

This is not a statement against childhood lead poisoning prevention, but rather an account of our experience of being new parents and homeowners who have been navigating the challenges of an unexpected expense in excess of \$100,000.

We, like many young families in Portland and beyond, have found ourselves in the increasingly common situation of being new parents whose one-year-old child had elevated blood lead levels and were subsequently faced with the immense financial and logistical burden of a state-mandated lead abatement order.

In addition to being new parents, we are also new owners of a West End three-unit. The house is very typical and shares the common materials of the time with many of the surrounding homes. One material, in particular, is lead paint. Our house is not dilapidated or in a state of disrepair, it just happens to be old. The windows, doors, and trim have lead paint beneath the more recent coats of latex paint. When a door is shut, an old window opened, or trim bumped into, a small amount of lead dust can be created that settles on the floor. The lead dust gets on a child's hands and the child puts their hands in their mouth as children do. This is a typical scenario of how a child gets an elevated blood lead level.

When the process began, one of our units had just become vacant and we learnt that we were not allowed to rent the unit until the lead abatement process was completed and all postings were removed. In a city with a housing crisis, this decision seems illogical, since our unit (and presumably many other unoccupied units in houses under a state-mandated abatement order) would have been perfectly safe for adults to live in. From start to finish, the abatement process took 8.5 months to complete, therefore throughout this process we've lost in excess of \$16000 in rental income alone all while a perfectly fine unit has been unrentable due to current regulations.

Owning and maintaining a multifamily home in Portland is expensive and homeowners rely on steady rental income to make ends meet. Being faced with expenses of over \$100,000 and then losing 50% of our rental income on top was a challenge to say the least. An option to rent a vacant unit would have made a significant difference for us and I hope that future home owners may have the option to do so.

To conclude, I would like you to please consider why existing tenants are allowed to remain in their unit, while renting a vacant unit to new low-risk tenants is not?

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Patrick Thompson