



Re: HB 2004A

30 years ago my wife and I were put out of a rental house, without cause, with 30 days notice. It was a frightening and stressful experience. We were lucky... we found another house within a few days. However, most people would find it very difficult to find acceptable replacement housing in just 30 days.

This type of short-notice eviction is extremely disruptive: The need to search for new housing, and to move a household within a limited period of time, interferes with peoples' job obligations. If children are involved, a short-notice move can mean dislocation from their schools and loss of continuity in their education.

The financial cost of a short-notice eviction can be staggering. Most landlords require at least a security deposit and first-month's rent up-front; many also want the last month's rent also. Coming up with \$ 2,500 - \$ 5,000 in less than 30 days to put towards securing a new place to live is challenging, if not impossible, for probably most renters. The alternative is of course homelessness.

That said, I still believe that "no cause" month-to-month rental agreements often provide benefits to both landlords and renters.

If the goal is to protect renters, I would recommend that HB 2004A be revised to reflect the following:

1. Do not prohibit or restrict "no-cause" evictions
2. Do require 90 day minimum notice for "no-cause" evictions
3. Do require that the 90 day notice period be **rent-free** (so that dislocated renters have the funds necessary to secure new rental housing)

/s/ Frederick W. Scalise, Ph.D.
Senior Consultant