

Annette Gurdijan

I want to make you aware of one more below market rental unit that Portland just lost because of its egregious anti-landlord extraneous rules. I owned this unit for 28 years, but just put it up for sale due to the cumbersome laws that Portland has put in place. My philosophy as a landlord has always been to imagine myself as the tenant or person living in my unit and hold myself to those standards. As in any sector I am sure there are a small percentage of people who are greedy bad landlords, just as there are a small percentage of tenants who are destructive bad tenants. The laws and rules that Portland has put in place for landlords are cumbersome, one-sided, and do more to lessen the number of rental units in the city than to help tenants.

Portland could have done better by putting laws in place that require developers to set aside 20% of new multi-family housing at affordable rents rather than punishing landlords of a single unit like myself.

Aaron Kirk Douglas

Honorable members of the Portland Rental Services Commission,

My name is Aaron Kirk Douglas. I speak today as an investor and a commercial real estate broker who regularly works with developers and owners deeply concerned about Portland's rental housing market. We are here, not as adversaries, but as allies in the shared endeavor of providing affordable, quality housing to the citizens of our city. Unfortunately, the conditions under which we operate have become increasingly challenging, pushing many in our community to move investment dollars outside of Portland and the entirety of Multnomah County, further exacerbating the future potential for rental housing.

Consider the story of Michael Gregory from a recent *Willamette Week* article. Mr. Gregory is a developer who, despite his commitment to building affordable housing, has sworn off future Portland projects due to the bureaucratic obstacles he faced while developing a 12-unit complex in the Foster-Powell neighborhood. Although our city desperately needs what he offers, developers like Gregory face an arduous and sometimes impossible task navigating the city's approval process, often mired in a bureaucracy involving up to seven city agencies. Even *Willamette Week* referred to the situation as a "Soviet-style bureaucracy."

In the same vein, many rental housing providers are experiencing increasing challenges managing properties, primarily due to growing costs, regulatory burdens, and increased taxes. The outcome is a worrying trend: investment dollars that could have been directed into maintaining and upgrading Portland's aging rental properties are now flowing to Washington, Florida, Arizona, and Idaho.

Data from a local 1031 exchange company reveals a troubling statistic: out of \$220 million in Portland-based sales they saw last year, only \$55 million were reinvested in the city. This paints a concerning picture of a city losing vital resources needed to rejuvenate the existing housing stock, much of which was built before 1980.

Developers and rental housing providers are critical in meeting the city's dire need for more housing. An Oregon Housing and Community Services analysis identifies a need for 554,000 new units statewide over the next 20 years. However, the current environment, characterized by over-regulation and a lack of incentives, is stifling the actors poised to help meet this demand. While efforts like City Commissioner Carmen Rubio's proposed freeze on system development charges are commendable, they are insufficient in isolation. We need a broader, more comprehensive strategy that genuinely addresses the root causes of our issues. It's clear from developers' experiences like Gregory and countless others that the permitting process needs an overhaul. Efforts to streamline this process, reduce fees, and ensure that developers have a single point of contact within the city bureaucracy would go a long way in easing these pain points.

The City of Portland must also critically reassess its desire to implement regulatory measures discouraging investment in the rental housing sector. Instead, we must balance protecting tenants' rights and fostering a conducive environment for developers and rental housing providers.

The beautiful city of Portland is undoubtedly worth investing in. But it is crucial to remember that investments are not just financial. They also involve time, effort, and a belief in Portland's future. For example, those of us who invested in the rental housing industry are asking for a partnership with the city to create a better, more sustainable, and more inclusive housing market. We want to invest in Portland. We want to be part of the solution. But for that to happen, we need the city to work with us, not against us.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to the opportunity for collaboration to make Portland a city where affordable, quality housing is a reality for all its residents.

Lisa Long

Dear Chair Bryant and RSC members,

Thank you for taking the time to listen to members of Portland's rental housing community. As a housing provider, I have direct experience with the city of Portland's rental regulations and their impacts on my ability to provide housing in the city.

Please revisit the FAIR ordinances. These have had a detrimental impact on housing supply in Portland. According to ECO-Northwest, we have seen a 14% decrease in single-family rentals since those policies passed.

We need the RSC to advocate for more efficient permitting timelines. A recent study found that Portland's average permitting time for a multifamily project is around 400 days. This severely impacts the rental market and disadvantages Oregonians.

The RSC should work to hold local leaders accountable for delivering on rent assistance. As leaders in the rental housing industry, we need the RSC to be a prominent voice ensuring that

budgeted dollars are spent, and homelessness prevention strategies are implemented. Ending homelessness must be an all-hands-on-deck effort.

We should re-evaluate the Inclusionary Zoning policies in Portland. While this is not a rental regulation, it is restricting the number of rentable and affordable units that are built in the city and is unequivocally a detriment to Portlanders looking to rent.

Please do not pre-empt the state's anti-harassment policies. Housing providers and renters are already held to a strict statewide standard of conduct that a vast majority of stakeholders are compliant with. We should not pre-empt state law based on unfounded complaints on either side of landlord-tenant disputes.

Thank you again for your consideration.

Tamara Westbrook

I've been a landlord in the Portland area for over 30 years. Our policy in general was to provide a home at a reasonable, usually low price in the market. By finding a good fit we felt our property would be well cared for. This view proved well. My concern now is the lack of landlord rights and the fear presented for making mistakes in following the new and ever changing laws. As a result many people like my self have turned their rental homes over to rental businesses. And what has happened? The rents in the market have gone crazy. For example, I rent a small 2 bedroom, 1 bath for \$1,530 in SE Portland. My friends daughter is going to rent her small , same size home in North Portland for \$2800 thru a rental agency. Further with all the threats of fees and legal costs, landlords raise their rents to compensate for these unfortunate and possible events. It's sad that people can not afford to live in Portland.

David Weislogel

Dear Chair Bryant and RSC members,

Thank you for taking the time to listen to members of Portland's rental housing community. As a housing provider for over 40 years, I have direct experience with the city of Portland's rental regulations and their impacts on my ability to provide housing in the city. I am all for tenant protections and keeping tenants content, but most of what has been put in place is having the reverse effect.

Please revisit the FAIR ordinances. These have had a detrimental impact on housing supply in Portland. According to ECONorthwest, we have seen a 14% decrease in single-family rentals since those policies passed.

I have personally witnessed single family homeowners sell when vacant because of the complexities that have been put in place over the last few years by State and Local governments. This reduces affordable inventory and puts upward pressure on rents for homes still available for

rent. Owners who no longer feel comfortable managing their own properties turn to professional management, which adds costs, as well.

The RSC should work to hold local leaders accountable for delivering on rent assistance for those needy in a timely and reliable way. As leaders in the rental housing industry, we need the RSC to be a prominent voice ensuring that budgeted dollars are spent, and homelessness prevention strategies are implemented. Ending homelessness must be an all-hands-on-deck effort.

We should re-evaluate the Inclusionary Zoning policies in Portland. While this is not a rental regulation, it is restricting the number of rentable and affordable units that are built in the city and is unequivocally a detriment to Portlanders looking to rent.

Please do not pre-empt the state's anti-harassment policies. Housing providers and renters are already held to a strict statewide standard of conduct that a vast majority of stakeholders are compliant with. We should not pre-empt state law based on unfounded complaints on either side of landlord-tenant disputes.

Thank you again for your consideration.

Sandra Stevens

In January of 2015, a relative I was staying with in Vancouver, Washington evicted me from his home knowing I had no transportation, no money, and nowhere to go. He gave me 24 hours to pack up my things and leave, without even offering me a ride somewhere. I had no other relatives or friends that would take me in. Fortunately, when my nephew tossed me to the curb like a bag of garbage, I was at my therapist's office. I told my therapist I was suddenly homeless and didn't have a clue what to do next. She made a few phone calls and gave me a bus ticket to Portland. The only thing I knew about Portland was Powell's Bookstore, as when I lived in Seattle, I made biannual pilgrimages there. Within an hour, I was walking through the portal of SAFES (Salvation Army Female Emergency Shelter) where I would spend the next month sleeping on a cement floor waiting for a bed in the dormitory. Across the street from SAFES is the Portland Rescue Mission where I would stay for 3 months before getting a bed at Jean's Place on NE 11th Avenue. Jean's Place is run by TPI (Transition Projects) and it was there that I was given the keys to my first apartment in Portland. From there I sat on a waitlist for over a year to get an apartment in the building where I live now. October 9, 2023 will mark my 8th year anniversary at my apartment in Southeast Portland, and I intend to celebrate. Not a day goes by without expressing gratitude for a safe and comfortable place to live. A place I don't have to share with one hundred other women. Not having to share a bathroom or kitchen with anyone is my idea of heaven.

Looking back at my experience with homelessness, I am in awe of how lucky I was and how persistently therapists, doctors, peer support specialists and social workers advocated for me. The Portland Rescue Mission on West Burnside was for men only until the year I became homeless. That year they opened a women's dorm with 16 beds. SAFES closed in 2019, so if I had become

homeless that year, I would have been on the streets, waiting on a long list to get into a shelter. I read recently that senior citizens are the fastest growing homeless population and that profoundly disturbs me. Being a homeless woman at 49 was terrifying. I can't imagine how vulnerable I would have felt had I been twenty years older. If I hadn't found affordable housing where rent increases are capped at 5%, I would be homeless still. My \$914 SSI check doesn't go far, but it's enough to keep myself healthy and safe, and even strong enough to advocate for others. Please consider building more affordable housing. The lives of tens of thousands of people are on hold and getting shorter every day because no one reaches their "golden years" living on the street.

Thank you for reading,

Alan Walworth

Portland's well-intentioned rental regulations are often counter-productive. The complexity of dealing with Portland's rules, in addition to state and federal regulations, is problematic for mom and pop landlords like myself. Despite attending several classes annually to learn about the rules, I find it difficult to keep up with them, and this difficulty is increased by the frequency with which the laws are changed. I tried to deal with this problem by employing a property manager, but that added about 10% to the cost of providing a rental; moreover, it did not relieve me of ultimate responsibility, so I had the residual burden of monitoring the manager. For these reasons I've reverted to managing my rentals myself.

Here are a few examples of problems caused by Portland's rental regulations:

The burden of complying with the regulations discourages people from offering properties for rent in Portland. ECONorthwest's 2022 research found a 14% reduction in single family detached rental units in Portland from 2017, when local regulation increased, to 2020 (https://assets.noviams.com/novi-file-uploads/mfnw/Files/article/Portland_Metro-Detached_Housing_Rental_Stock_Analysis-Updated_Report-3-25-22__002_.pdf). The reduced supply makes it harder to find a single family rental, and increases the cost. As mom and pop landlords deal with the frustrations of renting in Portland by selling their properties, rental units are increasingly operated by larger corporations that tend to focus primarily on maximizing profit, whereas many mom and pop landlords take a more personal interest in providing an optimal tenant experience.

The first come first serve rule increases the risk of ending up with a problematic tenant, and the difficulty and cost of evicting a problem tenant, or even declining to renew a fixed term lease, magnifies that risk. Consequently, landlords who would be open to taking special circumstances into account, and renting to someone lacking a good credit score or rental history, feel compelled to reduce such risk by requiring a high credit score and substantial rental history. Though an applicant not satisfying such criteria can in principle appeal for special consideration, it is very unlikely they will pay the application fee to get the chance to do so.

Being required to maintain an inventory of items in the rental with purchase price and depreciated value in order to justify using deposit money to cover damage, was exasperating additional work, especially for someone like myself who purchased a house and did not know the

purchase date and price of the toilets, doors, windows, etc. Kudos to Portland for eliminating the need to track depreciation of items in the rental, but maintaining the list of items is still an inconvenient chore.

Portland's rules enable disruptive tenants to remain and continue causing distress for neighboring tenants who must endure their bad behavior.

Much of the trouble Portland's regulations cause for mom and pop landlords could be avoided by exempting owners of 4 or fewer rentals, but in general (with a few exceptions) Portland's current rules lack such an exemption.

I urge you to give more attention to the unintended consequences of your regulations, and change them so they don't have such negative results.

Estelle Gordon

Dear Chair Bryant and RSC members,

Thank you for taking the time to listen to members of Portland's rental housing community. As a housing provider, I had direct experience with the city of Portland's rental regulations and their impacts on my ability to provide housing in the city. Unfortunately the regulations became so burdensome and in some cases contradictory and punitive that I decided the risk was no longer worth the potential reward and I recently sold my duplex to a private party who will use it to house their family.

I had a non-paying tenant and, following every regulation, it took four months to evict him through the courts. I lost \$4k on this tenant and have no hope to recover that money. Quite frankly the onerous and punitive regulations around the tenant application and move-in process discouraged me from renting to new tenants, so I put my property on the market. I am glad to be out of the landlord business. The regulatory climate makes it too hard for a single landlord to operate. I would discourage any potential investor from buying in Portland. Better to go elsewhere.

Thank you again for your consideration.

Jamie Latham

Hello!

I am unable to attend the City Council Meeting this evening but would like to submit my testimony via writing.

Last year while renting a room in a 3-bedroom house in SE Portland for \$1,200 a month I contracted a mold infection. I paid to test the house and the mold in the house matches the mold in my body. I am now disabled. I moved out and was homeless for 4 months. The rental market

is so competitive I found that I needed to be the first person to apply, finding long lists of applicants on houses that had only been listed 2 hours prior. My roommates still live in the moldy house and my room has been rented out again for \$1,200. Housing is only now accessible to me because my family members were able to sign a rental lease for me. I would still be homeless without wealthy family. Many apartments are only available if you can prove your income is 2 or 3 or 3.5 times as high as your rent. I work as a personal support worker for adults with disabilities, this is not high paying although extremely important in our community. While applying for or accepting disability payments I am not allowed to earn more than \$1,350 a month. The housing market is extremely inaccessible. Many members of my community are experiencing housing insecurity while some of our neighbors are collecting passive income on AirBnB rentals. We need rent control! We need deeply accessible housing! Thank you

John Griffiths

This is my testimony, I will submit it here to allow enough space for those going in person. Rent is disproportionately high compared to income.

There are too many property owners who do not properly maintain their properties. Who will only fix things if legally required, resulting in people sacrificing their safety and accessibility needs to have rent they can afford in an effort to keep a roof over their heads. The laws that are passed do not have enough teeth. An example is the law requiring air conditioning. The electric and water heating have not been updated in my 1940s apartment it does not have powerful enough electric to support an AC unit powerful enough to cool my home.

There are not enough places that will not take a section 8 voucher, even though they are mandated to. These property owners find ways to work around it and deny residents. Sweeps of houseless peoples' bare essentials are not helping. They are taking up too much of the budget that could be spent covering individual's rent. Every half decent plan to create more housing to meet the need is derailed by property developers looking to line their pockets and property owner's desire to sweep the evidence of the housing crisis out of sight.

Katherine Bettis

Dear Chair Bryant and RSC members,

Thank you for taking the time to listen to members of Portland's rental housing community.

I was about to buy a house in Portland that I intended to rent out but after learning details of the rent ordinances I am cancelling. My biggest complaint is that the rules keep changing. It is terrifying to live in fear of unknowingly breaking a rule. It is exhausting to try and keep up with the changes. Stop making changes.

Please revisit the FAIR ordinances. These have had a detrimental impact on housing supply in Portland. According to ECONorthwest, we have seen a 14% decrease in single-family rentals since those policies passed.

The RSC should work to hold local leaders accountable for delivering on rent assistance. As leaders in the rental housing industry, we need the RSC to be a prominent voice ensuring that budgeted dollars are spent, and homelessness prevention strategies are implemented. Ending homelessness must be an all-hands-on-deck effort.

We should re-evaluate the Inclusionary Zoning policies in Portland. While this is not a rental regulation, it is restricting the number of rentable and affordable units that are built in the city and is unequivocally a detriment to Portlanders looking to rent.

Please do not pre-empt the state's anti-harassment policies. Housing providers and renters are already held to a strict statewide standard of conduct that a vast majority of stakeholders are compliant with. We should not pre-empt state law based on unfounded complaints on either side of landlord-tenant disputes.

Thank you again for your consideration.

Michelle and John Fitzgerald

Thank you for the opportunity to represent a small business owner's point of view. I am the owner of both a permitted short-term and long-term rental in NE Portland. My husband and myself have worked hard to educate ourselves on tenant law and also do right by our renters. That said, we are continuously in situations where we as individual owners, just trying to save for retirement, are held to standards that do not apply to us.

The rental laws of Portland and Multnomah County are overly restrictive to small landlords with three or fewer rental properties. Our current laws reflect those of a city like New York or Los Angeles. The result has been for many mom&pop owners to sell their properties to large corporate rental entities or move their rentals out of Multnomah county. Thus the laws meant to keep us from experiencing large city problems are creating exactly those conditions where a majority of rental units are owned by corporate giants and the lack of rental homes has greatly dwindled. We need to bring back the relocation assistance exemption for owners of three or fewer properties, or scale it appropriately.

The rental increase cap is somewhat understandable and we as mom&pop landlords agree to abide by these rules. We were rarely the landlords gouging tenants with huge rent increases anyway.

The exemption of service animals to circumvent pets rules is being abused. We chose to allow pets up to 25lbs in our rental home with original hardwood floors. We use a property management company to vet tenants and help with rental negotiation and contracts. Our tenants were approved, never mentioned a service animal, moved in then presented an ESA note the day after they moved in when the property manager asked about the large dog. At that point, we as landlords, have no recourse and cannot currently collect a pet deposit. That is unfair, if we cannot turn away tenants (which we wouldn't do), we should be allowed by law to set a standard pet fee for damages.

We completely understand the need for service animals and agree landlords need to accept the presence of these working animals. However, renters with a service animal should still be made to pay a Pet Deposit to account for potential damage, since we currently have no recourse to collect funds for pet damages. When a service dog's toenails scratch up the hardwood floors of my rental home, it should be the animal's owner who pays for the damage. The ADA provides that any accommodations or alterations to a rental unit for the accessibility of the tenant must be paid for by the tenant. A service animal should be no different.

We would have loved to have joined the session but are unable to as I am on the board of the Concordia Neighborhood Association and our monthly meeting conflicts and John is the adult leader for a youth leadership organization, which meets the same evening. Perhaps, channeling the announcement of these meetings through the neighborhood associations would increase visibility and attendance?

Thanks in advance for the chance to submit comments and have them read.

Rhea Hannon

My name is Rhea Hannon, and I am a Portland renter living in the Buckman neighborhood.

When moving into my current neighborhood, I was extremely fortunate to find a unit within my budget. Prior to securing our current apartment, my roommate and I searched for weeks, checking rental sites every single day, multiple times a day to ensure we could submit our rental application as soon as possible. As any renter will tell you, waiting even five minutes to submit a rental application will greatly diminish your chances of being approved. For two young professionals, tech savvy and with ample access to secure WiFi, the process was painstaking, anxiety-inducing, and stressful.

I cannot begin to imagine how much more difficult the process would be for people who are low income, older, unhoused, or who speak other languages. The obstacles these people face do not disappear even when housing is secured, as all of these communities are at a higher risk of eviction.

We need better renter support and resources for all Portlanders. We need more affordable housing. We need smaller rent increases.

Measures like Eviction Representation for All, despite the vitriol it received, are critical to the long-term stability of the city's renters and housing market.

If the City has any interest in growing its diversity and attracting young professionals, Portland needs to protect its renters.

Scott Clyburn

My wife and I own a single rental unit in the City of Portland – a two-bedroom bungalow that I bought before we were married and moved in together.

We've rented it to long-term tenants for over three years now, and have found the City of Portland's regulations on landlords and red tape around residential rentals to be so overwhelming (and the prospect of getting something wrong so frightening), that we are planning to sell the house this summer when our current tenant vacates, despite the terrible market for doing so.

In particular, we believe restrictions such as the following create an undue hardship on small landlords:

- moving financial assistance - the rates set here are absurdly high and we've been coerced into waiving policies by tenants threatening to pursue moving assistance
- required timelines for notices (e.g., 90 days) - these are often more lenient for tenants and more restrictive for landlords
- requirement that notices be mailed, not tendered digitally - the reality is tenants prefer email and digital documents

In brief, the City of Portland's approach means that the only residential landlords able to do business are very big corporations that can shoulder the burden through scale. Small landlords are squeezed at every juncture, which has resulted (in our case) in having to charge as high of rent as possible just to make it worth our effort.

This is obviously a paradoxical result, and I firmly believe that if Portland loosened restrictions – and added landlord services to provide legal advice amidst the host of restrictions, among other resources – then rental costs would decrease due to increased competition.

Bob Law

I bought my first rental in Oregon in 1978 and my first one in Portland in 1987. At one point, I owned 32 homes, thanks to working 70 hour weeks at my job (which didn't include time looking out after my rentals) for 25 years+, living very frugally (my renters almost always had better cars and TVs than I did and doing whatever repairs/maintenance I was capable of doing) and continually investing any available capital to purchase another home.

Many of my renters have told me that I'm the best landlord they've ever had. My average renter stays with me for 12-15 years. A current one is 25 years and counting. I have had renters to my home for dinner many times.

The one thing that I don't want are vacancies as they are very expensive. You have no income to cover your on-going expenses, you have costs of repairs and wear and tear that you wouldn't have if there wasn't a vacancy, and you spend a lot of time dealing with those repairs (even if you hire someone), talking with prospective new tenants, and going through all the requisite paper work.

A lot has been made of the current rental increase annual cap at 14.6%. If I was a renter and got notice of that kind of increase, I'd know that I had been getting by extremely cheaply in the

past. Why would a landlord assess that kind of an increase knowing that they likely would face a vacancy?

The City of Portland has brought us to this point by steadfastly, over the nearly 50 years that I've been in Portland and listened to developers and builders say they refused to work in the city, made it so much more difficult, costly, and slow (which is costly as holding expenses are often considerable) to do construction in the city. Has the city ever polled the area's builder's organization to see what percentage of them will not work in Portland? Whatever the percentage, it's considerable. The recent Willamette Week article about the affordable housing developer in Portland is an excellent example of what has happened repeatedly over many years. It's no wonder that prices in Portland are so high.

But someone else had to be the scapegoat. The antipathy and disrespect that the city has for landlords has been evident for a long time, but the pandemic magnified the virtual harassment with new taxes, "registration" (what has the city done with all that money other than to create yet another bureaucracy that does nothing to help the situation. It does have the benefit of paying wages to those bureaucrats), a requirement for yet another form that a landlord must fill out spelling out the depreciation schedule for every little part of a dwelling, paying "relocation" expenses if you want to use your own home, letting tenants give 30 days notice but landlords must give 90 (and still pay the relocation expenses). It just goes on and on.

It's no wonder that landlords have fled Portland (as well as other Oregon jurisdictions who aren't nearly as onerous, but who have to follow the Oregon law's which are created by the legislature which despises landlords as well). Hasn't the number of rental homes gone down close to 6,000 just in the last few years? Count me as one of them that has been getting out as quickly as I can. I have only one remaining in Portland, thankfully, but as soon as the tenants vacate, I'm selling that one too. Unfortunately for me, I don't evict a tenant to sell. I have to wait until a renter vacates, then I sell. That's my choice, but, like the woman who testified toward the beginning of the Zoom meeting, I have empathy for my renters.

R. Koerner

Just a couple comments as a rental property owner. I am Rochelle Koerner (she/ Her). I have a couple rental properties and was a cpa until I had to give up my license due to chronic migraine issues and have a real estate license although I again don't use it much due to the migraine issues.

- The worries about coming possible harsher rental rules are causing my mom and some other landlords who have not raised rents since 2016 to raise rents since they are worried about the chance that if they fail to increase rents now they might get stuck with the lower rents later and not be able to raise them. Instituting things that reassure landlords that rent ceiling won't happen would actually be better for renters...I have no issue with the rules about cola plus a percent for rent increases as long as it does not cover new renters and 60 day notice is fine for that.... But I don't want to see a no increase set again or other stricter limitations and the additional paperwork with evictions (the months paid

or not) seems kind of pointless as I am assuming most landlords are not like me and don't allow their tenants to get 6 months behind. Since you normally give notice after one month it seems pointless.....

- Personal rants on financial imbalance issues for properties - My two personal pet peeves although not sure if this falls into your preview or not.... 1) The disparity between the property taxes on different properties with the same value and huge differences in property taxes. Taxes on Properties should always reset to market value when sold so that the disparity between the remodeled and reassessed to market houses and the old never remodeled houses but still worth a ton are not so huge. 2) The exemption on business revenue tax for Portland and Multnomah county if you have only rental properties is good since you pay a per unit tax on rentals (plus a tax on revenue instead of income in that small of a zone is a bad idea.. but that is a different issue) but losing the exclusion if you have a schedule c for a small home based business in another state seems weird.....let alone the sale of a personal property.....this is investment income not business income....why is being factored into the business income tax? This is weird criteria to cause you to lose the exemption....and this form is just confusing.....cant you just send me a bill based on units....
- Possibly more useful- if you want to get rid of large business or individuals buying properties and driving up the prices on them.....remove the depreciation deduction on residential rental property.....depreciating it over 39 years is stupid in almost all cities.....you should be able to depreciate the carpet the roof the appliances, but the overall building.....no.....historically in the past 70 years.....the values have gone up.....not down.....recapturing depreciation at ordinary income rate just allows for stupid tax strategies and 1031 exchanges to keep delaying paying taxes on that income till you die and then the property is revalued to market and there is a pretty big estate tax exclusion so in many cases no one ever pays tax on that income.....it is really pretty absurd.....
- If you want to get more landlords to all renters with bad credit or issues.....setup the same type of thing as with mortgages for those for bad credit. The government instead of paying their rent directly just offer insurance for them. They can pay a bit more and purchase the insurance which the government maybe pays part of as long as they keep paying on time..... and in turn that covers rent if tenant does not pay for the landlords and damage if more than the deposit amount. That would make far more landlords willing to rent to low income housing people if any damage was covered.
- With the changing market for commercial real estate there should be a lot of opportunities for the city/ state to buy properties and convert them into low income housing or transitional housing... please think outside the box as to what properties would work for this.....there are soo many vacant buildings

Random:

- Someone made the comment to allow a 3 day “backout period” please don’t do this.....the costs would be astronomical for landlords since many hold the unit for 2 weeks ahead of move in for the tenant.....and the cleaning fee for recleaning again after the tenant, costs of accounting for setting up a tenant and move in and move out accounting...the additional overhead of this makes me consider running for the hills.....however, a way for tenants to review landlords, property management companies, and maybe properties themselves on some sort of public forum might be an alternative..... if someone really feels a need to move in and “test the unit before living there” they need to discuss this on an individual basis with the landlord.....this should not be a legislated item. They can always ask about anything they are worried about and if it is misrepresented that is already a legal issue they can pursue damages for in small claims court.

Sorry if most of this is not relevant to your group....I get kind of random when I take migraine meds and have to take them to use the computer... Let me know if I need to change formatting of this Feel free to ignore whatever is not relevant