

Pachkovsky, Alex

From: Dr. Dave <mousatonic@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 11:20 AM
To: HSGTestimony
Subject: HB 5118

David Epstein, rental property owner, New Britain:

Concerning this language:

"except where the premises are intentionally rendered unfit or uninhabitable by the tenant, a member of his family or other person on the premises with his consent, in which case such duty shall be the responsibility of the tenant;"

In rental properties, whenever such things occur, no tenant willfully takes responsibility. Establishing such, based on suspicions, is all but impossible. So the burden will fall entirely on property owners for the misdeeds of the tenants, basically as it is now. And getting a tenant to expend time and money to rectify a situation is all but impossible as well. Reject this bill based on the problematicity of this language alone.

Further: with regard to a property owner's having to "provide and maintain sufficient lighting and a security system in all hallways of the premises having public access." First, we already provide lighting, both for night and for emergencies. And what constitutes a "security system" is so vague as to be laughable. Are we talking parabolic mirrors to see around corners? Are we talking motion sensor cameras with reporting screens in everyone's apartment and another outside the building? What security system salesperson got someone to write this in to a bill such as this? Requiring property owners to provide such a "system" will only mean that any equipment involved is vulnerable to abuse, with minimal added security to tenants and odious and burdensome costs to property owners. This language is far too vague to be useful, and the implications of enactment and enforcement far too costly to both property owners and the State to be practicable.

The greatest security of all is empowering property owners to screen their tenants carefully.

Sincerely,

D. Epstein