

I oppose LD 1710 for the following reasons:

1. The LD1710 bill will allow the State Government to overstep and interfere with a property Owner landlord's legal authority to determine how best to conduct their rental business by imposing requirements of the manner and form they must accept payment for the service the property Owner landlord provides, lest they be charged by a potential tenant with *discrimination on the basis of payment method*. A rental property is a business, and the business Owner must be allowed to determine the method of payment they will accept and in the time limits of the rental agreement following current applicable laws in order for timely receipt to ensure ability to pay the outgoing costs of their business in timely manner. This bill will restrict me as a property Owner landlord who provides the service of housing, from conducting my business in the manner that I choose to ensure my rental units will remain available in the future. I am widowed and of the older sector of the population and rely on income generated from my rental business for my own sustenance and covering. I have participated with General Assistance and Section 8 housing in the past, as recently as this past year on a temporary basis, but currently have full occupancy with non-program tenants who pay in a timely manner without disruption or need for reporting/compliance with excess oversight or demands from any governmental agency. My tenants are happy with their living situation, and it is in my best interest to conduct my business in a manner that sustains this relationship. I must be allowed to charge appropriate rent for the property in order to be able to maintain it properly.
2. The LD1710 bill forces a property Owner of greater than 10 residential rental units to keep a percentage of their units at a rate determined by the State as "affordable". This is akin to demanding of a restaurant that a certain # of tables must receive a specific amount for the same food served at an unmandated table – which is ABSURD. If the State wishes to ensure a certain number of units are available at a determined affordable rate in a specific locality, then the State can purchase and operate those units rather than demand its citizen property Owner landlords do so.
3. The LD1710 bill interferes with Municipal government's authority to determine the level of funding availability by demanding they exceed maximum level of assistance with the State's promise of reimbursement. Again, timeliness of outgoing funds should be within the Municipality's determination, not forced by the State to exceed the amount the Municipality has available. Forcing the Municipality to provide culturally appropriate and trauma-informed services is ambiguous and can result in increased cost local taxpayers or reduced municipal services to pay for this, resulting in more trauma-induced situations for its tax-paying citizens.
4. The LD1710 bill will put the cost of these demands on real estate sales by increasing the transfer tax. Increased taxes can result in fewer real estate sales; a market that is currently at a high but will correct itself, thereby not generating the anticipated \$75,500,000.00 annually needed to cover the cost of these LD1710 requirements, easily resulting in untimely or non-payment to Municipalities and property Owner landlord's forced subsidized rent.

5. The LD1710 bill denies a property Owner landlord from their right to collect past rent through a credit reporting agency if the State determines the rent was “unaffordable”. Any tenant who received the benefit of the service (housing provided by the landlord) at a specific rate, then the tenant is responsible for payment and a property Owner landlord should not be denied the recourse of using a credit reporting agency. The effect this LD1710 bill could have is essentially allowing irresponsible tenants to move from one housing source to another, without requirement to prove responsible or irresponsible past rental payment by use of a credit reporting agency.

I urge the Legislatures to consider carefully that LD1710 is a costly law, and once enacted will remain a cost to the State and to the property Owner landlords with great potential to have the opposite of the effect desired, reducing the number of reasonably priced rental units available.