

Submitter: Tim & Diane Busald  
On Behalf of: Our family  
Measure: SB799--OPPOSED

We are housing providers who oppose this extreme measure. We have always provided well-maintained, quality homes at below-market rent. We enjoy the loyalty of our tenants and they enjoy the provision of a nice, well-maintained home at below-market rent. But we simply cannot afford to provide FREE housing. Nor do we believe it is fair to place this burden on housing providers. In essence, SB799 is asking housing providers to subsidize rent payments. This is unfair and places an undue burden on the very people who are trying to house people. It is not financially practical. There are many monthly COSTS associated with providing housing:

- 1) Mortgage Payments
- 2) Property Taxes
- 3) Insurance Costs
- 4) Maintenance and Utility Costs
- 5) Repair Costs
- 6) Landscaping Costs
- 7) Association Dues

The rent received from the tenant is used to off-set the above expenditures. Without rent, the above expenditures do not get paid. Period! To expect a housing provider to pay these expenses and not receive rent for 1 or 2 months or longer is unfair and places an extreme financial burden and risk on all housing providers. No other business is required to provide people with a product or service (such as food, clothing, or transportation) for free. This is an extreme measure that has not been well thought out. It is oppressive, unfair, unreasonable and places a hardship on not only our family but ALL housing providers.

The fall-out from this measure could be detrimental:

- 1) Housing providers will go broke
- 2) Housing providers will have to keep rents as high as legally possible to offset the financial risks associated with such a draconian requirement
- 3) Housing providers will no longer be willing to take ANY chances on someone who does not meet ALL criteria. Normally we work with folks. This measure will make that too risky.

This measure should be eliminated and a better support system for those who need help should be devised. The burden should not fall on the housing providers who, plain and simple, cannot afford it.