

I am a small time landlord trying to make ends meet. In the current rental market prices of rental properties are selling for 15 time gross rent.

That means for a \$400,000 duplex I need to put down about \$110000 of my own money and then pay a mortgage, taxes and insurance of \$2000 a month.

When the rents are only \$1000 a month , I am required to subsidize the tenants housing costs. This is not a sustainable model.

What HB2004 is that if I then want to raise the rents to \$1100, my tenants can then move and I am forced to pay housing costs and try to make mortgage payments. The moving costs alone will cost me 2 months mortgage, and then there is lost rent due to having to clean and prepare the property for another tenant.

If a tenant leave without notice and/or damages the property, who is going to help me?

Maintenance costs alone are quite a burden for small landlords. Cleaning costs have gone up, mainly due to minimum wage increases, yet as landlords we cannot charge cleaning fees. So again this eats into any income that I may eventually have.

I recently had to replace a bathroom floor of my property because the tenant had not informed me of a leaking faucet. That cost me \$5000. I had to repalce the roof last year, that cost me almost \$30,000. For these costs I had to take out additional loans.

It is not easy being a landlord, it is no get rich quick scheme like PERS. Some people are trying to prepare for retirement, but the State is also trying to make it harder for the small guy.

With regards to using fixed percentages in legislation, I think this is a bad idea. We have already got the problem with PERS. If inflation or interest rates go over 10% , landlords need to be able to increase rents with inflation. The figures need to be tied to LIBOR or an inflation index.

I can understand there is a problem with no cause evictions. On the whole this should not occur very often if landlords use good screening methods. I recommend limiting the no cause eviction to 1 eviction per property or 10 units , per year. Maybe if a landlord requires more no cause evictions than that, they can pay into a central fund which can be used to fund hardship cases.

No cause evictions can be a useful tool for a landlord to evict people that are not breaking any rules. For example if someone insists on cleaning their guns on the front porch and other tenant's children are playing nearby. If you get complaints from multiple tenants/parents and the person still carries on with the undired behavior , a landlord could use a no cause evictions.

Same tools can be used if a tenant is continually making sexual comments towards other tenants. This is very hard to prove as a rent violation, but can be very concerning for other tenants.

How would you propose we deal with those types of situations?

Also a no cause eviction has minimal effect on a tenants record, but a for cause eviction may stop them being able to rent another property.

