

MMHA - 2023 - HB 1076 - fee in lieu of security de

Uploaded by: Aaron Greenfield

Position: FAV



Bill Title: House Bill 1076, Real Property – Residential Leases – Fee in Lieu of Security Deposit

Committee: Environment and Transportation

Date: March 7, 2022

Position: Favorable

This testimony is offered on behalf of the Maryland Multi-Housing Association (MMHA). MMHA is a professional trade association established in 1996, whose membership consists of owners and managers of more than 207,246 rental housing homes in more than 937 apartment communities. Our members house over 667,000 residents of the State of Maryland throughout the entire State of Maryland. MMHA membership also includes more than 216 associate members that supply goods and services to the multi-housing industry. More information is available at <https://www.mmhaonline.org/>

House Bill 1076 authorizes housing providers to offer residents a fee in lieu of a security deposit. The housing provider is required to disclose in writing the fee amount and security deposit, the frequency of payment, whether the fee is non-refundable, and that the resident is still responsible for paying to repair damages and their rent. A resident may opt out of the fee in lieu of a security deposit upon providing a housing provider with the security deposit. The fee, which may not be altered during the lease term, must be used to purchase insurance to cover unpaid damages or lost rent. Should a resident opt to pay the fee, the housing provider must still comply with all notice and inspection requirements per the security deposit law, including providing the resident documentation of any damages and receipts for damages repaired. If a housing provider cancels a fee in lieu of a security deposit, a housing provider faces penalties under the bill. A violation of this provision could result in damages equal to as much as three months' rent.

In Maryland, security deposits are one way to protect a housing provider from defaults on rent and unpaid damage at the end of a lease term. However, MMHA recognizes that a security deposit can come at a high upfront cost to residents.

Maryland is one of only four states that does not permit housing providers to offer residents the option of a small monthly non-refundable fee instead of a security deposit. A recent poll of 400 Maryland voters who rent found: 69% would welcome the fee option and 45% would take advantage of the fee option with the understanding that it is not refundable and that they are responsible for unrepaired damages at the end of the lease.

When residents pay a monthly fee in lieu of a security deposit, a housing provider will purchase insurance instead of collecting a security deposit against damages and lost rent. The housing provider is insured, and residents can save significant expenses prior to and including on move-in day.



For these reasons, we respectfully request a favorable report on House Bill 1076.

Aaron J. Greenfield, MMHA Director of Government Affairs, 410.446.1992

HB 1076 - Chris Grimm - LeaseLock - Favorable.pdf

Uploaded by: Chris Grimm

Position: FAV



HB 1076 - Real Property - Residential Leases – Fee in Lieu of Security Deposit - Favorable

Waiving Security Deposits: A Renter’s most significant housing barrier is the advance payment of the first and last month's rent plus a security deposit. A “deposit waiver fee” offers tenants an option to pay a small monthly “fee” (avg \$29) instead of a large upfront security deposit (avg \$1,700). This option is a win-win for landlords and tenants. Landlords are still protected against a tenant’s failure to pay for damages or rent by purchasing insurance, and tenants can waive the significant upfront cost of a security deposit. The deposit waiver fee works much like Primary Mortgage Insurance, which allows home buyers to waive another significant housing barrier, the 20% down payment.

Unfortunately, Maryland is one of only four states that does not permit landlords to offer tenants the option of a small monthly non-refundable fee instead of a security deposit. A recent poll of 400 Maryland voters who rent found:

- 69% would welcome the fee option.
- 45% would take advantage of the fee option with the understanding that it is not refundable and that they are responsible for unrepaired damages at the end of the lease.

Legislative Proposal:

HB 1076 would permit landlords to offer tenants a fee in lieu of a security deposit and introduce several common-sense protections for tenants.

- Permits a landlord to offer tenants the option of paying a non-refundable fee.
- The landlord shall disclose in writing the fee amount and security deposit required, the frequency of payment, whether the fee is non-refundable, and that the tenant is still responsible for paying to repair damages and their rent.
- A tenant may opt out of the fee in lieu of a security deposit upon providing a landlord with the security deposit.
- A landlord must use the fee to purchase insurance to cover unpaid damages or lost rent.
- The fee is capped to what it costs the landlord to obtain and administer the insurance.
- A landlord shall not charge a tenant for normal wear and tear.
- A landlord shall not alter the fee amount during a lease term.
- The landlord must comply with all notice and inspection requirements per the security deposit law, including providing the tenant documentation of any damages and receipts for damages repaired.
- Provides for penalties if a landlord cancels a fee in lieu of a security deposit during a tenancy or fails to procure or maintain insurance.
- Restricts landlords from “double-dipping,” charging a tenant for damages an insurer covered in a claim.
- Provides for damages for violating this section to up to three months’ rent.

HB_1076_Sponsor Amendment _ Wells

Uploaded by: Melissa Wells

Position: FWA



HB1076/543421/1

AMENDMENTS
PREPARED
BY THE
DEPT. OF LEGISLATIVE
SERVICES

07 MAR 23
08:03:46

BY: Delegate Wells
(To be offered in the Environment and Transportation Committee)

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE BILL 1076
(First Reading File Bill)

On page 3, in line 7, after the second “**THE**” insert “**FOLLOWING:**”

(I) 1. THE”;

in line 8, strike “**AND THE**” and substitute “**; AND**”

2. THAT A TENANT WHO CHOOSES TO PAY A FEE IN LIEU OF A SECURITY DEPOSIT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PAYING FOR DAMAGES BEYOND ORDINARY WEAR AND TEAR AND THE TENANT’S RENT; AND

(II) 1. THE”;

in line 9, after “**REQUIRE**” insert “**; AND**”

2. THAT THE LANDLORD MAY WITHHOLD ALL OR PART OF A SECURITY DEPOSIT TO PAY FOR DAMAGES BEYOND ORDINARY WEAR AND TEAR OR UNPAID RENT”;

in line 11, strike “**AS PART OF THE FEE IN LIEU OF A SECURITY DEPOSIT**”; in line 13, strike “**PAYMENTS**” and substitute “**AMOUNTS**”; and in line 14, strike “**RATE**” and substitute “**AMOUNT**”.

On page 5, after line 17, insert:

“(III) A LANDLORD MAY NOT DISCONTINUE OR ALTER THE TERMS OF INSURANCE DURING THE TERM OF A RENTAL AGREEMENT.”;

strike beginning with “IF” in line 18 down through the colon in line 19; strike beginning with “CONTINUE” in line 20 down through “OR” in line 23 and substitute “IF A LANDLORD FAILS TO PURCHASE OR MAINTAIN INSURANCE IN VIOLATION OF PARAGRAPH (1) OF THIS SUBSECTION AND A TENANT CONTINUES TO PAY A MONTHLY FEE IN LIEU OF A SECURITY DEPOSIT, ON TERMINATION OF THE TENANCY, THE LANDLORD SHALL CREDIT THE TOTAL INSURANCE COVERAGE STATED IN THE DISCLOSURE TO ANY AMOUNT OWED BY THE TENANT VACATING THE UNIT.”; strike beginning with “DISCONTINUE” in line 24 down through “AGREEMENT” in line 26 and substitute:

“1. IF, THROUGH NO FAULT OF THE LANDLORD, AN INSURER REFUSES OR IS OTHERWISE UNABLE TO PROVIDE COVERAGE FOR UNPAID SUMS DUE UNDER THE LEASE, THE LANDLORD MAY CONTINUE TO CHARGE A FEE IN LIEU OF A SECURITY DEPOSIT FOR 60 DAYS WITHOUT PENALTY PROVIDED THAT THE LANDLORD ATTEMPTS TO PURCHASE NEW INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR UNPAID SUMS DUE UNDER THE LEASE RETROACTIVE TO THE DATE OF CANCELLATION OF THE PRIOR COVERAGE.

2. IF THE LANDLORD FAILS TO SECURE ADDITIONAL COVERAGE AFTER THE 60 DAYS DESCRIBED IN SUBSUBPARAGRAPH 1 OF THIS SUBPARAGRAPH, THE LANDLORD:

A. MAY NO LONGER CHARGE A FEE IN LIEU OF A SECURITY DEPOSIT AND IS NOT REQUIRED TO CREDIT THE INSURANCE COVERAGE STATED IN THE DISCLOSURE TO ANY INDEBTEDNESS OWED BY THE TENANT UPON THE TENANT VACATING THE UNIT; AND

B. MAY NOT CHARGE THE TENANT A SECURITY DEPOSIT DURING THE LEASE TERM;

and strike beginning with “**IF**” in line 27 down through “**DEPOSIT**” in line 32 and substitute “**IF AT THE END OF THE LEASE TERM, A LANDLORD AND TENANT WISH TO RENEW A LEASE BUT THE LANDLORD DECIDES TO DISCONTINUE PROVIDING THE OPTION OF PAYING A FEE IN LIEU OF A SECURITY DEPOSIT, THE LANDLORD SHALL:**”

(I) PROVIDE NOTICE TO THE TENANT THAT THE OPTION WILL BE DISCONTINUED AT LEAST 60 DAYS BEFORE THE END OF THE LEASE TERM; AND

(II) REDUCE THE SECURITY DEPOSIT REQUIRED ON THE RENEWED LEASE BY THE AMOUNT OF A TENANT’S PREVIOUS FEE PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF THE SECURITY DEPOSIT”.

On page 6, strike beginning with “**(5)**” in line 1 down through “**(6)**” in line 3 and substitute “**(4)**”.

On page 8, in line 9, strike “**(I)**”; in line 11, after “**AMOUNTS**” insert “**UNLESS:**”; in the same line, strike the period; strike beginning with “**(II)**” in line 12 down through “**1.**” in line 15 and substitute “**(I)**”; and strike in their entirety lines 17 and 18 and substitute:

“(II) THE LOSS EXCEEDS THE INSURANCE COVERAGE.”

HB 1076_Consumer Protection Division_Unfavorable_2

Uploaded by: Kira Wilpone-Welborn

Position: UNF

ANTHONY G. BROWN
Attorney General

CANDACE MCLAREN LANHAM
Chief of Staff

CAROLYN QUATTROCKI
Deputy Attorney General



WILLIAM D. GRUHN
Chief
Consumer Protection Division

STATE OF MARYLAND
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
CONSUMER PROTECTION DIVISION

Writer's Fax No.

Writer's Direct Dial No.
410-576-6986
kwilponewelborn@oag.state.md.us

March 3, 2023

To: The Honorable Kumar Barve
Chair, Environment and Transportation Committee

From: Kira Wilpone-Welborn, Assistant Attorney General
Consumer Protection Division

Re: House Bill 1076 – Real Property - Residential Leases - Fee in Lieu of Security Deposit
(OPPOSE)

The Consumer Protection Division of the Office of the Attorney General (the “Division”) **opposes** House Bill 1076 sponsored by Delegate Wells. House Bill 1076 purports to provide consumers a reasonable alternative to paying a security deposit or obtaining a surety bond by allowing them to pay a “fee in lieu of a security deposit,” which their landlord would use to purchase insurance coverage for unpaid monies and damage to the unit. However, the “fee in lieu of a security deposit” provides few benefits to tenants and could result in some tenants paying significantly more than they would have if they had paid a security deposit. For example, House Bill 1076 would permit the landlord to charge a fee in any amount, payable at any interval, that is wholly nonrefundable, would permit a landlord to contract with an insurance provider that is not licensed by the Maryland Insurance Commission, and would encourage insurance providers to seek subrogation (financial compensation) from tenants for claims paid to their former landlords. Thus, House Bill 1076 would make it easier for landlords to engage in unfair, abusive, or deceptive practices by either misleading or failing to advise prospective tenants of the consequences of choosing to pay a “fee in lieu of security deposit” and ultimately fails to provide any meaningful benefit to tenants.

Maryland's Security Deposit Law

Maryland's Security Deposit Law defines “security deposit” to mean “any payment of money, including payment of the last month's rent in advance of the time it is due, given to a landlord by a tenant in order to protect the landlord against nonpayment of rent, damage due to breach of lease, or damage to the leased premises, common areas, major appliances, and furnishings.” Md. Code Ann., Real Prop. §8-203(a)(3). Maryland's Security Deposit law affords consumers who lease residential properties in Maryland important protections from unscrupulous landlords. For

example, a landlord may not require a tenant to pay a security deposit that exceeds the equivalent of two months' rent per dwelling unit, regardless of the number of tenants. Md. Code Ann., Real Prop. §8-203(b). A landlord must maintain security deposits in an account that is devoted exclusively to security deposits and bears interest. Md. Code Ann., Real Prop. §8-203(d). A landlord may only withhold a security deposit for unpaid rent, damage due to breach of lease, or for damage caused by the tenant beyond "ordinary wear and tear to the leased premises, common areas, major appliances, and furnishings owned by the landlord" and must provide a tenant a written list of the damages claimed together with a statement of the costs actually incurred. Md. Code Ann., §§8-203(f)(1) and (g)(1). A security deposit is not liquidated damages and may not be forfeited to the landlord for breach of the rental agreement, except in the amount that the landlord is actually damaged by the breach. Md. Code Ann., Real Prop. §8-203(f)(2).

Alternatively, a tenant can purchase a surety bond to protect the landlord against nonpayment of rent, damage due to breach of lease, or damage to the leased premises, common areas, major appliances, and furnishings. As with a traditional security deposit under section 8-203, the amount of the surety bond purchased and any security deposit paid may not exceed the equivalent of two month's rent per dwelling unit. Md. Code Ann., Real Prop. §8-203(i)(3). Importantly, it is the tenant who purchases the bond rather than the landlord and the tenant must be advised in writing of all the tenant's rights prior to the purchase of the security bond. Md. Code Ann., Real Prop., §8-203(i)(5). Additionally, before making a claim against the surety bond, a landlord must provide written notice to the tenant that includes a list of damages to be claimed and costs actually incurred; and a tenant has the right to pay any damages directly to the landlord and has the right to dispute a landlord's claim. Md. Code Ann., Real Prop. §8-203(i)(7), (8), and (9).

House Bill 1076 Would Harm Consumers

House Bill 1076 does not include many of the protections afforded by the provisions in the Real Property Article related to security deposits and surety bonds. While the proposed "fee in lieu of security deposit" may appear to benefit and open housing opportunities for low-income households, in fact, House Bill 1076 would likely harm consumers in several ways.

First, House Bill 1076 could result in higher out-of-pocket costs paid by consumers over their lease term. Unlike the provisions related to the payment of a security deposit or purchase of a surety bond, House Bill 1076 does not cap the total amount a landlord would be permitted to charge as a "fee in lieu of security deposit." Thus, the total fees paid over the course of a multiple year lease could easily exceed the equivalent of two months' rent. Additionally, unlike a security deposit, which must be returned to a tenant with interest minus any authorized damages within 45 days of the end of a tenancy, House Bill 1076 permits a landlord to deem a "fee in lieu of security deposit" wholly nonrefundable.

Second, House Bill 1076 does not require a landlord who has purchased insurance to disclose to consumers the landlord's actual costs to obtain the insurance or require that the fee charged to consumers be the actual cost of the insurance. Further, the bill does not require a landlord to first apply the portion of the fee charged which is over and above the costs to obtain the insurance towards any claimed losses as a result of nonpayment of rent, damage due to breach of lease, or

damage to the leased premises before making a claim on the insurance. As a result, House Bill 1076 would permit landlords to charge tenants fees that exceed their costs to obtain insurance and unfairly profit from a tenant's election to pay the "fee in lieu of security deposit" instead of the lump-sum security deposit.

Third, because consumers would not be parties to the insurance contract, consumers would not be able to make claims to the insurer, appropriately challenge an insurer's decision to deny a claim, or dispute an insurer's decision to pay a claim until after another party initiates collection activity against the tenant. Moreover, if an insurer sought subrogation against a tenant for a claim paid to a landlord or transfers a paid claim to a third-party as permitted in House Bill 1076, a tenant may not have sufficient information to defend the claim or understand a demand for payment of the claim. As a result, the tenant would pay both a monthly fee and the claim at the conclusion of a tenancy. Thus, the "fee in lieu of security deposit" would ultimately provide no material financial benefit to the consumer.

As such, a "fee in lieu of security deposit" is not a reasonable alternative to a security deposit, which is limited in amount, is refundable, and provides consumers protections under section 8-203 of the Real Property Article. Likewise, a "fee in lieu of security deposit" is not a reasonable alternative to a surety bond, which allows a consumer to avoid an upfront security deposit payment by paying a small monthly fee, and provides consumers protections as a party to the insurance contract and the financial cap protections under section 8-203 of the Real Property Article.

For these reasons, the Division encourages an unfavorable report from the Environment and Transportation Committee on House Bill 1076.

cc: The Honorable Melissa Wells
Members, Environment and Transportation Committee

HB 1076 Public Justice Center UNF.pdf

Uploaded by: Matt Hill

Position: UNF



C. Matthew Hill
Attorney
Public Justice Center
201 North Charles Street, Suite 1200
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
410-625-9409, ext. 229
hillm@publicjustice.org

HB 1076 - Real Property – Residential Leases – Fee in Lieu of Deposit
Hearing before the Environment & Transportation Committee, March 7, 2023
Position: OPPOSE (UNFAV)

Public Justice Center (PJC) is a non-profit advocacy organization and civil legal services provider that provides advice and representation to over 800 tenants in Maryland each year. Numerous tenants contact the Public Justice Center each year over disputes with their respective landlords regarding the return of a security deposit. Public Justice Center recognizes that a landlord’s upfront security deposit requirement is a significant barrier for tenants seeking to leave unhealthy or unsustainable housing, and we want to thank the sponsor of the legislation for seeking to address this significant issue that limits mobility and fair housing choice.

We are concerned that HB 1076 promotes the use of a complex financial product without adequate tenant/consumer protections; there are alternative ways to address the housing choice barrier posed by a security deposit. HB 1076, which is strongly supported by the company Lease Lock, does not address many concerns that we have stated in previous years, and, in some ways, creates additional problems in this year’s version of the bill:

1. The language is unclear on whether the fee-in-lieu payments may be designated as “rent” by the landlord and collected under threat of eviction in rent court (p. 3, lines 3-5). There should be clear language in the bill indicating that the fee in lieu is not “rent.”
2. Nothing limits landlords to charging tenants only the cost of the Lease Lock product. Thus, landlords may turn these “fees in lieu” into another profit center by charging an administrative fee in addition to the actual cost of the insurance to the landlord (p. 5 lines 15-17).
3. The bill would encourage landlords to charge the maximum security deposit allowed by law – 2 months’ rent – in order to force tenants into buying the Lease Lock product. In last year’s bill, if the landlord offer the fee-in-lieu product, they were only allowed to charge only one month’s rent for the security deposit if the tenant chose a traditional

security deposit. This year's version removes that cap. We are very concerned that if there is no cap, landlords will charge the maximum security deposit of 2 months' rent in order to coerce tenants to purchase the fee-in-lieu product which is a better deal for landlords than a traditional security deposit.

4. If a tenant no longer wants to pay the fee, then the tenant has to pay the full deposit without any credit for the prior fees paid.
5. The fee-in-lieu arrangement offers fewer tenant protections than a security deposit or surety bond under Real Property § 8-203:
 - a. Unlike a security deposit agreement that transfers automatically to the new owner, if a new landlord takes over the property, the fee arrangement is not required to transfer to the new owner, and the new owner can require the payment of a security deposit.
 - b. If an insurer seeking to collect from a tenant upon a claim that the insurer paid to the landlord, and the insurer violates the statutory notice requirements, the bill allows the insurer to "cure" the deficiency.
 - c. To have a pre-move-in inspection under the bill, a tenant must give notice in writing by certified mail at least 15 days before she moves in. This could result in tenants being accused of damage that was not their responsibility.
6. Finally, we are generally concerned that we do not yet understand the full implications of this financial product and how it will affect renters in the marketplace. We suggest further study on this matter including whether this will lead to an increase in third-party debt collection. In other words, Lease Lock may be more likely than a landlord to sell off purported tenant debts to a third-party debt collector, making it more difficult for tenants to later dispute the validity of the purported debt.

Other ways of addressing the housing choice barrier posed by security deposits include requiring landlords to allow tenants to pay the security deposit in installments over the course of the tenancy, e.g., allowing the tenant to pay the security deposit in three installments over the course of 6 months. This policy would promote housing mobility and housing choice without the use of complex financial products that have not been adequately studied.

Public Justice Center asks that the Committee **issue an UNFAVORABLE report on HB 1076**. If you have any questions, please contact: Matt Hill, hillm@publicjustice.org, 410-625-9409, ext. 229.

hb1076.pdf

Uploaded by: Matthew Pipkin

Position: UNF

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CONFERENCE
GOVERNMENT RELATIONS AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Hon. Matthew J. Fader
Chief Justice

187 Harry S. Truman Parkway
Annapolis, MD 21401

MEMORANDUM

TO: House Environment and Transportation Committee
FROM: Legislative Committee
Suzanne D. Pelz, Esq.
410-260-1523
RE: House Bill 1076
Real Property – Residential Leases – Fee in Lieu of Security
Deposit
DATE: February 15, 2023
(3/7)
POSITION: Oppose, as drafted

The Maryland Judiciary opposes House Bill 1076, as drafted. House Bill 1076 establishes Real Property § 8-203.2 which states that a landlord may offer a fee in lieu of a security deposit. A county or municipality may not require a landlord to offer a fee in lieu of a security deposit. An agreement to pay a fee in lieu of a security deposit is not a defense in an action brought by a landlord under RP § 8-401 for a tenant’s failure to pay rent.

The Judiciary takes no position on the policy aims of the legislation but has concerns in the bill’s drafting. This bill creates a burdensome statutory process to incorporate insurance policies of landlords for nonpayment by tenants, while creating the possibility of inconsistent interpretations of the statute by courts around the State. In addition, the bill provides on page six that any fee paid by a tenant shall be credited toward the security deposit. Yet, on page two, the bill indicates that a security deposit does not include a fee in lieu of a security deposit. These provisions are confusing.

Additionally, on page 8, line 27 through and including page 9, line 2, the bill references debts that are “declared void” by the Court. This is not a legal term of art with which the Judiciary is familiar and there are no provisions within the bill to determine how such a declaration is to be made.

cc. Hon. Melissa Wells
Judicial Council
Legislative Committee
Kelley O’Connor

Economic Action Maryland_HB1076_UNFAVORABLE.pdf

Uploaded by: Michael Donnelly

Position: UNF



**Testimony to the House Environment and Transportation Committee
HB 1076: Real Property – Residential Leases – Fee in Lieu of Security Deposit
Position: Unfavorable**

March 7, 2023

The Honorable Kumar P. Barve, Chair
House Environment and Transportation Committee
Room 251, House Office Building
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
cc: Members, Environment and Transportation Committee

Honorable Chair Barve and Members of the Committee:

Economic Action Maryland is a nonprofit organization that works to advance economic justice and equity statewide through direct-service, research, education, and advocacy.

We write in opposition to House Bill 1076.

Economic Action Maryland’s Tenant Advocacy Program provides information to renters and property owners about their rights and responsibilities. In 2022 we received 1,396 client intakes. A common concern is housing affordability, and security deposits can exist as a barrier to finding safe, stable, and affordable housing. We must find solutions to reduce the burdens of our housing affordability crisis. But at the same time, we must ensure proposed solutions would not make problems worse.

Under Maryland law, security deposits exist to protect landlords from specific types of damages. They can withhold deposits if they experience losses from unpaid rent, a breach of the lease, or physical damage to the property more than “normal wear and tear.”¹

Security deposits also protect renters. Because deposits cover unpaid rent and damages, they can reduce claims against renters if they can’t pay the rent or property damage occurs. Maryland’s laws define what deposits can cover, the maximum amount that can be charged, and procedures to prevent disputes or mitigate their effects. While they aren’t perfect, security deposits are regulated to provide protection while reducing opportunities for exploitation.

Fees in lieu of security deposits are not security deposits. Fees in-lieu-of security deposits insure property owners against the renters paying for them, but they don’t protect renters from claims the way deposits would. Renters would be paying monthly fees that expose them to liability instead of reducing

¹ <https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/mgawebsite/laws/StatuteText?article=grp§ion=8-203&enactments=false>

it. Renters are entitled to have their deposits returned with deductions for actual damages to the landlord, but there's no guarantee fees paid under this alternative would be returned.

The fee structures provided by SB603/HB1076 threatens renters. Currently, Maryland's security deposit law caps deposits at the equivalent of two (2) months' rent. But as it stands there is no limit on the amount these proposed fees could add up to, and landlords can charge even more to "effectuate" obtaining the insurance. Thus, renters could easily end up paying more than the maximum amount allowed for security deposits, all for far less protection than deposits provide.

In our current housing crisis, finding ways to reduce burdens on renters is necessary. Security deposits can be a barrier to obtaining safe, stable, affordable housing. But we must weigh the effects of proposed alternatives. Fees in-lieu of security deposits would protect landlords, but not the renters paying for them.

Instead, these fees would open renters up to greater liability. Because the fees aren't capped and aren't necessarily refundable, they could serve to extract from renters already struggling to assemble a security deposit. This housing crisis demands solutions, but exposing lower-income households to extraction and increased liability could make the situation far worse.

Finally, we are generally concerned that we do not yet understand the full implications of this financial product and how it will affect renters in the marketplace. We suggest further study on this matter including whether this will lead to an increase in third-party debt collection. In other words, Lease Lock may be more likely than a landlord to sell off purported tenant debts to a third-party debt collector, making it more difficult for tenants to later dispute the validity of the purported debt.

Other ways of addressing the housing choice barrier posed by security deposits include requiring landlords to allow tenants to pay the security deposit in installments over the course of the tenancy, e.g., allowing the tenant to pay the security deposit in three installments over the course of 6 months. This policy would promote housing mobility and housing choice without the use of complex financial products that have not been adequately studied.

For these reasons, we respectfully urge an unfavorable report on HB1076.

Best,

Michael Donnelly
Tenant Advocacy Coordinator