

Hi Senators,

My husband and I have been landlords over the last 17 years and have striven to be good landlords/housing providers that respond quickly to repairs and maintenance needs,

be fair and compassionate and even generous toward our tenants in many circumstances that have arisen over the years. One situation for example is that we have a section 8

tenant that shouldn't be in our 3 bedroom duplex because she lives alone. She lived in it when we bought it. She wouldn't be able to move as she doesn't have the ability to come up with the rent and Security Deposit that she'd need to pay out so because of her age we consider her our charity tenant and haven't raised her rent much over the years we've owned the property. She's

paying the amount for a 1 bdm as understandability that's all that the housing authorities would be able to pay for her. Her rent is currently \$1,300 (Including water/sewer cost), for a 3 bdrm apartment which could rent for \$1,800. Our rents for our other apartments have been a little below the market because we always knew we could get them up to the market if need be.

Now looking over the last 3 years of the pandemic and how it has not only affected tenants but landlords also. My experience with the 4 tenants that applied for and received rental assistance help is that 3 of the 4 in my opinion abused the system and got way more money (rental assistance) than they should have. One got help for about 9 months and another for I believe 5 months, a 3 rd tenant for 4 months.

I know that one of them purchased a new motorcycle during this time. Another one when I asked them about why they were applying even thou they were working, they said because they could.

Aside from the abuses I saw & knowing that it was paid by tax payers money I believe that this bill doesn't require people to get back to work to pay their bills, nor help fix the housing supply problem, or address increased rental assistance for those who truly are in need. It's also unfair to continue with extending these safe harbor requirements on housing providers when we were promised that they were only temporary. Why is it OK to live in our homes for free for 60 days while they wait for funding they may not get and maybe shouldn't get. We're the loser in that case.

I don't see our government actually fixing the problem but passing on the burden again to us. Why can't our government work to make more housing available to renters than to burden those housing providers that are already doing so.

Thank you for your consideration,

Susan & John Vaughn