programs and policies that expand supply — approaches that research repeatedly shows are more effective at helping households facing affordability challenges.

Additionally, if regulated property values stagnate while municipal obligations remain constant, tax burdens inevitably shift. Because municipalities must still fund schools, infrastructure, and safety services, pressure moves toward the most stable tax base: single-family homeowners.

Rhode Island's housing challenge is real, but long-term affordability depends on increasing availability and encouraging reinvestment — not discouraging it. For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose H8108 and instead focus on policies that expand housing opportunity and directly assist residents in need.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Zilla Docanto
308 Willow St
Woonsocket, RI 02895
zdocanto11@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of janice hannert <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Oppose Rent Control H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

Please do not pass Rent Control. This bill if passed, will not achieve what it is trying to do and will hurt housing in Rhode Island.

Landlords want to have stable long term tenants. It is expensive when tenants move. You have to renovate the apartment, find a new tenant, you might have a vacant month where you do not receive rent. You have to pay the utilities while the apartment is vacant, get a new lead certificate, etc. Turnover is not good.

In the past I tried not to raise the rent until the tenant moved and I would then renovate the apartment and bring the rent in line with market rent. This bill will force me to raise the rent on every tenant every year because it does not allow vacant units to be brought up to market after a tenant has moved. It will be VERY disruptive to the stability of housing in Providence.

Rent control is not need based. The results are not targeted to lower income households. As a small private landlord I try not to raise rents on people who cannot afford it because I know they will have to move.

My house is in a local historic district. It costs more to maintain a historic home with wood clapboard and wooden windows than a newer home with vinyl siding and vinyl windows. I will not be able to maintain my historic house under rent control provisions.

Rents went up during COVID when people were allowed to work remotely and people were moving here from New York and other places. Most people are now required to be back in the office at least part time so these people are gone and rents are already softening.

Rent control will hurt housing in Rhode Island. The real estate taxes that are collected are based on assessments which are based on the revenue of rental real estate. Property values will go down and the amount of real estate taxes the Cities and Towns can collect will go down and they may not be able to pay their bills.

What is the cost of administering this program? Does anyone have a budget? We need a cost benefit analysis. This is not something to rush into, it needs to be carefully studied. Property owners do not need another layer of bureaucracy to oversee real estate.

Adopting the proposed rent stabilization ordinance is a bad idea. Landlords will not be able to maintain their properties and the quality of housing will suffer.

Please do not pass rent control!

Sincerely,

janice hannert
242 Broadway
Providence, RI 02903
hcj132@yahoo.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Ariana Salamone <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE RENT CONTROL - H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I respectfully submit testimony in opposition to H8108 (Rent Control)

The discussion around this proposal is not a landlord-tenant dispute; it is a statewide economic policy that will shape housing availability, investment decisions, and the cost of living across Rhode Island. Even individuals or properties that appear exempt would still experience its consequences, because regulating prices changes behavior throughout the entire housing market — influencing lending, insurance, screening practices, reinvestment, and whether housing is created at all.

The bill would also require a substantial administrative system. Boards, hearings, compliance review, and enforcement actions cost millions of dollars to operate while producing no additional housing supply. Rhode Island's limited public resources would be better directed toward targeted and proven approaches that assist residents who are struggling to afford housing rather than maintaining a permanent regulatory bureaucracy.

There is also a tax impact. When regulated properties lose value or stagnate, municipalities must still fund schools, public safety services, and essential services. That burden does not disappear — it shifts, most often onto single-family homeowners.

Across decades of research, economists broadly agree that rent control reduces housing supply and worsens long-term affordability for the following reasons:

- Market distortion — Artificial price ceilings separate rents from supply and demand, discouraging participation in the rental market and creating shortages.
- Declining housing quality — Limited income potential reduces the ability and incentive to maintain or improve properties.
- Allocation inefficiency — Subsidies are not reliably targeted to those most in need, while others cannot find available housing.
- Reduced investment — New construction and reinvestment become less financially viable, slowing housing creation.
- Unintended consequences — Supply shrinks, screening becomes stricter, and housing shifts to alternative uses.
- Market segmentation — A divided market forms between controlled and uncontrolled units, increasing disparities.
- Administrative burden — Complex rules require ongoing enforcement and litigation at public expense.
- Legal and operational strain — Expanded litigation exposure and capped turnover rents make it difficult to fund necessary repairs between tenancies while also adding pressure to already burdened courts.

Rhode Island faces a real housing affordability challenge, but policies that restrict housing creation and shift costs onto homeowners will not solve it. Expanding supply and using targeted assistance for households in need are more effective approaches.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose all rent control proposals.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Ariana Salamone
28 Bayberry Rd
Smithfield, RI 02917
asalamoneholdings@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of David Sullivan <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE - Please vote NO H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I respectfully submit testimony in opposition to H8108

This legislation should be viewed as a statewide economic policy rather than a landlord-tenant dispute. Regulating housing prices changes incentives across the entire market — affecting investment decisions, property maintenance, financing, and ultimately the availability of housing for Rhode Island residents.

Evidence from other jurisdictions consistently shows that rent control reduces housing supply and reinvestment. A national survey by the National Apartment Association found that 71% of housing providers expect to reduce or halt investment in regulated markets, while more than 60% report deferring non-essential maintenance and improvements. The National Association of Home Builders similarly reports that nearly 90% of builders avoid constructing housing in rent-controlled jurisdictions.

This is particularly concerning in Rhode Island, where over 80% of the housing stock is older and depends on continual reinvestment to remain safe and habitable. Limiting rental income makes it more difficult to finance repairs, modernization, and energy improvements, which ultimately harms the quality of housing available to tenants.

Historical outcomes reinforce this pattern. In the 1980s, after rent control was imposed, the number of rental units declined by 8% in Cambridge and 12% in Brookline, Massachusetts. After Cambridge repealed rent control in 1994, permits for new construction and renovation more than doubled for the following decade — demonstrating how regulation had suppressed housing activity.

Rent regulation also affects public finances. Reduced property values translate into reduced tax revenue for essential services. Because municipalities rely heavily on property taxation, that burden does not disappear — it shifts, often onto single-family homeowners. In Portland, Maine, analysts estimated \$6.3 to \$10.6 million annually in redistributed tax burden onto other property owners following similar policies. Many of Rhode Island's cities have a larger share of multifamily property in comparison to Portland, ME - meaning that shift would be even larger.

Finally, rent control often fails to reach those most in need. After repeal in Cambridge, a study of over 12,000 units showed only 10% of rent-controlled units were occupied by low-income households, illustrating how broad price controls can misallocate benefits while making housing harder to find for future renters.

Rhode Island faces a real affordability challenge, but long-term solutions require expanding housing availability and supporting targeted assistance for households in need — not discouraging housing creation and reinvestment.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose this proposal.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

David Sullivan

25 Lillian Ave
Rumford, RI 02916
fth547@aol.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of Michael A Tortolani
<user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Oppose Rent Control H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

Housing affordability is a serious and legitimate concern. However, this proposal adopts a rigid price-control framework that will undermine housing production, discourage reinvestment in existing properties, and ultimately restrict supply in a market that already faces long-standing structural constraints.

The ordinance would cap rent increases at 4% annually, restrict rent resets between tenancies through vacancy control, and impose substantial statutory penalties — including three months' rent in damages, attorneys' fees, and potential punitive damages — for violations. This combination of price caps, administrative oversight, and litigation exposure creates significant regulatory risk for housing providers of all sizes, and fuels displacement of residents by fueling massive disinvestment from the current diverse housing provider market that is unique to Rhode Island.

Providence has faced barriers to new housing production for decades. Only recently has the state taken meaningful steps to encourage additional units through zoning reform, ADUs, and more flexible use of existing structures. Not all new housing comes in the form of large-scale developments. Many units enter the market through two-family conversions, small additions, and incremental reinvestment in existing properties. Policies that disconnect rent levels from operating costs, inflation, property taxes, and insurance premiums will slow this momentum.

Vacancy control is especially concerning. By limiting the ability to reset rent between tenancies, the ordinance suppresses normal market turnover dynamics. In other jurisdictions, similar frameworks have led to reduced mobility, deferred maintenance, and withdrawal of units from the rental market. When revenue growth is constrained but expenses continue to rise — including municipal taxes and insurance — property viability erodes over time.

Moreover, enforcement will require public resources. Administrative oversight, exemption review, compliance monitoring, and inevitable litigation will impose ongoing costs. Those resources could instead be deployed toward targeted rental assistance, production incentives, and strategies that directly expand housing supply and support the most vulnerable residents.

Rhode Island deserves solutions that increase housing choice and availability at all levels. Expanding supply (for renters and buyers), streamlining permitting, encouraging adaptive reuse, and directing responsible, targeted assistance to households in need are approaches that strengthen the housing ecosystem without creating the unintended consequences consistently associated with rent control.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to vote no on this ordinance and instead pursue policies that produce measurable, durable improvements in housing affordability.

Sincerely,

Michael A Tortolani
7 Aroostook Trl
Narragansett, RI 02882
4001mt@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Duncan Xue <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Oppose Rent Control H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I oppose H8108/S2271 rent control. First it's not fair to constrain landlords only. Landlord is just a service provider who provides housing by hard-working. Why constraining landlord only but leaving all other service providers unconstrained? High living cost is not only in housing, but also all other merchandises and services, such as car dealers, gas prices, food prices, utilities, taxes, etc. Landlords are pressured by high cost of all other merchandises/services/taxes/labors, maintaining a housing is getting more and more expensive, why landlords can't adjust their service price -- rent? While everyone else can adjust their merchandise/service prices. Secondly, rent control creates lots of bureaucracy.

Housing affordability is a serious and legitimate concern. However, this proposal adopts a rigid price-control framework that will undermine housing production, discourage reinvestment in existing properties, and ultimately restrict supply in a market that already faces long-standing structural constraints.

The ordinance would cap rent increases at 4% annually, restrict rent resets between tenancies through vacancy control, and impose substantial statutory penalties — including three months' rent in damages, attorneys' fees, and potential punitive damages — for violations. This combination of price caps, administrative oversight, and litigation exposure creates significant regulatory risk for housing providers of all sizes, and fuels displacement of residents by fueling massive disinvestment from the current diverse housing provider market that is unique to Rhode Island.

Providence has faced barriers to new housing production for decades. Only recently has the state taken meaningful steps to encourage additional units through zoning reform, ADUs, and more flexible use of existing structures. Not all new housing comes in the form of large-scale developments. Many units enter the market through two-family conversions, small additions, and incremental reinvestment in existing properties. Policies that disconnect rent levels from operating costs, inflation, property taxes, and insurance premiums will slow this momentum.

Vacancy control is especially concerning. By limiting the ability to reset rent between tenancies, the ordinance suppresses normal market turnover dynamics. In other jurisdictions, similar frameworks have led to reduced mobility, deferred maintenance, and withdrawal of units from the rental market. When revenue growth is constrained but expenses continue to rise — including municipal taxes and insurance — property viability erodes over time.

Moreover, enforcement will require public resources. Administrative oversight, exemption review, compliance monitoring, and inevitable litigation will impose ongoing costs. Those resources could instead be deployed toward targeted rental assistance, production incentives, and strategies that directly expand housing supply and support the most vulnerable residents.

Rhode Island deserves solutions that increase housing choice and availability at all levels. Expanding supply (for renters and buyers), streamlining permitting, encouraging adaptive reuse, and directing responsible, targeted assistance to households in need are approaches that strengthen the housing ecosystem without creating the unintended consequences consistently associated with rent control.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to vote no on this ordinance and instead pursue policies that produce measurable, durable improvements in housing affordability.

Sincerely,

Duncan Xue
52 Oppen St
Providence, RI 02904
duncan.xue@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Timothy Garcia <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Opposed -Rent Control H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

Rent control has been studied extensively, and over 94% of economists conclude it creates more housing problems than it solves. A few of the key reasons are below.

First, rent control distorts the housing market by holding rents below the level set by supply and demand. When prices are capped, some owners choose not to rent units or delay improvements, and fewer new apartments get built in the first place. Lower allowable rents reduce the projected value of new housing, which often cannot offset rising construction costs driven by inflation and higher interest rates.

Second, restricted rental income affects upkeep. When revenue cannot keep pace with expenses, maintenance is reduced and buildings gradually decline. Owners who purchased recently may only be able to afford basic repairs, while others with lower mortgage costs may still avoid major upgrades because they know they cannot recover the investment through future rents.

Finally, rent control interferes with normal housing mobility. Households who could afford market-rate housing often remain in regulated units, while those with the greatest need struggle to find available apartments. Because the policy discourages construction of new rental and multifamily housing, fewer affordable options open up over time. In practice, rent control locks tenants into place, limits reinvestment in aging housing stock, and significantly reduces new development by weakening the financial viability of building housing.

Research and policy analysis in Rhode Island, including recommendations discussed by the Rhode Island Public Expenditure Council (RIPEC), instead emphasize approaches that directly address affordability without suppressing housing production. These include expanding housing supply through zoning and permitting reform, encouraging new construction and redevelopment, supporting rehabilitation of existing units, and providing targeted assistance such as rental subsidies or income-based support for households most in need.

For these reasons, policymakers should pursue solutions that increase housing availability and target aid effectively, rather than adopt rent regulation policies that risk reducing supply and housing quality.

Sincerely,

Timothy Garcia
710 Atwells Ave
Providence, RI 02909
timgarcia63@yahoo.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Rob Ziobrowski <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Opposed -Rent Control H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

Rent control has been studied extensively, and over 94% of economists conclude it creates more housing problems than it solves. A few of the key reasons are below.

First, rent control distorts the housing market by holding rents below the level set by supply and demand. When prices are capped, some owners choose not to rent units or delay improvements, and fewer new apartments get built in the first place. Lower allowable rents reduce the projected value of new housing, which often cannot offset rising construction costs driven by inflation and higher interest rates.

Second, restricted rental income affects upkeep. When revenue cannot keep pace with expenses, maintenance is reduced and buildings gradually decline. Owners who purchased recently may only be able to afford basic repairs, while others with lower mortgage costs may still avoid major upgrades because they know they cannot recover the investment through future rents.

Finally, rent control interferes with normal housing mobility. Households who could afford market-rate housing often remain in regulated units, while those with the greatest need struggle to find available apartments. Because the policy discourages construction of new rental and multifamily housing, fewer affordable options open up over time.

In practice, rent control locks tenants into place, limits reinvestment in aging housing stock, and significantly reduces new development by weakening the financial viability of building housing.

Research and policy analysis in Rhode Island, including recommendations discussed by the Rhode Island Public Expenditure Council (RIPEC), instead emphasize approaches that directly address affordability without suppressing housing production. These include expanding housing supply through zoning and permitting reform, encouraging new construction and redevelopment, supporting rehabilitation of existing units, and providing targeted assistance such as rental subsidies or income-based support for households most in need.

For these reasons, policymakers should pursue solutions that increase housing availability and target aid effectively, rather than adopt rent regulation policies that risk reducing supply and housing quality.

Sincerely,

Rob Ziobrowski
33 Barstow St
Providence, RI 02909
robertmich26@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of Nicole Ziobrowski <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Opposed -Rent Control H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

Rent control has been studied extensively, and over 94% of economists conclude it creates more housing problems than it solves. A few of the key reasons are below.

First, rent control distorts the housing market by holding rents below the level set by supply and demand. When prices are capped, some owners choose not to rent units or delay improvements, and fewer new apartments get built in the first place. Lower allowable rents reduce the projected value of new housing, which often cannot offset rising construction costs driven by inflation and higher interest rates.

Second, restricted rental income affects upkeep. When revenue cannot keep pace with expenses, maintenance is reduced and buildings gradually decline. Owners who purchased recently may only be able to afford basic repairs, while others with lower mortgage costs may still avoid major upgrades because they know they cannot recover the investment through future rents.

Finally, rent control interferes with normal housing mobility. Households who could afford market-rate housing often remain in regulated units, while those with the greatest need struggle to find available apartments. Because the policy discourages construction of new rental and multifamily housing, fewer affordable options open up over time. In practice, rent control locks tenants into place, limits reinvestment in aging housing stock, and significantly reduces new development by weakening the financial viability of building housing.

Research and policy analysis in Rhode Island, including recommendations discussed by the Rhode Island Public Expenditure Council (RIPEC), instead emphasize approaches that directly address affordability without suppressing housing production. These include expanding housing supply through zoning and permitting reform, encouraging new construction and redevelopment, supporting rehabilitation of existing units, and providing targeted assistance such as rental subsidies or income-based support for households most in need.

For these reasons, policymakers should pursue solutions that increase housing availability and target aid effectively, rather than adopt rent regulation policies that risk reducing supply and housing quality.

Sincerely,

Nicole Ziobrowski
33 Barstow St
Providence, RI 02909
nicky26zio@aol.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of Michelle Ziobrowski
<user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE RENT CONTROL - H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I respectfully submit testimony in opposition to H8108 (Rent Control)

The discussion around this proposal is not a landlord-tenant dispute; it is a statewide economic policy that will shape housing availability, investment decisions, and the cost of living across Rhode Island. Even individuals or properties that appear exempt would still experience its consequences, because regulating prices changes behavior throughout the entire housing market — influencing lending, insurance, screening practices, reinvestment, and whether housing is created at all.

The bill would also require a substantial administrative system. Boards, hearings, compliance review, and enforcement actions cost millions of dollars to operate while producing no additional housing supply. Rhode Island's limited public resources would be better directed toward targeted and proven approaches that assist residents who are struggling to afford housing rather than maintaining a permanent regulatory bureaucracy.

There is also a tax impact. When regulated properties lose value or stagnate, municipalities must still fund schools, public safety services, and essential services. That burden does not disappear — it shifts, most often onto single-family homeowners.

Across decades of research, economists broadly agree that rent control reduces housing supply and worsens long-term affordability for the following reasons:

- Market distortion — Artificial price ceilings separate rents from supply and demand, discouraging participation in the rental market and creating shortages.
- Declining housing quality — Limited income potential reduces the ability and incentive to maintain or improve properties.
- Allocation inefficiency — Subsidies are not reliably targeted to those most in need, while others cannot find available housing.
- Reduced investment — New construction and reinvestment become less financially viable, slowing housing creation.
- Unintended consequences — Supply shrinks, screening becomes stricter, and housing shifts to alternative uses.
- Market segmentation — A divided market forms between controlled and uncontrolled units, increasing disparities.
- Administrative burden — Complex rules require ongoing enforcement and litigation at public expense.
- Legal and operational strain — Expanded litigation exposure and capped turnover rents make it difficult to fund necessary repairs between tenancies while also adding pressure to already burdened courts.

Rhode Island faces a real housing affordability challenge, but policies that restrict housing creation and shift costs onto homeowners will not solve it. Expanding supply and using targeted assistance for households in need are more effective approaches.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose all rent control proposals.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Michelle Ziobrowski
33 Barstow St
Providence, RI 02909
robertmich26@aol.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Justin Ziobrowski <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE - Please vote NO H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I respectfully submit testimony in opposition to H8108

This legislation should be viewed as a statewide economic policy rather than a landlord-tenant dispute. Regulating housing prices changes incentives across the entire market — affecting investment decisions, property maintenance, financing, and ultimately the availability of housing for Rhode Island residents.

Evidence from other jurisdictions consistently shows that rent control reduces housing supply and reinvestment. A national survey by the National Apartment Association found that 71% of housing providers expect to reduce or halt investment in regulated markets, while more than 60% report deferring non-essential maintenance and improvements. The National Association of Home Builders similarly reports that nearly 90% of builders avoid constructing housing in rent-controlled jurisdictions.

This is particularly concerning in Rhode Island, where over 80% of the housing stock is older and depends on continual reinvestment to remain safe and habitable. Limiting rental income makes it more difficult to finance repairs, modernization, and energy improvements, which ultimately harms the quality of housing available to tenants.

Historical outcomes reinforce this pattern. In the 1980s, after rent control was imposed, the number of rental units declined by 8% in Cambridge and 12% in Brookline, Massachusetts. After Cambridge repealed rent control in 1994, permits for new construction and renovation more than doubled for the following decade — demonstrating how regulation had suppressed housing activity.

Rent regulation also affects public finances. Reduced property values translate into reduced tax revenue for essential services. Because municipalities rely heavily on property taxation, that burden does not disappear — it shifts, often onto single-family homeowners. In Portland, Maine, analysts estimated \$6.3 to \$10.6 million annually in redistributed tax burden onto other property owners following similar policies. Many of Rhode Island's cities have a larger share of multifamily property in comparison to Portland, ME - meaning that shift would be even larger.

Finally, rent control often fails to reach those most in need. After repeal in Cambridge, a study of over 12,000 units showed only 10% of rent-controlled units were occupied by low-income households, illustrating how broad price controls can misallocate benefits while making housing harder to find for future renters.

Rhode Island faces a real affordability challenge, but long-term solutions require expanding housing availability and supporting targeted assistance for households in need — not discouraging housing creation and reinvestment.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose this proposal.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Justin Ziobrowski

10 Green Lane Rd
Pawtucket, RI 02861
ziobrowskij911@aol.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Steve Burt <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE RENT CONTROL - H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I respectfully submit testimony in opposition to H8108 (Rent Control)

The discussion around this proposal is not a landlord-tenant dispute; it is a statewide economic policy that will shape housing availability, investment decisions, and the cost of living across Rhode Island. Even individuals or properties that appear exempt would still experience its consequences, because regulating prices changes behavior throughout the entire housing market — influencing lending, insurance, screening practices, reinvestment, and whether housing is created at all.

The bill would also require a substantial administrative system. Boards, hearings, compliance review, and enforcement actions cost millions of dollars to operate while producing no additional housing supply. Rhode Island's limited public resources would be better directed toward targeted and proven approaches that assist residents who are struggling to afford housing rather than maintaining a permanent regulatory bureaucracy.

There is also a tax impact. When regulated properties lose value or stagnate, municipalities must still fund schools, public safety services, and essential services. That burden does not disappear — it shifts, most often onto single-family homeowners.

Across decades of research, economists broadly agree that rent control reduces housing supply and worsens long-term affordability for the following reasons:

- Market distortion — Artificial price ceilings separate rents from supply and demand, discouraging participation in the rental market and creating shortages.
- Declining housing quality — Limited income potential reduces the ability and incentive to maintain or improve properties.
- Allocation inefficiency — Subsidies are not reliably targeted to those most in need, while others cannot find available housing.
- Reduced investment — New construction and reinvestment become less financially viable, slowing housing creation.
- Unintended consequences — Supply shrinks, screening becomes stricter, and housing shifts to alternative uses.
- Market segmentation — A divided market forms between controlled and uncontrolled units, increasing disparities.
- Administrative burden — Complex rules require ongoing enforcement and litigation at public expense.
- Legal and operational strain — Expanded litigation exposure and capped turnover rents make it difficult to fund necessary repairs between tenancies while also adding pressure to already burdened courts.

Rhode Island faces a real housing affordability challenge, but policies that restrict housing creation and shift costs onto homeowners will not solve it. Expanding supply and using targeted assistance for households in need are more effective approaches.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose all rent control proposals.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Steve Burt
710 Atwells Ave
Providence, RI 02909
steveburt588@aol.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Brian Peruch <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE RENT CONTROL H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I am writing to express opposition to House Bill 8108.

This legislation should be understood as a policy detrimental to the state economy, not a landlord-tenant disagreement. Policies that regulate housing prices alter incentives across the entire housing market — influencing investment, maintenance, lending, insurance underwriting, and ultimately whether additional housing is created in Rhode Island. Analysis from the Rhode Island Public Expenditure Council (RIPEC) consistently emphasizes two realities about our state's housing and municipal finance structure: Rhode Island faces a structural housing shortage, and municipalities rely heavily on stable property values to fund core public services. Policies that discourage reinvestment or reduce property values directly undermine both of these conditions at the same time.

By limiting the financial viability of rental housing, this proposal risks reducing reinvestment in existing units and slowing new development. RIPEC's research has highlighted that increasing supply is essential to improving affordability. Measures that restrict returns on housing do the opposite — they discourage production and delay rehabilitation, worsening long-term affordability rather than improving it.

The bill would also require an extensive regulatory framework to administer compliance, hearings, and enforcement. This type of permanent oversight structure carries substantial cost while producing no new housing units. Rhode Island's limited public resources would be more effectively directed toward targeted assistance programs and policies that expand supply — approaches that research repeatedly shows are more effective at helping households facing affordability challenges.

Additionally, if regulated property values stagnate while municipal obligations remain constant, tax burdens inevitably shift. Because municipalities must still fund schools, infrastructure, and safety services, pressure moves toward the most stable tax base: single-family homeowners.

Rhode Island's housing challenge is real, but long-term affordability depends on increasing availability and encouraging reinvestment — not discouraging it. For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose H8108 and instead focus on policies that expand housing opportunity and directly assist residents in need.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Brian Peruch
172 Glenwood Ave
Pawtucket, RI 02860
brianperuch@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of Julian Ziobrowski <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Oppose Rent Control H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

Housing affordability is a serious and legitimate concern. However, this proposal adopts a rigid price-control framework that will undermine housing production, discourage reinvestment in existing properties, and ultimately restrict supply in a market that already faces long-standing structural constraints.

The ordinance would cap rent increases at 4% annually, restrict rent resets between tenancies through vacancy control, and impose substantial statutory penalties — including three months' rent in damages, attorneys' fees, and potential punitive damages — for violations. This combination of price caps, administrative oversight, and litigation exposure creates significant regulatory risk for housing providers of all sizes, and fuels displacement of residents by fueling massive disinvestment from the current diverse housing provider market that is unique to Rhode Island.

Providence has faced barriers to new housing production for decades. Only recently has the state taken meaningful steps to encourage additional units through zoning reform, ADUs, and more flexible use of existing structures. Not all new housing comes in the form of large-scale developments. Many units enter the market through two-family conversions, small additions, and incremental reinvestment in existing properties. Policies that disconnect rent levels from operating costs, inflation, property taxes, and insurance premiums will slow this momentum.

Vacancy control is especially concerning. By limiting the ability to reset rent between tenancies, the ordinance suppresses normal market turnover dynamics. In other jurisdictions, similar frameworks have led to reduced mobility, deferred maintenance, and withdrawal of units from the rental market. When revenue growth is constrained but expenses continue to rise — including municipal taxes and insurance — property viability erodes over time.

Moreover, enforcement will require public resources. Administrative oversight, exemption review, compliance monitoring, and inevitable litigation will impose ongoing costs. Those resources could instead be deployed toward targeted rental assistance, production incentives, and strategies that directly expand housing supply and support the most vulnerable residents.

Rhode Island deserves solutions that increase housing choice and availability at all levels. Expanding supply (for renters and buyers), streamlining permitting, encouraging adaptive reuse, and directing responsible, targeted assistance to households in need are approaches that strengthen the housing ecosystem without creating the unintended consequences consistently associated with rent control.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to vote no on this ordinance and instead pursue policies that produce measurable, durable improvements in housing affordability.

Sincerely,

Julian Ziobrowski
10 Green Lane Rd
Pawtucket, RI 02861
zebrowskig783@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of Michael Pawlitschek
<user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE RENT CONTROL - H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I respectfully submit testimony in opposition to H8108 (Rent Control)

The discussion around this proposal is not a landlord-tenant dispute; it is a statewide economic policy that will shape housing availability, investment decisions, and the cost of living across Rhode Island. Even individuals or properties that appear exempt would still experience its consequences, because regulating prices changes behavior throughout the entire housing market — influencing lending, insurance, screening practices, reinvestment, and whether housing is created at all.

The bill would also require a substantial administrative system. Boards, hearings, compliance review, and enforcement actions cost millions of dollars to operate while producing no additional housing supply. Rhode Island's limited public resources would be better directed toward targeted and proven approaches that assist residents who are struggling to afford housing rather than maintaining a permanent regulatory bureaucracy.

There is also a tax impact. When regulated properties lose value or stagnate, municipalities must still fund schools, public safety services, and essential services. That burden does not disappear — it shifts, most often onto single-family homeowners.

Across decades of research, economists broadly agree that rent control reduces housing supply and worsens long-term affordability for the following reasons:

- Market distortion — Artificial price ceilings separate rents from supply and demand, discouraging participation in the rental market and creating shortages.
- Declining housing quality — Limited income potential reduces the ability and incentive to maintain or improve properties.
- Allocation inefficiency — Subsidies are not reliably targeted to those most in need, while others cannot find available housing.
- Reduced investment — New construction and reinvestment become less financially viable, slowing housing creation.
- Unintended consequences — Supply shrinks, screening becomes stricter, and housing shifts to alternative uses.
- Market segmentation — A divided market forms between controlled and uncontrolled units, increasing disparities.
- Administrative burden — Complex rules require ongoing enforcement and litigation at public expense.
- Legal and operational strain — Expanded litigation exposure and capped turnover rents make it difficult to fund necessary repairs between tenancies while also adding pressure to already burdened courts.

Rhode Island faces a real housing affordability challenge, but policies that restrict housing creation and shift costs onto homeowners will not solve it. Expanding supply and using targeted assistance for households in need are more effective approaches.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose all rent control proposals.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Michael Pawlitschek
188 Railroad St Apt 3R
Marville, RI 02838
mike.summitrp@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.votervice.net on behalf of Jackie Alvarez <user@votervice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE - Please vote NO H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I respectfully submit testimony in opposition to H8108

This legislation should be viewed as a statewide economic policy rather than a landlord-tenant dispute. Regulating housing prices changes incentives across the entire market — affecting investment decisions, property maintenance, financing, and ultimately the availability of housing for Rhode Island residents.

Evidence from other jurisdictions consistently shows that rent control reduces housing supply and reinvestment. A national survey by the National Apartment Association found that 71% of housing providers expect to reduce or halt investment in regulated markets, while more than 60% report deferring non-essential maintenance and improvements. The National Association of Home Builders similarly reports that nearly 90% of builders avoid constructing housing in rent-controlled jurisdictions.

This is particularly concerning in Rhode Island, where over 80% of the housing stock is older and depends on continual reinvestment to remain safe and habitable. Limiting rental income makes it more difficult to finance repairs, modernization, and energy improvements, which ultimately harms the quality of housing available to tenants.

Historical outcomes reinforce this pattern. In the 1980s, after rent control was imposed, the number of rental units declined by 8% in Cambridge and 12% in Brookline, Massachusetts. After Cambridge repealed rent control in 1994, permits for new construction and renovation more than doubled for the following decade — demonstrating how regulation had suppressed housing activity.

Rent regulation also affects public finances. Reduced property values translate into reduced tax revenue for essential services. Because municipalities rely heavily on property taxation, that burden does not disappear — it shifts, often onto single-family homeowners. In Portland, Maine, analysts estimated \$6.3 to \$10.6 million annually in redistributed tax burden onto other property owners following similar policies. Many of Rhode Island's cities have a larger share of multifamily property in comparison to Portland, ME - meaning that shift would be even larger.

Finally, rent control often fails to reach those most in need. After repeal in Cambridge, a study of over 12,000 units showed only 10% of rent-controlled units were occupied by low-income households, illustrating how broad price controls can misallocate benefits while making housing harder to find for future renters.

Rhode Island faces a real affordability challenge, but long-term solutions require expanding housing availability and supporting targeted assistance for households in need — not discouraging housing creation and reinvestment.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose this proposal.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jackie Alvarez

301 Reservoir Ave
Providence, RI 02907
jjpropertygmtceo@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Stephanie Corsetti <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE RENT CONTROL - H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

This law represents far reaching government control over private citizens who purchased there investment properties using hard work and sacrifice. This law represents a government dictatorship. It is unbelievable and sad that we are even fighting to prevent this law from passing and ruining so many middle class individuals who are struggling to get ahead and provide a better future for them selves and their families. This is in addition to the overall negative consequences it will have on the state in general. Becoming a failure like New York should not be the model we want to replicate.

I respectfully submit testimony in opposition to H8108 (Rent Control)

The discussion around this proposal is not a landlord-tenant dispute; it is a statewide economic policy that will shape housing availability, investment decisions, and the cost of living across Rhode Island. Even individuals or properties that appear exempt would still experience its consequences, because regulating prices changes behavior throughout the entire housing market — influencing lending, insurance, screening practices, reinvestment, and whether housing is created at all.

The bill would also require a substantial administrative system. Boards, hearings, compliance review, and enforcement actions cost millions of dollars to operate while producing no additional housing supply. Rhode Island's limited public resources would be better directed toward targeted and proven approaches that assist residents who are struggling to afford housing rather than maintaining a permanent regulatory bureaucracy.

There is also a tax impact. When regulated properties lose value or stagnate, municipalities must still fund schools, public safety services, and essential services. That burden does not disappear — it shifts, most often onto single-family homeowners.

Across decades of research, economists broadly agree that rent control reduces housing supply and worsens long-term affordability for the following reasons:

- Market distortion — Artificial price ceilings separate rents from supply and demand, discouraging participation in the rental market and creating shortages.
- Declining housing quality — Limited income potential reduces the ability and incentive to maintain or improve properties.
- Allocation inefficiency — Subsidies are not reliably targeted to those most in need, while others cannot find available housing.
- Reduced investment — New construction and reinvestment become less financially viable, slowing housing creation.
- Unintended consequences — Supply shrinks, screening becomes stricter, and housing shifts to alternative uses.
- Market segmentation — A divided market forms between controlled and uncontrolled units, increasing disparities.
- Administrative burden — Complex rules require ongoing enforcement and litigation at public expense.
- Legal and operational strain — Expanded litigation exposure and capped turnover rents make it difficult to fund necessary repairs between tenancies while also adding pressure to already burdened courts.

Rhode Island faces a real housing affordability challenge, but policies that restrict housing creation and shift costs onto homeowners will not solve it. Expanding supply and using targeted assistance for households in need are more effective approaches.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose all rent control proposals.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Corsetti
466 Mattity Rd
North Smithfield, RI 02896
s.corsetti.moran@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Matthew Mozak <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE - Please vote NO H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I respectfully submit testimony in opposition to H8108

This legislation should be viewed as a statewide economic policy rather than a landlord-tenant dispute. Regulating housing prices changes incentives across the entire market — affecting investment decisions, property maintenance, financing, and ultimately the availability of housing for Rhode Island residents.

Evidence from other jurisdictions consistently shows that rent control reduces housing supply and reinvestment. A national survey by the National Apartment Association found that 71% of housing providers expect to reduce or halt investment in regulated markets, while more than 60% report deferring non-essential maintenance and improvements. The National Association of Home Builders similarly reports that nearly 90% of builders avoid constructing housing in rent-controlled jurisdictions.

This is particularly concerning in Rhode Island, where over 80% of the housing stock is older and depends on continual reinvestment to remain safe and habitable. Limiting rental income makes it more difficult to finance repairs, modernization, and energy improvements, which ultimately harms the quality of housing available to tenants.

Historical outcomes reinforce this pattern. In the 1980s, after rent control was imposed, the number of rental units declined by 8% in Cambridge and 12% in Brookline, Massachusetts. After Cambridge repealed rent control in 1994, permits for new construction and renovation more than doubled for the following decade — demonstrating how regulation had suppressed housing activity.

Rent regulation also affects public finances. Reduced property values translate into reduced tax revenue for essential services. Because municipalities rely heavily on property taxation, that burden does not disappear — it shifts, often onto single-family homeowners. In Portland, Maine, analysts estimated \$6.3 to \$10.6 million annually in redistributed tax burden onto other property owners following similar policies. Many of Rhode Island's cities have a larger share of multifamily property in comparison to Portland, ME - meaning that shift would be even larger.

Finally, rent control often fails to reach those most in need. After repeal in Cambridge, a study of over 12,000 units showed only 10% of rent-controlled units were occupied by low-income households, illustrating how broad price controls can misallocate benefits while making housing harder to find for future renters.

Rhode Island faces a real affordability challenge, but long-term solutions require expanding housing availability and supporting targeted assistance for households in need — not discouraging housing creation and reinvestment.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose this proposal.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Matthew Mozak

15 Nestor St
West Warwick, RI 02893
matthew.mozak@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Jimmy Murray <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE - Please vote NO H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I respectfully submit testimony in opposition to H8108

This legislation should be viewed as a statewide economic policy rather than a landlord-tenant dispute. Regulating housing prices changes incentives across the entire market — affecting investment decisions, property maintenance, financing, and ultimately the availability of housing for Rhode Island residents.

Evidence from other jurisdictions consistently shows that rent control reduces housing supply and reinvestment. A national survey by the National Apartment Association found that 71% of housing providers expect to reduce or halt investment in regulated markets, while more than 60% report deferring non-essential maintenance and improvements. The National Association of Home Builders similarly reports that nearly 90% of builders avoid constructing housing in rent-controlled jurisdictions.

This is particularly concerning in Rhode Island, where over 80% of the housing stock is older and depends on continual reinvestment to remain safe and habitable. Limiting rental income makes it more difficult to finance repairs, modernization, and energy improvements, which ultimately harms the quality of housing available to tenants.

Historical outcomes reinforce this pattern. In the 1980s, after rent control was imposed, the number of rental units declined by 8% in Cambridge and 12% in Brookline, Massachusetts. After Cambridge repealed rent control in 1994, permits for new construction and renovation more than doubled for the following decade — demonstrating how regulation had suppressed housing activity.

Rent regulation also affects public finances. Reduced property values translate into reduced tax revenue for essential services. Because municipalities rely heavily on property taxation, that burden does not disappear — it shifts, often onto single-family homeowners. In Portland, Maine, analysts estimated \$6.3 to \$10.6 million annually in redistributed tax burden onto other property owners following similar policies. Many of Rhode Island's cities have a larger share of multifamily property in comparison to Portland, ME - meaning that shift would be even larger.

Finally, rent control often fails to reach those most in need. After repeal in Cambridge, a study of over 12,000 units showed only 10% of rent-controlled units were occupied by low-income households, illustrating how broad price controls can misallocate benefits while making housing harder to find for future renters.

Rhode Island faces a real affordability challenge, but long-term solutions require expanding housing availability and supporting targeted assistance for households in need — not discouraging housing creation and reinvestment.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose this proposal.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jimmy Murray

22 Parkway Dr
Warwick, RI 02886
jemurrayii@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Scott Gaudreau <sgaudreau@pag-cdg.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Opposed -Rent Control H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

Rent control has been studied extensively, and over 94% of economists conclude it creates more housing problems than it solves. A few of the key reasons are below.

First, rent control distorts the housing market by holding rents below the level set by supply and demand. When prices are capped, some owners choose not to rent units or delay improvements, and fewer new apartments get built in the first place. Lower allowable rents reduce the projected value of new housing, which often cannot offset rising construction costs driven by inflation and higher interest rates.

Second, restricted rental income affects upkeep. When revenue cannot keep pace with expenses, maintenance is reduced and buildings gradually decline. Owners who purchased recently may only be able to afford basic repairs, while others with lower mortgage costs may still avoid major upgrades because they know they cannot recover the investment through future rents.

Finally, rent control interferes with normal housing mobility. Households who could afford market-rate housing often remain in regulated units, while those with the greatest need struggle to find available apartments. Because the policy discourages construction of new rental and multifamily housing, fewer affordable options open up over time.

In practice, rent control locks tenants into place, limits reinvestment in aging housing stock, and significantly reduces new development by weakening the financial viability of building housing.

Research and policy analysis in Rhode Island, including recommendations discussed by the Rhode Island Public Expenditure Council (RIPEC), instead emphasize approaches that directly address affordability without suppressing housing production. These include expanding housing supply through zoning and permitting reform, encouraging new construction and redevelopment, supporting rehabilitation of existing units, and providing targeted assistance such as rental subsidies or income-based support for households most in need.

For these reasons, policymakers should pursue solutions that increase housing availability and target aid effectively, rather than adopt rent regulation policies that risk reducing supply and housing quality.

Sincerely,

Scott Gaudreau
103 Tepee Trl
Cranston, RI 02921
sgaudreau@pag-cdg.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of James Hite, Jr <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSED RENT CONTROL - H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I am writing to respectfully oppose the proposed rent control ordinance and to urge the State House to reconsider this policy in light of its well-documented and unintended consequences.

While housing affordability is a serious concern, rent control ultimately reduces the supply of housing and worsens the very problem it seeks to solve. When rents are capped, developers are far less likely to build new housing, and existing property owners are forced to delay improvements or exit the rental market altogether. The result is fewer available units, aging buildings, and increased competition for housing—driving prices up for everyone not fortunate enough to secure a regulated unit.

This is especially concerning in Rhode Island, where much of the housing stock is older and requires constant reinvestment to remain safe and livable. Rent control limits the ability to keep pace with rising costs such as taxes, insurance, utilities, maintenance, and repairs—none of which are capped. Over time, this leads to deterioration of existing housing and declining neighborhood conditions, ultimately harming tenants.

Rent control also carries significant fiscal consequences for the state. When property values decline, municipal tax revenues fall as well. Because local governments rely heavily on real estate taxes to fund essential services, these losses directly impact public schools, public safety, public works, transportation, libraries, and other critical services. When revenue declines, the tax burden shifts to single-family homeowners and owner-occupants who are least able to absorb additional costs.

Equally important, rent control is not an equitable solution. It does not reliably reach those most in need. Instead, it often benefits higher-income households who secure regulated units, regardless of financial need, while lower-income renters face fewer options and longer waits in an increasingly constrained market. By discouraging new construction, rent control also reduces housing mobility, limiting the natural process by which new housing creates opportunities throughout the market.

Although a small number of tenants may experience short-term relief, the long-term effects are fewer housing choices, higher rents for unregulated units, reduced maintenance, and greater inequity. These outcomes have been consistently observed in cities that have adopted similar policies.

Rhode Island would be better served by solutions that expand housing supply and provide targeted assistance to residents who truly need help. Investing in housing production, reducing unnecessary regulatory barriers, and strengthening direct rental assistance programs offer a more effective and sustainable path toward affordability—without the harmful side effects of rent control.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the state to oppose the proposed rent control ordinance and pursue policies that promote long-term housing stability and opportunity for all residents.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

James Hite
15 Girouard St Apt 2
Manville, RI 02838
jimmyray63@yahoo.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of Lynn Weinstein <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Opposed -Rent Control H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

Rent control has been studied extensively, and over 94% of economists conclude it creates more housing problems than it solves. A few of the key reasons are below.

First, rent control distorts the housing market by holding rents below the level set by supply and demand. When prices are capped, some owners choose not to rent units or delay improvements, and fewer new apartments get built in the first place. Lower allowable rents reduce the projected value of new housing, which often cannot offset rising construction costs driven by inflation and higher interest rates.

Second, restricted rental income affects upkeep. When revenue cannot keep pace with expenses, maintenance is reduced and buildings gradually decline. Owners who purchased recently may only be able to afford basic repairs, while others with lower mortgage costs may still avoid major upgrades because they know they cannot recover the investment through future rents.

Finally, rent control interferes with normal housing mobility. Households who could afford market-rate housing often remain in regulated units, while those with the greatest need struggle to find available apartments. Because the policy discourages construction of new rental and multifamily housing, fewer affordable options open up over time. In practice, rent control locks tenants into place, limits reinvestment in aging housing stock, and significantly reduces new development by weakening the financial viability of building housing.

Research and policy analysis in Rhode Island, including recommendations discussed by the Rhode Island Public Expenditure Council (RIPEC), instead emphasize approaches that directly address affordability without suppressing housing production. These include expanding housing supply through zoning and permitting reform, encouraging new construction and redevelopment, supporting rehabilitation of existing units, and providing targeted assistance such as rental subsidies or income-based support for households most in need.

For these reasons, policymakers should pursue solutions that increase housing availability and target aid effectively, rather than adopt rent regulation policies that risk reducing supply and housing quality.

Sincerely,

Lynn Weinstein
185 E Hill Dr
Cranston, RI 02920
lynnweinstein1@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Kevin Flynn <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE - Please vote NO H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I respectfully submit testimony in opposition to H8108

This legislation should be viewed as a statewide economic policy rather than a landlord-tenant dispute. Regulating housing prices changes incentives across the entire market — affecting investment decisions, property maintenance, financing, and ultimately the availability of housing for Rhode Island residents.

Evidence from other jurisdictions consistently shows that rent control reduces housing supply and reinvestment. A national survey by the National Apartment Association found that 71% of housing providers expect to reduce or halt investment in regulated markets, while more than 60% report deferring non-essential maintenance and improvements. The National Association of Home Builders similarly reports that nearly 90% of builders avoid constructing housing in rent-controlled jurisdictions.

This is particularly concerning in Rhode Island, where over 80% of the housing stock is older and depends on continual reinvestment to remain safe and habitable. Limiting rental income makes it more difficult to finance repairs, modernization, and energy improvements, which ultimately harms the quality of housing available to tenants.

Historical outcomes reinforce this pattern. In the 1980s, after rent control was imposed, the number of rental units declined by 8% in Cambridge and 12% in Brookline, Massachusetts. After Cambridge repealed rent control in 1994, permits for new construction and renovation more than doubled for the following decade — demonstrating how regulation had suppressed housing activity.

Rent regulation also affects public finances. Reduced property values translate into reduced tax revenue for essential services. Because municipalities rely heavily on property taxation, that burden does not disappear — it shifts, often onto single-family homeowners. In Portland, Maine, analysts estimated \$6.3 to \$10.6 million annually in redistributed tax burden onto other property owners following similar policies. Many of Rhode Island's cities have a larger share of multifamily property in comparison to Portland, ME - meaning that shift would be even larger.

Finally, rent control often fails to reach those most in need. After repeal in Cambridge, a study of over 12,000 units showed only 10% of rent-controlled units were occupied by low-income households, illustrating how broad price controls can misallocate benefits while making housing harder to find for future renters.

Rhode Island faces a real affordability challenge, but long-term solutions require expanding housing availability and supporting targeted assistance for households in need — not discouraging housing creation and reinvestment.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose this proposal.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Kevin Flynn

70 Hope Rd
Cranston, RI 02921
kevinflynn1989@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Angelo Kapsimals <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE RENT CONTROL H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

Totally against it.

I am writing to express opposition to House Bill 8108.

This legislation should be understood as a policy detrimental to the state economy, not a landlord-tenant disagreement. Policies that regulate housing prices alter incentives across the entire housing market — influencing investment, maintenance, lending, insurance underwriting, and ultimately whether additional housing is created in Rhode Island. Analysis from the Rhode Island Public Expenditure Council (RIPEC) consistently emphasizes two realities about our state's housing and municipal finance structure: Rhode Island faces a structural housing shortage, and municipalities rely heavily on stable property values to fund core public services. Policies that discourage reinvestment or reduce property values directly undermine both of these conditions at the same time.

By limiting the financial viability of rental housing, this proposal risks reducing reinvestment in existing units and slowing new development. RIPEC's research has highlighted that increasing supply is essential to improving affordability. Measures that restrict returns on housing do the opposite — they discourage production and delay rehabilitation, worsening long-term affordability rather than improving it.

The bill would also require an extensive regulatory framework to administer compliance, hearings, and enforcement. This type of permanent oversight structure carries substantial cost while producing no new housing units. Rhode Island's limited public resources would be more effectively directed toward targeted assistance programs and policies that expand supply — approaches that research repeatedly shows are more effective at helping households facing affordability challenges.

Additionally, if regulated property values stagnate while municipal obligations remain constant, tax burdens inevitably shift. Because municipalities must still fund schools, infrastructure, and safety services, pressure moves toward the most stable tax base: single-family homeowners.

Rhode Island's housing challenge is real, but long-term affordability depends on increasing availability and encouraging reinvestment — not discouraging it. For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose H8108 and instead focus on policies that expand housing opportunity and directly assist residents in need.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Angelo Kapsimals
23 Owen Ave
Pawtucket, RI 02860
angelokap4@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Mae Gammino <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE - Please vote NO H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

This Law does not include an exemption for ALL small landlords. The current carve out is only for owner-occupied properties.

The appeals process to the rent cap does not truly address the reality of owning rental property, with respect to the costs associated with maintaining property.

And, I owned a business that was subject to price controls from the U.S. government, exactly like the rent cap proposal, and this one-sided approach does not function as intended, and regardless of an appeals process. I've lived a price-control scenario, I know the reality, and it does not work as intended.

Moreover, the rent cap will result in owners increasing rents every by 4%, without question. This is not a threat, it's a fact. When people fear financial uncertainty they try to create stability. The prospect of an unexpectedly high tax bill and/or insurance cost, or repairs always looms large. But, now, with a cap, a preventive method to mitigate cost issues will cause landlords to adjust rents each year, even when they typically had not done this. And, the idea of having to appeal to a board to ask for an exemption, while well intended, is not something owners want to risk.

I respectfully submit testimony in opposition to H8108

This legislation should be viewed as a statewide economic policy rather than a landlord-tenant dispute. Regulating housing prices changes incentives across the entire market — affecting investment decisions, property maintenance, financing, and ultimately the availability of housing for Rhode Island residents.

Evidence from other jurisdictions consistently shows that rent control reduces housing supply and reinvestment. A national survey by the National Apartment Association found that 71% of housing providers expect to reduce or halt investment in regulated markets, while more than 60% report deferring non-essential maintenance and improvements. The National Association of Home Builders similarly reports that nearly 90% of builders avoid constructing housing in rent-controlled jurisdictions.

This is particularly concerning in Rhode Island, where over 80% of the housing stock is older and depends on continual reinvestment to remain safe and habitable. Limiting rental income makes it more difficult to finance repairs, modernization, and energy improvements, which ultimately harms the quality of housing available to tenants.

Historical outcomes reinforce this pattern. In the 1980s, after rent control was imposed, the number of rental units declined by 8% in Cambridge and 12% in Brookline, Massachusetts. After Cambridge repealed rent control in 1994, permits for new construction and renovation more than doubled for the following decade — demonstrating how regulation had suppressed housing activity.

Rent regulation also affects public finances. Reduced property values translate into reduced tax revenue for essential services. Because municipalities rely heavily on property taxation, that burden does not disappear — it shifts, often onto single-family homeowners. In Portland, Maine, analysts estimated \$6.3 to \$10.6 million annually in redistributed tax

burden onto other property owners following similar policies. Many of Rhode Island's cities have a larger share of multifamily property in comparison to Portland, ME - meaning that shift would be even larger.

Finally, rent control often fails to reach those most in need. After repeal in Cambridge, a study of over 12,000 units showed only 10% of rent-controlled units were occupied by low-income households, illustrating how broad price controls can misallocate benefits while making housing harder to find for future renters.

Rhode Island faces a real affordability challenge, but long-term solutions require expanding housing availability and supporting targeted assistance for households in need — not discouraging housing creation and reinvestment.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose this proposal.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Mae Gammino
8 Irving Ave
Providence, RI 02906
gamminom@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of David Edgerton <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Opposed -Rent Control H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

Rent control has been studied extensively, and over 94% of economists conclude it creates more housing problems than it solves. A few of the key reasons are below.

First, rent control distorts the housing market by holding rents below the level set by supply and demand. When prices are capped, some owners choose not to rent units or delay improvements, and fewer new apartments get built in the first place. Lower allowable rents reduce the projected value of new housing, which often cannot offset rising construction costs driven by inflation and higher interest rates.

Second, restricted rental income affects upkeep. When revenue cannot keep pace with expenses, maintenance is reduced and buildings gradually decline. Owners who purchased recently may only be able to afford basic repairs, while others with lower mortgage costs may still avoid major upgrades because they know they cannot recover the investment through future rents.

Finally, rent control interferes with normal housing mobility. Households who could afford market-rate housing often remain in regulated units, while those with the greatest need struggle to find available apartments. Because the policy discourages construction of new rental and multifamily housing, fewer affordable options open up over time. In practice, rent control locks tenants into place, limits reinvestment in aging housing stock, and significantly reduces new development by weakening the financial viability of building housing.

Research and policy analysis in Rhode Island, including recommendations discussed by the Rhode Island Public Expenditure Council (RIPEC), instead emphasize approaches that directly address affordability without suppressing housing production. These include expanding housing supply through zoning and permitting reform, encouraging new construction and redevelopment, supporting rehabilitation of existing units, and providing targeted assistance such as rental subsidies or income-based support for households most in need.

For these reasons, policymakers should pursue solutions that increase housing availability and target aid effectively, rather than adopt rent regulation policies that risk reducing supply and housing quality.

Sincerely,

David Edgerton
23 Grove St
Pawtucket, RI 02860
edgertondave@aol.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Robert D'Andrea <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSED RENT CONTROL - H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I am writing to respectfully oppose the proposed rent control ordinance and to urge the State House to reconsider this policy in light of its well-documented and unintended consequences.

While housing affordability is a serious concern, rent control ultimately reduces the supply of housing and worsens the very problem it seeks to solve. When rents are capped, developers are far less likely to build new housing, and existing property owners are forced to delay improvements or exit the rental market altogether. The result is fewer available units, aging buildings, and increased competition for housing—driving prices up for everyone not fortunate enough to secure a regulated unit.

This is especially concerning in Rhode Island, where much of the housing stock is older and requires constant reinvestment to remain safe and livable. Rent control limits the ability to keep pace with rising costs such as taxes, insurance, utilities, maintenance, and repairs—none of which are capped. Over time, this leads to deterioration of existing housing and declining neighborhood conditions, ultimately harming tenants.

Rent control also carries significant fiscal consequences for the state. When property values decline, municipal tax revenues fall as well. Because local governments rely heavily on real estate taxes to fund essential services, these losses directly impact public schools, public safety, public works, transportation, libraries, and other critical services. When revenue declines, the tax burden shifts to single-family homeowners and owner-occupants who are least able to absorb additional costs.

Equally important, rent control is not an equitable solution. It does not reliably reach those most in need. Instead, it often benefits higher-income households who secure regulated units, regardless of financial need, while lower-income renters face fewer options and longer waits in an increasingly constrained market. By discouraging new construction, rent control also reduces housing mobility, limiting the natural process by which new housing creates opportunities throughout the market.

Although a small number of tenants may experience short-term relief, the long-term effects are fewer housing choices, higher rents for unregulated units, reduced maintenance, and greater inequity. These outcomes have been consistently observed in cities that have adopted similar policies.

Rhode Island would be better served by solutions that expand housing supply and provide targeted assistance to residents who truly need help. Investing in housing production, reducing unnecessary regulatory barriers, and strengthening direct rental assistance programs offer a more effective and sustainable path toward affordability—without the harmful side effects of rent control.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the state to oppose the proposed rent control ordinance and pursue policies that promote long-term housing stability and opportunity for all residents.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Robert D'Andrea
855 Jefferson Blvd
Warwick, RI 02886
robertdandreari@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Carol Salamone <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE - Please vote NO H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I respectfully submit testimony in opposition to H8108

This legislation should be viewed as a statewide economic policy rather than a landlord-tenant dispute. Regulating housing prices changes incentives across the entire market — affecting investment decisions, property maintenance, financing, and ultimately the availability of housing for Rhode Island residents.

Evidence from other jurisdictions consistently shows that rent control reduces housing supply and reinvestment. A national survey by the National Apartment Association found that 71% of housing providers expect to reduce or halt investment in regulated markets, while more than 60% report deferring non-essential maintenance and improvements. The National Association of Home Builders similarly reports that nearly 90% of builders avoid constructing housing in rent-controlled jurisdictions.

This is particularly concerning in Rhode Island, where over 80% of the housing stock is older and depends on continual reinvestment to remain safe and habitable. Limiting rental income makes it more difficult to finance repairs, modernization, and energy improvements, which ultimately harms the quality of housing available to tenants.

Historical outcomes reinforce this pattern. In the 1980s, after rent control was imposed, the number of rental units declined by 8% in Cambridge and 12% in Brookline, Massachusetts. After Cambridge repealed rent control in 1994, permits for new construction and renovation more than doubled for the following decade — demonstrating how regulation had suppressed housing activity.

Rent regulation also affects public finances. Reduced property values translate into reduced tax revenue for essential services. Because municipalities rely heavily on property taxation, that burden does not disappear — it shifts, often onto single-family homeowners. In Portland, Maine, analysts estimated \$6.3 to \$10.6 million annually in redistributed tax burden onto other property owners following similar policies. Many of Rhode Island's cities have a larger share of multifamily property in comparison to Portland, ME - meaning that shift would be even larger.

Finally, rent control often fails to reach those most in need. After repeal in Cambridge, a study of over 12,000 units showed only 10% of rent-controlled units were occupied by low-income households, illustrating how broad price controls can misallocate benefits while making housing harder to find for future renters.

Rhode Island faces a real affordability challenge, but long-term solutions require expanding housing availability and supporting targeted assistance for households in need — not discouraging housing creation and reinvestment.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose this proposal.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Carol Salamone

600 Laurel Hill Ave
Cranston, RI 02920
cab.salamone@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Melissa Evans <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSED RENT CONTROL - H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

Statewide rent control isn't the answer!!! ANY CONTROL is wrong

I am writing to respectfully oppose the proposed rent control ordinance and to urge the State House to reconsider this policy in light of its well-documented and unintended consequences.

While housing affordability is a serious concern, rent control ultimately reduces the supply of housing and worsens the very problem it seeks to solve. When rents are capped, developers are far less likely to build new housing, and existing property owners are forced to delay improvements or exit the rental market altogether. The result is fewer available units, aging buildings, and increased competition for housing—driving prices up for everyone not fortunate enough to secure a regulated unit.

This is especially concerning in Rhode Island, where much of the housing stock is older and requires constant reinvestment to remain safe and livable. Rent control limits the ability to keep pace with rising costs such as taxes, insurance, utilities, maintenance, and repairs—none of which are capped. Over time, this leads to deterioration of existing housing and declining neighborhood conditions, ultimately harming tenants.

Rent control also carries significant fiscal consequences for the state. When property values decline, municipal tax revenues fall as well. Because local governments rely heavily on real estate taxes to fund essential services, these losses directly impact public schools, public safety, public works, transportation, libraries, and other critical services. When revenue declines, the tax burden shifts to single-family homeowners and owner-occupants who are least able to absorb additional costs.

Equally important, rent control is not an equitable solution. It does not reliably reach those most in need. Instead, it often benefits higher-income households who secure regulated units, regardless of financial need, while lower-income renters face fewer options and longer waits in an increasingly constrained market. By discouraging new construction, rent control also reduces housing mobility, limiting the natural process by which new housing creates opportunities throughout the market.

Although a small number of tenants may experience short-term relief, the long-term effects are fewer housing choices, higher rents for unregulated units, reduced maintenance, and greater inequity. These outcomes have been consistently observed in cities that have adopted similar policies.

Rhode Island would be better served by solutions that expand housing supply and provide targeted assistance to residents who truly need help. Investing in housing production, reducing unnecessary regulatory barriers, and strengthening direct rental assistance programs offer a more effective and sustainable path toward affordability—without the harmful side effects of rent control.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the state to oppose the proposed rent control ordinance and pursue policies that promote long-term housing stability and opportunity for all residents.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Melissa Evans
20 Crescent Ave
Riverside, RI 02915
mevansogle@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of Vedrana Hrsak <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSED RENT CONTROL - H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I am writing to respectfully oppose the proposed rent control ordinance and to urge the State House to reconsider this policy in light of its well-documented and unintended consequences.

While housing affordability is a serious concern, rent control ultimately reduces the supply of housing and worsens the very problem it seeks to solve. When rents are capped, developers are far less likely to build new housing, and existing property owners are forced to delay improvements or exit the rental market altogether. The result is fewer available units, aging buildings, and increased competition for housing—driving prices up for everyone not fortunate enough to secure a regulated unit.

This is especially concerning in Rhode Island, where much of the housing stock is older and requires constant reinvestment to remain safe and livable. Rent control limits the ability to keep pace with rising costs such as taxes, insurance, utilities, maintenance, and repairs—none of which are capped. Over time, this leads to deterioration of existing housing and declining neighborhood conditions, ultimately harming tenants.

Rent control also carries significant fiscal consequences for the state. When property values decline, municipal tax revenues fall as well. Because local governments rely heavily on real estate taxes to fund essential services, these losses directly impact public schools, public safety, public works, transportation, libraries, and other critical services. When revenue declines, the tax burden shifts to single-family homeowners and owner-occupants who are least able to absorb additional costs.

Equally important, rent control is not an equitable solution. It does not reliably reach those most in need. Instead, it often benefits higher-income households who secure regulated units, regardless of financial need, while lower-income renters face fewer options and longer waits in an increasingly constrained market. By discouraging new construction, rent control also reduces housing mobility, limiting the natural process by which new housing creates opportunities throughout the market.

Although a small number of tenants may experience short-term relief, the long-term effects are fewer housing choices, higher rents for unregulated units, reduced maintenance, and greater inequity. These outcomes have been consistently observed in cities that have adopted similar policies.

Rhode Island would be better served by solutions that expand housing supply and provide targeted assistance to residents who truly need help. Investing in housing production, reducing unnecessary regulatory barriers, and strengthening direct rental assistance programs offer a more effective and sustainable path toward affordability—without the harmful side effects of rent control.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the state to oppose the proposed rent control ordinance and pursue policies that promote long-term housing stability and opportunity for all residents.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Vedrana Hrsak
40 Brighton St
Providence, RI 02909
vhrsak@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of Jennifer Urena <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Opposed -Rent Control H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

Rent control has been studied extensively, and over 94% of economists conclude it creates more housing problems than it solves. A few of the key reasons are below.

First, rent control distorts the housing market by holding rents below the level set by supply and demand. When prices are capped, some owners choose not to rent units or delay improvements, and fewer new apartments get built in the first place. Lower allowable rents reduce the projected value of new housing, which often cannot offset rising construction costs driven by inflation and higher interest rates.

Second, restricted rental income affects upkeep. When revenue cannot keep pace with expenses, maintenance is reduced and buildings gradually decline. Owners who purchased recently may only be able to afford basic repairs, while others with lower mortgage costs may still avoid major upgrades because they know they cannot recover the investment through future rents.

Finally, rent control interferes with normal housing mobility. Households who could afford market-rate housing often remain in regulated units, while those with the greatest need struggle to find available apartments. Because the policy discourages construction of new rental and multifamily housing, fewer affordable options open up over time.

In practice, rent control locks tenants into place, limits reinvestment in aging housing stock, and significantly reduces new development by weakening the financial viability of building housing.

Research and policy analysis in Rhode Island, including recommendations discussed by the Rhode Island Public Expenditure Council (RIPEC), instead emphasize approaches that directly address affordability without suppressing housing production. These include expanding housing supply through zoning and permitting reform, encouraging new construction and redevelopment, supporting rehabilitation of existing units, and providing targeted assistance such as rental subsidies or income-based support for households most in need.

For these reasons, policymakers should pursue solutions that increase housing availability and target aid effectively, rather than adopt rent regulation policies that risk reducing supply and housing quality.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Urena
169 Wood St
Providence, RI 02909
bu12245@aol.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Thomas Doyle <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE - Please vote NO H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

As a voter who has rehabbed historic property and offers safe and market rate rentals, I know that this bill will be overall very counterproductive.

I respectfully submit testimony in opposition to H8108

This legislation should be viewed as a statewide economic policy rather than a landlord-tenant dispute. Regulating housing prices changes incentives across the entire market — affecting investment decisions, property maintenance, financing, and ultimately the availability of housing for Rhode Island residents. This would be a massive overstep into governmental regulation.

Evidence from other jurisdictions consistently shows that rent control reduces housing supply and reinvestment. A national survey by the National Apartment Association found that 71% of housing providers expect to reduce or halt investment in regulated markets, while more than 60% report deferring non-essential maintenance and improvements. The National Association of Home Builders similarly reports that nearly 90% of builders avoid constructing housing in rent-controlled jurisdictions.

This is particularly concerning in Rhode Island, where over 80% of the housing stock is older and depends on continual reinvestment to remain safe and habitable. Limiting rental income makes it more difficult to finance repairs, modernization, and energy improvements, which ultimately harms the quality of housing available to tenants.

Historical outcomes reinforce this pattern. In the 1980s, after rent control was imposed, the number of rental units declined by 8% in Cambridge and 12% in Brookline, Massachusetts. After Cambridge repealed rent control in 1994, permits for new construction and renovation more than doubled for the following decade — demonstrating how regulation had suppressed housing activity.

Rent regulation also affects public finances. Reduced property values translate into reduced tax revenue for essential services. Because municipalities rely heavily on property taxation, that burden does not disappear — it shifts, often onto single-family homeowners. In Portland, Maine, analysts estimated \$6.3 to \$10.6 million annually in redistributed tax burden onto other property owners following similar policies. Many of Rhode Island's cities have a larger share of multifamily property in comparison to Portland, ME - meaning that shift would be even larger.

Finally, rent control often fails to reach those most in need. After repeal in Cambridge, a study of over 12,000 units showed only 10% of rent-controlled units were occupied by low-income households, illustrating how broad price controls can misallocate benefits while making housing harder to find for future renters.

Rhode Island faces a real affordability challenge, but long-term solutions require expanding housing availability and supporting targeted assistance for households in need — not discouraging housing creation and reinvestment.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose this proposal.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Thomas Doyle
36 Vassar Ave
Providence, RI 02906
tjdoyle7@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Michael Collins <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Oppose Rent Control H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

Housing affordability is a serious and legitimate concern. However, this proposal adopts a rigid price-control framework that will undermine housing production, discourage reinvestment in existing properties, and ultimately restrict supply in a market that already faces long-standing structural constraints.

The ordinance would cap rent increases at 4% annually, restrict rent resets between tenancies through vacancy control, and impose substantial statutory penalties — including three months' rent in damages, attorneys' fees, and potential punitive damages — for violations. This combination of price caps, administrative oversight, and litigation exposure creates significant regulatory risk for housing providers of all sizes, and fuels displacement of residents by fueling massive disinvestment from the current diverse housing provider market that is unique to Rhode Island.

Providence has faced barriers to new housing production for decades. Only recently has the state taken meaningful steps to encourage additional units through zoning reform, ADUs, and more flexible use of existing structures. Not all new housing comes in the form of large-scale developments. Many units enter the market through two-family conversions, small additions, and incremental reinvestment in existing properties. Policies that disconnect rent levels from operating costs, inflation, property taxes, and insurance premiums will slow this momentum.

Vacancy control is especially concerning. By limiting the ability to reset rent between tenancies, the ordinance suppresses normal market turnover dynamics. In other jurisdictions, similar frameworks have led to reduced mobility, deferred maintenance, and withdrawal of units from the rental market. When revenue growth is constrained but expenses continue to rise — including municipal taxes and insurance — property viability erodes over time.

Moreover, enforcement will require public resources. Administrative oversight, exemption review, compliance monitoring, and inevitable litigation will impose ongoing costs. Those resources could instead be deployed toward targeted rental assistance, production incentives, and strategies that directly expand housing supply and support the most vulnerable residents.

Rhode Island deserves solutions that increase housing choice and availability at all levels. Expanding supply (for renters and buyers), streamlining permitting, encouraging adaptive reuse, and directing responsible, targeted assistance to households in need are approaches that strengthen the housing ecosystem without creating the unintended consequences consistently associated with rent control.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to vote no on this ordinance and instead pursue policies that produce measurable, durable improvements in housing affordability.

Sincerely,

Michael Collins
190 Anthony St
East Providence, RI 02914
mike02914ri@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Rose Russell <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSED RENT CONTROL - H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

You cannot limit rents in the face of huge increasing costs without a collapse in the number of safe, clean, livable housing units.

I've already had a property go from \$9,017/year in property taxes to \$28,090 in just 3 years, a 311% increase!!! This past July one house was reassessed for 135% more and the property tax went up \$15,000/year which equaled \$1,250/month = \$416.66 per apartment per month. Huge increases in property taxes, insurance, water, sewer, etc...and limits on rent increases will result in people being unable to maintain their home, do work necessary to have lead certificates, and losing their homes, properties going up for tax auction and foreclosures, then being boarded up, and there will be fewer houses for rent.

You have all wanted housing providers to give residents lots of notice. I do that. It is in my leases that everyone gets at least 90-120 days notice. When I notify people in January to let me know by March 1st, for June 1st lease renewals; or I notify tenants in March to let me know by May 1st for August and September lease renewals; but huge property tax increases are not disclosed until July, I cannot recover from that for another full year, and requiring me to submit invasive private financial data to some unknown board to beg for a rent increase above 4%, especially in cases where a tenant bought a house and moved and I need to bring a unit up to market to compensate for huge tax increases is unwieldy, unfair, unjust and likely unconstitutional, not to mention that you are penalizing me for providing the notice you want me to give to my residents.

Studies have proven that every single municipality that has instituted rent control in some form found it had the opposite result and curtailed investment, stopped development of new housing, disabled homeowners ability to maintain their properties. All ended up limiting housing supplies further, while places became more dilapidated and unsafe.

Providence has many other options for balancing their city budget without unequal and unfair burdens placed on homeowners.

- 1) Large billionaire developers are given huge Tax Stabilization Agreements (TSA's) wherein they pay a small fraction of the taxable value of their luxury high rises while taking our best tenants and we end up subsidizing the billionaires tax bills. And this bill exempts them from rent limits!?
- 2) The alleged non-profit institutions like the universities either build, or buy from the billionaire developers (Brown bought the River House development on point street overlooking the water) taking these buildings off the tax rolls completely – when these buildings are highly profitable and NOT NON-PROFIT activities. They put 2 college kids in each bedroom, charge them \$1,200/month each making \$2,400 per bedroom, = \$4,800 for a 2 bedroom apartment, a sum the rest of us could never get, and we are paying the cities tax burden while these hugely profitable dorms are not taxed.
- 3) You do not have any idea what the costs are to a homeowner. Most people may have bought a habitable house and don't have a huge mortgage. Every house I have purchased was uninhabitable, vandalized, gutted, derelict, some did not even have any water or electric service, some had no floors and standing in the 1st floor you could see all the way to the attic. I bought the worst of the worst and spent a lifetime restoring and rebuilding these neglected houses into wonderful, safe, efficient and beautiful places for people to live. All cost a fortune to completely renovate, and bring up to code. I have worked hard to actually add to the housing stock and beautification of Providence and my neighborhood. I have personally rebuilt nearly 60 units that would not be standing if not for my dedicated intervention. Do not tax me out of my home and limit what I need to rent in order to cover the costs for me to run it.

I am writing to respectfully oppose the proposed rent control ordinance and to urge the State House to reconsider this policy in light of its well-documented and unintended consequences.

While housing affordability is a serious concern, rent control ultimately reduces the supply of housing and worsens the very problem it seeks to solve. When rents are capped, developers are far less likely to build new housing, and existing property owners are forced to delay improvements or exit the rental market altogether. The result is fewer available units, aging buildings, and increased competition for housing—driving prices up for everyone not fortunate enough to secure a regulated unit.

This is especially concerning in Rhode Island, where much of the housing stock is older and requires constant reinvestment to remain safe and livable. Rent control limits the ability to keep pace with rising costs such as taxes, insurance, utilities, maintenance, and repairs—none of which are capped. Over time, this leads to deterioration of existing housing and declining neighborhood conditions, ultimately harming tenants.

Rent control also carries significant fiscal consequences for the state. When property values decline, municipal tax revenues fall as well. Because local governments rely heavily on real estate taxes to fund essential services, these losses directly impact public schools, public safety, public works, transportation, libraries, and other critical services. When revenue declines, the tax burden shifts to single-family homeowners and owner-occupants who are least able to absorb additional costs.

Equally important, rent control is not an equitable solution. It does not reliably reach those most in need. Instead, it often benefits higher-income households who secure regulated units, regardless of financial need, while lower-income renters face fewer options and longer waits in an increasingly constrained market. By discouraging new construction, rent control also reduces housing mobility, limiting the natural process by which new housing creates opportunities throughout the market.

Although a small number of tenants may experience short-term relief, the long-term effects are fewer housing choices, higher rents for unregulated units, reduced maintenance, and greater inequity. These outcomes have been consistently observed in cities that have adopted similar policies.

Rhode Island would be better served by solutions that expand housing supply and provide targeted assistance to residents who truly need help. Investing in housing production, reducing unnecessary regulatory barriers, and strengthening direct rental assistance programs offer a more effective and sustainable path toward affordability—without the harmful side effects of rent control.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the state to oppose the proposed rent control ordinance and pursue policies that promote long-term housing stability and opportunity for all residents.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Rose Russell
26 Dexter St
Providence, RI 02909
rose02903@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Ghassan Daou <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Oppose Rent Control H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

Housing affordability is a serious and legitimate concern. However, this proposal adopts a rigid price-control framework that will undermine housing production, discourage reinvestment in existing properties, and ultimately restrict supply in a market that already faces long-standing structural constraints.

The ordinance would cap rent increases at 4% annually, restrict rent resets between tenancies through vacancy control, and impose substantial statutory penalties — including three months' rent in damages, attorneys' fees, and potential punitive damages — for violations. This combination of price caps, administrative oversight, and litigation exposure creates significant regulatory risk for housing providers of all sizes, and fuels displacement of residents by fueling massive disinvestment from the current diverse housing provider market that is unique to Rhode Island.

Providence has faced barriers to new housing production for decades. Only recently has the state taken meaningful steps to encourage additional units through zoning reform, ADUs, and more flexible use of existing structures. Not all new housing comes in the form of large-scale developments. Many units enter the market through two-family conversions, small additions, and incremental reinvestment in existing properties. Policies that disconnect rent levels from operating costs, inflation, property taxes, and insurance premiums will slow this momentum.

Vacancy control is especially concerning. By limiting the ability to reset rent between tenancies, the ordinance suppresses normal market turnover dynamics. In other jurisdictions, similar frameworks have led to reduced mobility, deferred maintenance, and withdrawal of units from the rental market. When revenue growth is constrained but expenses continue to rise — including municipal taxes and insurance — property viability erodes over time.

Moreover, enforcement will require public resources. Administrative oversight, exemption review, compliance monitoring, and inevitable litigation will impose ongoing costs. Those resources could instead be deployed toward targeted rental assistance, production incentives, and strategies that directly expand housing supply and support the most vulnerable residents.

Rhode Island deserves solutions that increase housing choice and availability at all levels. Expanding supply (for renters and buyers), streamlining permitting, encouraging adaptive reuse, and directing responsible, targeted assistance to households in need are approaches that strengthen the housing ecosystem without creating the unintended consequences consistently associated with rent control.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to vote no on this ordinance and instead pursue policies that produce measurable, durable improvements in housing affordability.

Sincerely,

Ghassan Daou
285 Slater Ave
Providence, RI 02906
gdaou69@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Robert Mongillo <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE - Please vote NO H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I respectfully submit testimony in opposition to H8108

This legislation should be viewed as a statewide economic policy rather than a landlord-tenant dispute. Regulating housing prices changes incentives across the entire market — affecting investment decisions, property maintenance, financing, and ultimately the availability of housing for Rhode Island residents.

Evidence from other jurisdictions consistently shows that rent control reduces housing supply and reinvestment. A national survey by the National Apartment Association found that 71% of housing providers expect to reduce or halt investment in regulated markets, while more than 60% report deferring non-essential maintenance and improvements. The National Association of Home Builders similarly reports that nearly 90% of builders avoid constructing housing in rent-controlled jurisdictions.

This is particularly concerning in Rhode Island, where over 80% of the housing stock is older and depends on continual reinvestment to remain safe and habitable. Limiting rental income makes it more difficult to finance repairs, modernization, and energy improvements, which ultimately harms the quality of housing available to tenants.

Historical outcomes reinforce this pattern. In the 1980s, after rent control was imposed, the number of rental units declined by 8% in Cambridge and 12% in Brookline, Massachusetts. After Cambridge repealed rent control in 1994, permits for new construction and renovation more than doubled for the following decade — demonstrating how regulation had suppressed housing activity.

Rent regulation also affects public finances. Reduced property values translate into reduced tax revenue for essential services. Because municipalities rely heavily on property taxation, that burden does not disappear — it shifts, often onto single-family homeowners. In Portland, Maine, analysts estimated \$6.3 to \$10.6 million annually in redistributed tax burden onto other property owners following similar policies. Many of Rhode Island's cities have a larger share of multifamily property in comparison to Portland, ME - meaning that shift would be even larger.

Finally, rent control often fails to reach those most in need. After repeal in Cambridge, a study of over 12,000 units showed only 10% of rent-controlled units were occupied by low-income households, illustrating how broad price controls can misallocate benefits while making housing harder to find for future renters.

Rhode Island faces a real affordability challenge, but long-term solutions require expanding housing availability and supporting targeted assistance for households in need — not discouraging housing creation and reinvestment.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose this proposal.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Robert Mongillo

24 Perkins Ave Apt 1
Narragansett, RI 02882
070707r@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of Marc Santos
<marc@premierpropertiesri.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Opposed -Rent Control H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

Please do your research and believe in the data that clearly concludes rent control has the opposite of its intended effect.

Rent control has been studied extensively, and over 94% of economists conclude it creates more housing problems than it solves. A few of the key reasons are below.

First, rent control distorts the housing market by holding rents below the level set by supply and demand. When prices are capped, some owners choose not to rent units or delay improvements, and fewer new apartments get built in the first place. Lower allowable rents reduce the projected value of new housing, which often cannot offset rising construction costs driven by inflation and higher interest rates.

Second, restricted rental income affects upkeep. When revenue cannot keep pace with expenses, maintenance is reduced and buildings gradually decline. Owners who purchased recently may only be able to afford basic repairs, while others with lower mortgage costs may still avoid major upgrades because they know they cannot recover the investment through future rents.

Finally, rent control interferes with normal housing mobility. Households who could afford market-rate housing often remain in regulated units, while those with the greatest need struggle to find available apartments. Because the policy discourages construction of new rental and multifamily housing, fewer affordable options open up over time. In practice, rent control locks tenants into place, limits reinvestment in aging housing stock, and significantly reduces new development by weakening the financial viability of building housing.

Research and policy analysis in Rhode Island, including recommendations discussed by the Rhode Island Public Expenditure Council (RIPEC), instead emphasize approaches that directly address affordability without suppressing housing production. These include expanding housing supply through zoning and permitting reform, encouraging new construction and redevelopment, supporting rehabilitation of existing units, and providing targeted assistance such as rental subsidies or income-based support for households most in need.

For these reasons, policymakers should pursue solutions that increase housing availability and target aid effectively, rather than adopt rent regulation policies that risk reducing supply and housing quality.

Sincerely,

Marc Santos
17 Logan Dr
Lincoln, RI 02865
marc@premierpropertiesri.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Kyle Cehanowicz <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE RENT CONTROL - H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

Rent control has been proven to be harmful to the housing supply and overall markets. Furthermore your legislation is an attempt to control a free market while robbing owners of hard earned equity. Perhaps your focus should be better placed in efforts to force municipalities to encourage development, eliminate bureaucratic policies that interfere with progress in construction approvals and investment and focus on managing your budget properly.

I respectfully submit testimony in opposition to H8108 (Rent Control)

The discussion around this proposal is not a landlord-tenant dispute; it is a statewide economic policy that will shape housing availability, investment decisions, and the cost of living across Rhode Island. Even individuals or properties that appear exempt would still experience its consequences, because regulating prices changes behavior throughout the entire housing market — influencing lending, insurance, screening practices, reinvestment, and whether housing is created at all.

The bill would also require a substantial administrative system. Boards, hearings, compliance review, and enforcement actions cost millions of dollars to operate while producing no additional housing supply. Rhode Island's limited public resources would be better directed toward targeted and proven approaches that assist residents who are struggling to afford housing rather than maintaining a permanent regulatory bureaucracy.

There is also a tax impact. When regulated properties lose value or stagnate, municipalities must still fund schools, public safety services, and essential services. That burden does not disappear — it shifts, most often onto single-family homeowners.

Across decades of research, economists broadly agree that rent control reduces housing supply and worsens long-term affordability for the following reasons:

- Market distortion — Artificial price ceilings separate rents from supply and demand, discouraging participation in the rental market and creating shortages.
- Declining housing quality — Limited income potential reduces the ability and incentive to maintain or improve properties.
- Allocation inefficiency — Subsidies are not reliably targeted to those most in need, while others cannot find available housing.
- Reduced investment — New construction and reinvestment become less financially viable, slowing housing creation.
- Unintended consequences — Supply shrinks, screening becomes stricter, and housing shifts to alternative uses.
- Market segmentation — A divided market forms between controlled and uncontrolled units, increasing disparities.
- Administrative burden — Complex rules require ongoing enforcement and litigation at public expense.
- Legal and operational strain — Expanded litigation exposure and capped turnover rents make it difficult to fund necessary repairs between tenancies while also adding pressure to already burdened courts.

Rhode Island faces a real housing affordability challenge, but policies that restrict housing creation and shift costs onto homeowners will not solve it. Expanding supply and using targeted assistance for households in need are more effective approaches.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose all rent control proposals.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Kyle Cehanowicz
PO Box 5448
Wakefield, RI 02880
kyle.cehanowicz@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of Gregory Rice <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE RENT CONTROL H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I am writing to express opposition to House Bill 8108.

This legislation should be understood as a policy detrimental to the state economy, not a landlord-tenant disagreement. Policies that regulate housing prices alter incentives across the entire housing market — influencing investment, maintenance, lending, insurance underwriting, and ultimately whether additional housing is created in Rhode Island. Analysis from the Rhode Island Public Expenditure Council (RIPEC) consistently emphasizes two realities about our state's housing and municipal finance structure: Rhode Island faces a structural housing shortage, and municipalities rely heavily on stable property values to fund core public services. Policies that discourage reinvestment or reduce property values directly undermine both of these conditions at the same time.

By limiting the financial viability of rental housing, this proposal risks reducing reinvestment in existing units and slowing new development. RIPEC's research has highlighted that increasing supply is essential to improving affordability. Measures that restrict returns on housing do the opposite — they discourage production and delay rehabilitation, worsening long-term affordability rather than improving it.

The bill would also require an extensive regulatory framework to administer compliance, hearings, and enforcement. This type of permanent oversight structure carries substantial cost while producing no new housing units. Rhode Island's limited public resources would be more effectively directed toward targeted assistance programs and policies that expand supply — approaches that research repeatedly shows are more effective at helping households facing affordability challenges.

Additionally, if regulated property values stagnate while municipal obligations remain constant, tax burdens inevitably shift. Because municipalities must still fund schools, infrastructure, and safety services, pressure moves toward the most stable tax base: single-family homeowners.

Rhode Island's housing challenge is real, but long-term affordability depends on increasing availability and encouraging reinvestment — not discouraging it. For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose H8108 and instead focus on policies that expand housing opportunity and directly assist residents in need.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Gregory Rice
249 E Shore Dr Apt Coventry
Coventry, RI 02816
Gregnexusleasing@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of William Rawlings <manager@pmfp.llc>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE RENT CONTROL - H8108

[You don't often get email from manager@pmfp.llc. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I respectfully submit testimony in opposition to H8108 (Rent Control)

The discussion around this proposal is not a landlord-tenant dispute; it is a statewide economic policy that will shape housing availability, investment decisions, and the cost of living across Rhode Island. Even individuals or properties that appear exempt would still experience its consequences, because regulating prices changes behavior throughout the entire housing market — influencing lending, insurance, screening practices, reinvestment, and whether housing is created at all.

The bill would also require a substantial administrative system. Boards, hearings, compliance review, and enforcement actions cost millions of dollars to operate while producing no additional housing supply. Rhode Island's limited public resources would be better directed toward targeted and proven approaches that assist residents who are struggling to afford housing rather than maintaining a permanent regulatory bureaucracy.

There is also a tax impact. When regulated properties lose value or stagnate, municipalities must still fund schools, public safety services, and essential services. That burden does not disappear — it shifts, most often onto single-family homeowners.

Across decades of research, economists broadly agree that rent control reduces housing supply and worsens long-term affordability for the following reasons:

- Market distortion — Artificial price ceilings separate rents from supply and demand, discouraging participation in the rental market and creating shortages.
- Declining housing quality — Limited income potential reduces the ability and incentive to maintain or improve properties.
- Allocation inefficiency — Subsidies are not reliably targeted to those most in need, while others cannot find available housing.
- Reduced investment — New construction and reinvestment become less financially viable, slowing housing creation.
- Unintended consequences — Supply shrinks, screening becomes stricter, and housing shifts to alternative uses.
- Market segmentation — A divided market forms between controlled and uncontrolled units, increasing disparities.
- Administrative burden — Complex rules require ongoing enforcement and litigation at public expense.
- Legal and operational strain — Expanded litigation exposure and capped turnover rents make it difficult to fund necessary repairs between tenancies while also adding pressure to already burdened courts.

Rhode Island faces a real housing affordability challenge, but policies that restrict housing creation and shift costs onto homeowners will not solve it. Expanding supply and using targeted assistance for households in need are more effective approaches.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose all rent control proposals.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

William Rawlings
564 S Water St
Providence, RI 02903
manager@pmfp.llc

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Rob Grace <rgrace@rihousebuyer.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Opposed -Rent Control H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

Rent control has been studied extensively, and over 94% of economists conclude it creates more housing problems than it solves. A few of the key reasons are below.

First, rent control distorts the housing market by holding rents below the level set by supply and demand. When prices are capped, some owners choose not to rent units or delay improvements, and fewer new apartments get built in the first place. Lower allowable rents reduce the projected value of new housing, which often cannot offset rising construction costs driven by inflation and higher interest rates.

Second, restricted rental income affects upkeep. When revenue cannot keep pace with expenses, maintenance is reduced and buildings gradually decline. Owners who purchased recently may only be able to afford basic repairs, while others with lower mortgage costs may still avoid major upgrades because they know they cannot recover the investment through future rents.

Finally, rent control interferes with normal housing mobility. Households who could afford market-rate housing often remain in regulated units, while those with the greatest need struggle to find available apartments. Because the policy discourages construction of new rental and multifamily housing, fewer affordable options open up over time.

In practice, rent control locks tenants into place, limits reinvestment in aging housing stock, and significantly reduces new development by weakening the financial viability of building housing.

Research and policy analysis in Rhode Island, including recommendations discussed by the Rhode Island Public Expenditure Council (RIPEC), instead emphasize approaches that directly address affordability without suppressing housing production. These include expanding housing supply through zoning and permitting reform, encouraging new construction and redevelopment, supporting rehabilitation of existing units, and providing targeted assistance such as rental subsidies or income-based support for households most in need.

For these reasons, policymakers should pursue solutions that increase housing availability and target aid effectively, rather than adopt rent regulation policies that risk reducing supply and housing quality.

Sincerely,

Rob Grace
PO Box 41568
Providence, RI 02940
rgrace@rihousebuyer.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveoice.net on behalf of Scott Gaudreau <sgaudreau@pag-cdg.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:35 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE RENT CONTROL - H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I respectfully submit testimony in opposition to H8108 (Rent Control)

The discussion around this proposal is not a landlord-tenant dispute; it is a statewide economic policy that will shape housing availability, investment decisions, and the cost of living across Rhode Island. Even individuals or properties that appear exempt would still experience its consequences, because regulating prices changes behavior throughout the entire housing market — influencing lending, insurance, screening practices, reinvestment, and whether housing is created at all.

The bill would also require a substantial administrative system. Boards, hearings, compliance review, and enforcement actions cost millions of dollars to operate while producing no additional housing supply. Rhode Island's limited public resources would be better directed toward targeted and proven approaches that assist residents who are struggling to afford housing rather than maintaining a permanent regulatory bureaucracy.

There is also a tax impact. When regulated properties lose value or stagnate, municipalities must still fund schools, public safety services, and essential services. That burden does not disappear — it shifts, most often onto single-family homeowners.

Across decades of research, economists broadly agree that rent control reduces housing supply and worsens long-term affordability for the following reasons:

- Market distortion — Artificial price ceilings separate rents from supply and demand, discouraging participation in the rental market and creating shortages.
- Declining housing quality — Limited income potential reduces the ability and incentive to maintain or improve properties.
- Allocation inefficiency — Subsidies are not reliably targeted to those most in need, while others cannot find available housing.
- Reduced investment — New construction and reinvestment become less financially viable, slowing housing creation.
- Unintended consequences — Supply shrinks, screening becomes stricter, and housing shifts to alternative uses.
- Market segmentation — A divided market forms between controlled and uncontrolled units, increasing disparities.
- Administrative burden — Complex rules require ongoing enforcement and litigation at public expense.
- Legal and operational strain — Expanded litigation exposure and capped turnover rents make it difficult to fund necessary repairs between tenancies while also adding pressure to already burdened courts.

Rhode Island faces a real housing affordability challenge, but policies that restrict housing creation and shift costs onto homeowners will not solve it. Expanding supply and using targeted assistance for households in need are more effective approaches.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose all rent control proposals.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Scott Gaudreau
103 Tepee Trl
Cranston, RI 02921
sgaudreau@pag-cdg.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of Francisco Sanchez <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 7, 2026 12:30 AM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE RENT CONTROL H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I am writing to express opposition to House Bill 8108.

This legislation should be understood as a policy detrimental to the state economy, not a landlord-tenant disagreement. Policies that regulate housing prices alter incentives across the entire housing market — influencing investment, maintenance, lending, insurance underwriting, and ultimately whether additional housing is created in Rhode Island. Analysis from the Rhode Island Public Expenditure Council (RIPEC) consistently emphasizes two realities about our state's housing and municipal finance structure: Rhode Island faces a structural housing shortage, and municipalities rely heavily on stable property values to fund core public services. Policies that discourage reinvestment or reduce property values directly undermine both of these conditions at the same time.

By limiting the financial viability of rental housing, this proposal risks reducing reinvestment in existing units and slowing new development. RIPEC's research has highlighted that increasing supply is essential to improving affordability.

Measures that restrict returns on housing do the opposite — they discourage production and delay rehabilitation, worsening long-term affordability rather than improving it.

The bill would also require an extensive regulatory framework to administer compliance, hearings, and enforcement.

This type of permanent oversight structure carries substantial cost while producing no new housing units. Rhode Island's limited public resources would be more effectively directed toward targeted assistance programs and policies that expand supply — approaches that research repeatedly shows are more effective at helping households facing affordability challenges.

Additionally, if regulated property values stagnate while municipal obligations remain constant, tax burdens inevitably shift. Because municipalities must still fund schools, infrastructure, and safety services, pressure moves toward the most stable tax base: single-family homeowners.

Rhode Island's housing challenge is real, but long-term affordability depends on increasing availability and encouraging reinvestment — not discouraging it. For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose H8108 and instead focus on policies that expand housing opportunity and directly assist residents in need.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Francisco Sanchez
52 Harding Ave
Johnston, RI 02919
sanchez1068@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of Andre Carew <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 10:37 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE RENT CONTROL - H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

As a small landlord who genuinely tries very hard to keep rents under market, this legislation would make it much harder for me to keep rents low and only make adjustments when needed. I feel most landlords would have to start raising rates to keep ahead of significant tax, insurance, etc. increases if our hands are tied to react to them. Also many times when a vacancy occurs we make repairs, improvements, etc tenants want and we need the ability to adjust rent to reflect those repairs. I feel this bill would encourage property conditions to deteriorate on a turn over rather than improve.

I respectfully submit testimony in opposition to H8108 (Rent Control)

The discussion around this proposal is not a landlord-tenant dispute; it is a statewide economic policy that will shape housing availability, investment decisions, and the cost of living across Rhode Island. Even individuals or properties that appear exempt would still experience its consequences, because regulating prices changes behavior throughout the entire housing market — influencing lending, insurance, screening practices, reinvestment, and whether housing is created at all.

The bill would also require a substantial administrative system. Boards, hearings, compliance review, and enforcement actions cost millions of dollars to operate while producing no additional housing supply. Rhode Island's limited public resources would be better directed toward targeted and proven approaches that assist residents who are struggling to afford housing rather than maintaining a permanent regulatory bureaucracy.

There is also a tax impact. When regulated properties lose value or stagnate, municipalities must still fund schools, public safety services, and essential services. That burden does not disappear — it shifts, most often onto single-family homeowners.

Across decades of research, economists broadly agree that rent control reduces housing supply and worsens long-term affordability for the following reasons:

- Market distortion — Artificial price ceilings separate rents from supply and demand, discouraging participation in the rental market and creating shortages.
- Declining housing quality — Limited income potential reduces the ability and incentive to maintain or improve properties.
- Allocation inefficiency — Subsidies are not reliably targeted to those most in need, while others cannot find available housing.
- Reduced investment — New construction and reinvestment become less financially viable, slowing housing creation.
- Unintended consequences — Supply shrinks, screening becomes stricter, and housing shifts to alternative uses.
- Market segmentation — A divided market forms between controlled and uncontrolled units, increasing disparities.
- Administrative burden — Complex rules require ongoing enforcement and litigation at public expense.
- Legal and operational strain — Expanded litigation exposure and capped turnover rents make it difficult to fund necessary repairs between tenancies while also adding pressure to already burdened courts.

Rhode Island faces a real housing affordability challenge, but policies that restrict housing creation and shift costs onto homeowners will not solve it. Expanding supply and using targeted assistance for households in need are more effective approaches.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose all rent control proposals.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Andre Carew
222 Taft Ave
Warwick, RI 02886
acj24@verizon.net

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Patricia Major <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 8:25 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSED RENT CONTROL - H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I am writing to respectfully oppose the proposed rent control ordinance and to urge the State House to reconsider this policy in light of its well-documented and unintended consequences.

While housing affordability is a serious concern, rent control ultimately reduces the supply of housing and worsens the very problem it seeks to solve. When rents are capped, developers are far less likely to build new housing, and existing property owners are forced to delay improvements or exit the rental market altogether. The result is fewer available units, aging buildings, and increased competition for housing—driving prices up for everyone not fortunate enough to secure a regulated unit.

This is especially concerning in Rhode Island, where much of the housing stock is older and requires constant reinvestment to remain safe and livable. Rent control limits the ability to keep pace with rising costs such as taxes, insurance, utilities, maintenance, and repairs—none of which are capped. Over time, this leads to deterioration of existing housing and declining neighborhood conditions, ultimately harming tenants.

Rent control also carries significant fiscal consequences for the state. When property values decline, municipal tax revenues fall as well. Because local governments rely heavily on real estate taxes to fund essential services, these losses directly impact public schools, public safety, public works, transportation, libraries, and other critical services. When revenue declines, the tax burden shifts to single-family homeowners and owner-occupants who are least able to absorb additional costs.

Equally important, rent control is not an equitable solution. It does not reliably reach those most in need. Instead, it often benefits higher-income households who secure regulated units, regardless of financial need, while lower-income renters face fewer options and longer waits in an increasingly constrained market. By discouraging new construction, rent control also reduces housing mobility, limiting the natural process by which new housing creates opportunities throughout the market.

Although a small number of tenants may experience short-term relief, the long-term effects are fewer housing choices, higher rents for unregulated units, reduced maintenance, and greater inequity. These outcomes have been consistently observed in cities that have adopted similar policies.

Rhode Island would be better served by solutions that expand housing supply and provide targeted assistance to residents who truly need help. Investing in housing production, reducing unnecessary regulatory barriers, and strengthening direct rental assistance programs offer a more effective and sustainable path toward affordability—without the harmful side effects of rent control.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the state to oppose the proposed rent control ordinance and pursue policies that promote long-term housing stability and opportunity for all residents.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Patricia Major
652 Orleans Ct
Warwick, RI 02886
pattymajor16@verizon.net

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of MERCEDES PATHANIA
<user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 8:25 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSED RENT CONTROL - H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I am writing to respectfully oppose the proposed rent control ordinance and to urge the State House to reconsider this policy in light of its well-documented and unintended consequences.

While housing affordability is a serious concern, rent control ultimately reduces the supply of housing and worsens the very problem it seeks to solve. When rents are capped, developers are far less likely to build new housing, and existing property owners are forced to delay improvements or exit the rental market altogether. The result is fewer available units, aging buildings, and increased competition for housing—driving prices up for everyone not fortunate enough to secure a regulated unit.

This is especially concerning in Rhode Island, where much of the housing stock is older and requires constant reinvestment to remain safe and livable. Rent control limits the ability to keep pace with rising costs such as taxes, insurance, utilities, maintenance, and repairs—none of which are capped. Over time, this leads to deterioration of existing housing and declining neighborhood conditions, ultimately harming tenants.

Rent control also carries significant fiscal consequences for the state. When property values decline, municipal tax revenues fall as well. Because local governments rely heavily on real estate taxes to fund essential services, these losses directly impact public schools, public safety, public works, transportation, libraries, and other critical services. When revenue declines, the tax burden shifts to single-family homeowners and owner-occupants who are least able to absorb additional costs.

Equally important, rent control is not an equitable solution. It does not reliably reach those most in need. Instead, it often benefits higher-income households who secure regulated units, regardless of financial need, while lower-income renters face fewer options and longer waits in an increasingly constrained market. By discouraging new construction, rent control also reduces housing mobility, limiting the natural process by which new housing creates opportunities throughout the market.

Although a small number of tenants may experience short-term relief, the long-term effects are fewer housing choices, higher rents for unregulated units, reduced maintenance, and greater inequity. These outcomes have been consistently observed in cities that have adopted similar policies.

Rhode Island would be better served by solutions that expand housing supply and provide targeted assistance to residents who truly need help. Investing in housing production, reducing unnecessary regulatory barriers, and strengthening direct rental assistance programs offer a more effective and sustainable path toward affordability—without the harmful side effects of rent control.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the state to oppose the proposed rent control ordinance and pursue policies that promote long-term housing stability and opportunity for all residents.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

MERCEDES PATHANIA
147 Wood St
Providence, RI 02909
mercedes428@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of Deborah Capoverde
<user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 7, 2026 10:08 AM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Opposed -Rent Control H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

OPPOSE OPPOSE OPPOSE

I OPPOSED it in Providence. I OPPOSE it statewide.
& has this proposal even been advertised statewide?
It has an under the cloak of darkness feel about it!

Rent control has been studied extensively, and over 94% of economists conclude it creates more housing problems than it solves. A few of the key reasons are below.

First, rent control distorts the housing market by holding rents below the level set by supply and demand. When prices are capped, some owners choose not to rent units or delay improvements, and fewer new apartments get built in the first place. Lower allowable rents reduce the projected value of new housing, which often cannot offset rising construction costs driven by inflation and higher interest rates.

Second, restricted rental income affects upkeep. When revenue cannot keep pace with expenses, maintenance is reduced and buildings gradually decline. Owners who purchased recently may only be able to afford basic repairs, while others with lower mortgage costs may still avoid major upgrades because they know they cannot recover the investment through future rents.

Finally, rent control interferes with normal housing mobility. Households who could afford market-rate housing often remain in regulated units, while those with the greatest need struggle to find available apartments. Because the policy discourages construction of new rental and multifamily housing, fewer affordable options open up over time.

In practice, rent control locks tenants into place, limits reinvestment in aging housing stock, and significantly reduces new development by weakening the financial viability of building housing.

Research and policy analysis in Rhode Island, including recommendations discussed by the Rhode Island Public Expenditure Council (RIPEC), instead emphasize approaches that directly address affordability without suppressing housing production. These include expanding housing supply through zoning and permitting reform, encouraging new construction and redevelopment, supporting rehabilitation of existing units, and providing targeted assistance such as rental subsidies or income-based support for households most in need.

For these reasons, policymakers should pursue solutions that increase housing availability and target aid effectively, rather than adopt rent regulation policies that risk reducing supply and housing quality.

Sincerely,

Deborah Capoverde
65 Orchard Ave
Barrington, RI 02806
debcapoverde@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of Mark Reilly
<mark@lyonpropertygroup.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 7, 2026 10:08 AM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Opposed -Rent Control H8108

[You don't often get email from mark@lyonpropertygroup.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

The government cannot continue with raising taxes and other fees for property owners and not expect it to affect rents. property owners want long term residents in their units they do not want turnover but with the taxes and fees going up each and every year it makes it impossible to not raise rent to cover incurred costs.

Rent control has been studied extensively, and over 94% of economists conclude it creates more housing problems than it solves. A few of the key reasons are below.

First, rent control distorts the housing market by holding rents below the level set by supply and demand. When prices are capped, some owners choose not to rent units or delay improvements, and fewer new apartments get built in the first place. Lower allowable rents reduce the projected value of new housing, which often cannot offset rising construction costs driven by inflation and higher interest rates.

Second, restricted rental income affects upkeep. When revenue cannot keep pace with expenses, maintenance is reduced and buildings gradually decline. Owners who purchased recently may only be able to afford basic repairs, while others with lower mortgage costs may still avoid major upgrades because they know they cannot recover the investment through future rents.

Finally, rent control interferes with normal housing mobility. Households who could afford market-rate housing often remain in regulated units, while those with the greatest need struggle to find available apartments. Because the policy discourages construction of new rental and multifamily housing, fewer affordable options open up over time. In practice, rent control locks tenants into place, limits reinvestment in aging housing stock, and significantly reduces new development by weakening the financial viability of building housing.

Research and policy analysis in Rhode Island, including recommendations discussed by the Rhode Island Public Expenditure Council (RIPEC), instead emphasize approaches that directly address affordability without suppressing housing production. These include expanding housing supply through zoning and permitting reform, encouraging new construction and redevelopment, supporting rehabilitation of existing units, and providing targeted assistance such as rental subsidies or income-based support for households most in need.

For these reasons, policymakers should pursue solutions that increase housing availability and target aid effectively, rather than adopt rent regulation policies that risk reducing supply and housing quality.

Sincerely,

Mark Reilly
65 Jefferson Blvd
Warwick, RI 02888
mark@lyonpropertygroup.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Jason Frezza <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 7, 2026 10:08 AM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE RENT CONTROL H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

My name is Jason Frezza and my wife and I have been life-long Rhode Islanders and have worked full-time jobs for 20 years while saving our money and investing in multi-family real estate for the purpose of our retirement. As long-term RI investors, we continue to add value to our properties. We are on call 24/7 and immediately respond to our tenants. We have several long-term tenants that are WELL below market rent because we strive to only increase rent after a tenant leaves. This bill below will change the way we handle rent which will be worse for the tenants.

I want to address S2271/H8108 - Statewide rent control limit of 4%, no reset on vacancy, limits evictions to "just cause". This particular bill would be disastrous. For one thing, there are times when we need to end a tenancy even if the tenant is still paying. This can happen if tenants are not getting along, or if there is a safety or security risk. We have had to do this on occasion. If "just cause" was in place, it could put the tenants and the property at risk.

As far as the rent control, this has already been proven to not work and can have the opposite effect. If this bill were to pass, we would probably sell our properties and invest elsewhere. You would see these properties bought by corporations where they will raise the rents as high as possible before the bill goes into effect. We have tenants that struggle to pay their low rents now. They would not be able to afford these higher rents. This will cause an influx of evictions. You will also see less improvements and renovations if housing providers can't get the returns to justify the work.

We have spent hundreds of thousands of our own hard-earned money into these properties, as well as countless hours of blood, sweat, and tears. We see the direction this state is moving in, and we are deeply concerned.

We do not want to sell our properties; we do not want to see our long-term tenants get displaced or become financially burdened. But we also do not want to continue to invest in a state that is over-regulating our business, taking away our rights, adding what we consider to be unnecessary burdens, and potentially putting us into a position where we are unable to make the changes we need to ensure our properties continue to be safe for everyone, updated, and remain profitable. It only takes one disgruntled tenant to have a severe impact on an entire building or neighborhood, and in some of our past experiences, may have had nothing to do with us or our properties.

We do not think it is fair to impose laws attempting to go after a small percentage of bad actors that typically invest in one particular area. We think instead there should be more enforcement of existing laws in those areas. We also think RI lawmakers should be giving MORE incentives to invest, develop, and remain in RI, not LESS.

Jason Frezza

I am writing to express opposition to House Bill 8108.

This legislation should be understood as a policy detrimental to the state economy, not a landlord-tenant disagreement. Policies that regulate housing prices alter incentives across the entire housing market — influencing investment, maintenance, lending, insurance underwriting, and ultimately whether additional housing is created in Rhode Island. Analysis from the Rhode Island Public Expenditure Council (RIPEC) consistently emphasizes two realities about our state's housing and municipal finance structure: Rhode Island faces a structural housing shortage, and municipalities rely heavily on stable property values to fund core public services. Policies that discourage reinvestment or reduce property values directly undermine both of these conditions at the same time.

By limiting the financial viability of rental housing, this proposal risks reducing reinvestment in existing units and slowing new development. RIPEC's research has highlighted that increasing supply is essential to improving affordability. Measures that restrict returns on housing do the opposite — they discourage production and delay rehabilitation, worsening long-term affordability rather than improving it.

The bill would also require an extensive regulatory framework to administer compliance, hearings, and enforcement. This type of permanent oversight structure carries substantial cost while producing no new housing units. Rhode Island's limited public resources would be more effectively directed toward targeted assistance programs and policies that expand supply — approaches that research repeatedly shows are more effective at helping households facing affordability challenges.

Additionally, if regulated property values stagnate while municipal obligations remain constant, tax burdens inevitably shift. Because municipalities must still fund schools, infrastructure, and safety services, pressure moves toward the most stable tax base: single-family homeowners.

Rhode Island's housing challenge is real, but long-term affordability depends on increasing availability and encouraging reinvestment — not discouraging it. For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose H8108 and instead focus on policies that expand housing opportunity and directly assist residents in need.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jason Frezza
51 Latham Farm Rd
Smithfield, RI 02917
jasonf231@yahoo.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of Yamarie Rivera <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 7, 2026 10:08 AM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSED RENT CONTROL - H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I am writing to respectfully oppose the proposed rent control ordinance and to urge the State House to reconsider this policy in light of its well-documented and unintended consequences.

While housing affordability is a serious concern, rent control ultimately reduces the supply of housing and worsens the very problem it seeks to solve. When rents are capped, developers are far less likely to build new housing, and existing property owners are forced to delay improvements or exit the rental market altogether. The result is fewer available units, aging buildings, and increased competition for housing—driving prices up for everyone not fortunate enough to secure a regulated unit.

This is especially concerning in Rhode Island, where much of the housing stock is older and requires constant reinvestment to remain safe and livable. Rent control limits the ability to keep pace with rising costs such as taxes, insurance, utilities, maintenance, and repairs—none of which are capped. Over time, this leads to deterioration of existing housing and declining neighborhood conditions, ultimately harming tenants.

Rent control also carries significant fiscal consequences for the state. When property values decline, municipal tax revenues fall as well. Because local governments rely heavily on real estate taxes to fund essential services, these losses directly impact public schools, public safety, public works, transportation, libraries, and other critical services. When revenue declines, the tax burden shifts to single-family homeowners and owner-occupants who are least able to absorb additional costs.

Equally important, rent control is not an equitable solution. It does not reliably reach those most in need. Instead, it often benefits higher-income households who secure regulated units, regardless of financial need, while lower-income renters face fewer options and longer waits in an increasingly constrained market. By discouraging new construction, rent control also reduces housing mobility, limiting the natural process by which new housing creates opportunities throughout the market.

Although a small number of tenants may experience short-term relief, the long-term effects are fewer housing choices, higher rents for unregulated units, reduced maintenance, and greater inequity. These outcomes have been consistently observed in cities that have adopted similar policies.

Rhode Island would be better served by solutions that expand housing supply and provide targeted assistance to residents who truly need help. Investing in housing production, reducing unnecessary regulatory barriers, and strengthening direct rental assistance programs offer a more effective and sustainable path toward affordability—without the harmful side effects of rent control.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the state to oppose the proposed rent control ordinance and pursue policies that promote long-term housing stability and opportunity for all residents.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Yamarie Rivera
133 Hillcrest Ave
Providence, RI 02909
yamarie0116@yahoo.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of Michael A Tortolani
<user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 7, 2026 10:08 AM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE - Please vote NO H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I respectfully submit testimony in opposition to H8108

This legislation should be viewed as a statewide economic policy rather than a landlord-tenant dispute. Regulating housing prices changes incentives across the entire market — affecting investment decisions, property maintenance, financing, and ultimately the availability of housing for Rhode Island residents.

Evidence from other jurisdictions consistently shows that rent control reduces housing supply and reinvestment. A national survey by the National Apartment Association found that 71% of housing providers expect to reduce or halt investment in regulated markets, while more than 60% report deferring non-essential maintenance and improvements. The National Association of Home Builders similarly reports that nearly 90% of builders avoid constructing housing in rent-controlled jurisdictions.

This is particularly concerning in Rhode Island, where over 80% of the housing stock is older and depends on continual reinvestment to remain safe and habitable. Limiting rental income makes it more difficult to finance repairs, modernization, and energy improvements, which ultimately harms the quality of housing available to tenants.

Historical outcomes reinforce this pattern. In the 1980s, after rent control was imposed, the number of rental units declined by 8% in Cambridge and 12% in Brookline, Massachusetts. After Cambridge repealed rent control in 1994, permits for new construction and renovation more than doubled for the following decade — demonstrating how regulation had suppressed housing activity.

Rent regulation also affects public finances. Reduced property values translate into reduced tax revenue for essential services. Because municipalities rely heavily on property taxation, that burden does not disappear — it shifts, often onto single-family homeowners. In Portland, Maine, analysts estimated \$6.3 to \$10.6 million annually in redistributed tax burden onto other property owners following similar policies. Many of Rhode Island's cities have a larger share of multifamily property in comparison to Portland, ME - meaning that shift would be even larger.

Finally, rent control often fails to reach those most in need. After repeal in Cambridge, a study of over 12,000 units showed only 10% of rent-controlled units were occupied by low-income households, illustrating how broad price controls can misallocate benefits while making housing harder to find for future renters.

Rhode Island faces a real affordability challenge, but long-term solutions require expanding housing availability and supporting targeted assistance for households in need — not discouraging housing creation and reinvestment.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose this proposal.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Michael A Tortolani
7 Aroostook Trl
Narragansett, RI 02882
4001mt@gmail.com