

04 April 2021

To: Senate Committee on Housing and Development

Re: Senate Bill 271

Dear Chair Senator Jama, Vice-Chair Senator Linthicum, and members of the Committee:

It is legislative bills such as this one that keep me scratching my head in wonder. With the exception of the one word, *rental*, Senate Bill 271 is identical to Senate Bill 282.

I'm almost surprised there isn't a senate bill to study issues related to *affordable* housing or *transitional* housing. Then there are also *single family* and *multi-family* housing. To make use of a term currently in vogue, just how *inclusive* do housing "issues" need to be? These days I'd venture "exceedingly inclusive" wouldn't be too strongly put. So, why the distinction that requires these two bills? Could it be due to "rental" and more particularly "landlord", are subjects very much in vogue these days as well? And homage must be paid?

Would it have been so difficult for the *Interim* Committee on Human Services to simply just say housing, and study it in all its manifestations? Is it really necessary to specify between the several types to come with an adequate and satisfactory study of "issues" related to housing?

Does whatever time and effort is involved in writing short bills such as these warrant *doubling* that effort for a minor distinction such as these do? Doubling also the time and energy of legislators and committees as well as those actually performing the studies? And for what?

With the hundreds - if not thousands - of bills wending their way through the legislative process aren't time and effort at a premium? Particularly in view of the currently diminished capabilities of the legislature as a result of lockdowns wouldn't efficiency be of the highest priority?

I've listened for years as various legislators bemoan the lack of time during any particular session "to *hear* all the bills." Ironically, when bills are actually read some bemoan that too! I've often wondered at the never-ending sense of *urgency* to get through the bills and wonder to myself, what's the rush?

I'm reminded of when a niece of mine would visit and would bring her list of what she wanted to do while here; the beach, the bayfront, the lighthouse and on and on. But no matter how we tried, no matter how fast we went, there was never enough time to accomplish all she had on her list. Our legislature seems to have that problem too. My niece however was a child at the time. It does not

seem to be a reasonable expectation to successfully vet thousands of bills during any legislative session.

But, we all know there is always that rush to "do something" about any given problem, real or imagined. But how often, a bit farther down the road, is legislation re-done due unexpected consequences? A bit too often if you ask me. Consequences that may have been foreseen had due time been allowed for prior investigation, understanding, and discussion. As an example, currently SB 330 is coming up. Essentially it's a back-peddle to make up for the deficiency of HR 4401 promulgated during last January's 3rd Special Session, itself a hurry up job.

I firmly believe that if enough time was given to the bills it would prove in the long run much more efficient and effective than not enough time given to bills, which seems to chronically plague the legislature.

But, knock yourselves out guys!

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Richard Wisner". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Richard Wisner