

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Jay Gifford <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 7, 2026 10:11 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSED RENT CONTROL - H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I officially oppose rent control bill H8108, because study after study all are in agreement, it is a bad policy. It only helps existing tenants, it hurts economic growth, it lowers tax revenue (Providence's Chief Financial Officer, Larry Mancini, who has more than 40 years of experience, testified that the city could lose between \$10.3 million and \$17.5 million in tax revenue if property values decline.), it forces landlords to abandon CapEx improvements (expensive, non recurring items like roofs, boilers, etc.), and more bad results.

But I don't care anymore. Why? Because you are putting a price floor on rent increases after a time of record high rent increases. Without rent control, and with added new construction meeting the housing demand, rents can level off or decline. With this bill, the rent will go up 4% every single year with less incentive for developers to build (even with new construction exemptions, politicians are creating a hostile environment for housing providers and there might not be enough trust for them to focus on developing in this area) Currently, I have been raising rent 2-3% or less per year. Not anymore if this passes. 4% year after year and that adds up. And other landlords will be doing the same thing. So go ahead, jam this though. I will do better at the expense of my tenants.

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,

Jay Gifford
68 Armistice Blvd
Pawtucket, RI 02860
jaygiff@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of Rose Russell <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 7, 2026 10:11 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Opposed -Rent Control H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

OPPOSE H5954 Rent Control and Just Cause Providence 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.

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.

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) Former mayor Cianci gave away the future of Providence buying off the unions with compounded 5-6% cost of living increases which turned into an exponentially increasing unfunded pensions and benefits liability whereby folks who worked for the city for 20 years, retired at 40 years old making \$35,000/year are now getting paid \$275,000/year and getting all of their health care benefits covered by the rest of us who, being taxed to death, cannot put aside anything for our own retirement. The mayor needs to grow some balls. Gina Raimondo took on the states unfunded pension liability, so RI has a chance to stabilize, but no mayor in this city in the recent past has addressed this issue, and now they come to the state to tax us into foreclosure. DO NOT APPROVE THIS COWARDLY, SCANDALOUS TAXATION!!!!!!

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. 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. 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.

As for just cause I have dealt with violent and destructive tenants that so scared my good tenants that the great tenants moved out and left rather than put their names on a police report and risk retaliation, like the neighbor across the street faced, when she called the police on these terrible folks and right in front of her these bad tenants slashed all of her car tires and assaulted her. She moved right away.

It is a threat to all peaceful decent tenants to restrict the right to terminate a lease as proving just cause is impossible to do because tenants would rather move than face physical threats from horrific tenants.

These awful tenants were 2 attorneys and a nurse, by the way. So they looked great on paper and pulled every trick in the book to remain. They caused over \$109,000 worth of damages and lost rent. I have a \$62,000 judgement against them that I will never be able to collect.

I recently had a tenant who would not contact me as required when there was an issue. Instead she called code enforcement. The 1st time the very reputable contractors with 30+ years of experience came over, the tenant accused them of casing the place when they were actually looking to use the bathroom. After that the tenants would not permit my contractors to enter to do the work. That clause in this bill leaves the opportunity for destructive and dishonest tenants to call code enforcement as a strategy to stop a homeowner from repairing an issue, and collecting rent. And if you want places to be habitable, sometimes people need to move and that is not ever an expense that should be borne by the homeowner who in good faith is trying to get a place fixed, renovated and safe. Those repair costs are outrageously expensive.

Lastly, many of my tenants move when it's time for them to buy a place. This past month 2 young families living in my apartments bought condos so they could start to paint and decorate as they wished and build equity for their families. Last year a friend of mine sold her 3 family house to move out of state. The person who bought the house turned it into 3 condos. My 2 tenants bought 2 of those condos and just finished moving in. When I'm too old and tired and it comes time for me to downsize, some of my units would be awesome condos which I would 1st offer to my current residents. Creating an opportunity for them to become homeowners and I will NOT let you infringe upon my property rights after all I have done to create housing from derelict structures, I will decide when, how and if to sell them.

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,

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

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of Allen Dennison, MD
<user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 7, 2026 10:11 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,

Allen Dennison
325 Newman Ave
Rumford, RI 02916
jamdmd@aol.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Pitman LLC <mandy@heirloom-books.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 7, 2026 10:11 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Oppose Rent Control H8108

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

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I am writing as a housing provider to express strong opposition to the proposed rent control bill.

While housing affordability is important, this legislation will ultimately make the problem worse by reducing the supply of rental housing and discouraging responsible ownership.

The 4% cap on rent increases does not reflect real-world cost increases in insurance, taxes, labor, and materials, all of which can rise unpredictably and far beyond that limit. Forcing landlords into a bureaucratic approval process to keep up with basic operating costs creates uncertainty and delay, particularly for small property owners.

The inclusion of vacancy control is especially concerning. Preventing rents from resetting between tenancies removes the incentive to reinvest in properties and will lead many owners to sell or exit the rental market entirely, reducing available housing.

The bill's "for cause" eviction requirement also increases risk. Limiting flexibility in managing tenancies makes it harder to address problem situations and will lead landlords to be more selective upfront, which can unintentionally make it harder for some renters to secure housing.

Equally troubling is the legal exposure created by this bill. Allowing private lawsuits, combined with statutory damages and attorneys' fees, invites unnecessary litigation and increases risk for housing providers without adding a single new unit of housing.

Housing affordability is a serious issue, but it cannot be solved by shifting the burden onto private property owners. Policies that increase supply and reduce the cost of building and maintaining housing are far more effective long-term solutions.

I urge you to oppose this legislation.

Sincerely,

Pitman LLC
20 Pitman St
Providence, RI 02906
mandy@heirloom-books.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Louis Siano <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 7, 2026 10:11 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Oppose Rent Control H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

In my personal experience, I would not have bought a property in RI if this was in place. If I would not buy the property as a mom and pop landlord, then you are looking at persons that can afford a property without any loans and therefore BIGGER investors... This bill takes away mom and pop landlords, decreases the amount of housing in such a housing needed environment, and also decreases the amount of future developers and builders that would have otherwise loved to make new apartments for our state!

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,

Louis Siano
18 Pocahontas Dr
Middletown, RI 02842
louissiano.realtor@yahoo.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of Tom Ricci <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 7, 2026 10:11 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Opposed -Rent Control H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

Another foolish idea It doesn't work ! Hasn't worked in any other city U want to cap rent at four percent What about taxes water sewer and insurance ? U think that caps at 4 percent ? Probably triples that ! This short sighted bill once again leads to less rental units since the owner will say I'll just sell it One of the worst ideas that has been presented

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,

Tom Ricci
PO Box 10476
Cranston, RI 02910
tr91065@aol.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of John Baldwin <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 7, 2026 10:11 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Opposed -Rent Control H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

If this passes, I will surely raise rents 4% every year. That is the only way I'll be able to keep up with everyone else who will surely do the same and not have my home devalued due to below market rates if/ when I go to sell. Currently, I leave rents alone as my tenants tend to stay a long while. And what does this bill address on the current un-affordability front? How does it address the current housing shortage which drives up rates? I've yet to hear any explanation for either concern.

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,

John Baldwin
60 Wright Ln
Jamestown, RI 02835
jebaldwin911@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Chris Woodard <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 7, 2026 10:37 AM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE RENT CONTROL H8108

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

Rhis will cripple the RI real estate market.

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,

Chris Woodard
778 Dartmouth St
South Dartmouth, MA 02748
cwwoodard@gmail.com

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.voterveice.net on behalf of Sharon Joubert <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 7, 2026 10:37 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,

Sharon Joubert
51 Latham Farm Rd
Smithfield, RI 02917
shajoubert@yahoo.com