

Transcript: House Human Services Committee  
February 27, 2018  
Re: H.736

“Shayla Livingston with the Health Department, so I’m happy to address that question first. The fees are remain only for those who are getting licenses, so those who are doing work for compensation. A landlord is going to take a training, there’s no fee in this statute about, around that training, it does still require them to take a training and that will be again, outlined in rule, as it is currently outlined in rule. To the Representative’s question earlier: the practices, the Essential Maintenance Practices that are currently in statute will be moving to rule, but they will be staying the same in terms of making sure the deteriorated and chipping paint is not, you know in a property. A place where a tenant or a child can be exposed to it, etc., etc. **The cost effective way in which landlords are able comply with this law will remain the same. They do not need to pay permitting fees, they do not need to pay licensing fees. Again, they will just be required to take the training, as they are required to do that now.** “

*Rep. Ann Pugh: What about the comment that the Federal standards are for big projects?*

“Yeah, so that maybe is an excellent example of where, you know, the Health Department is really hoping with this rewrite to be able to put some more time, energy and resources into doing education and outreach, in the sense that if a landlord is going to hire somebody to do work for bigger projects then yes, that is correct, right? If you’re hiring somebody to do work for compensation then they need to comply with these RRPM standards. If you are doing your own work, then you do not, under current law and that will continue to be the case going forward. So, you know, that is probably true. If you’re going to do a huge renovation, you might be hiring an somebody to work. That individual that you hired is required to comply with RRPM “