

**From:** [Sam Eddinger](#)  
**To:** [HSGTestimony](#)  
**Subject:** Reject H.B.No. 6433  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 5:03:34 PM

---

To whom this concerns,

I strongly urge you to reject H.B. No. 6433 as it will add unnecessary steps for managing property.

The summary of this bill reads:

"To permit tenants to request an inspection of rental property prior to occupancy and after notice of termination of a tenancy, to cap late fees for rental payments and to create a Rental Housing Ombudsman within the Department of Housing."

As a property manager and owner of a property management company that manages about 250 rental units throughout CT, I understand that the vast majority of tenants see a rental property prior to moving in. However, from my experience, having an exit inspection of a property (when a tenant is supposed to be moving out) wastes time. Our experience is that exit interviews will cause a tenant to not appropriately clean and remove possessions from a property and then us reminding them that they will be charged a cleaning fee or to remove the possessions causes them to send us back so they can do better. This law would have us have to do the move out process twice, causing additional cost to us and wasting time. It is the owners responsibility to set clear expectations based on the move in condition. We do that already.

Late fees are a necessary part of encouraging a tenant to pay rent on time. It is one of the few ways that we have to help prevent a tenant from getting too far behind. Once a tenant gets to be two months behind, usually they will be unable to make back the rent and will be forced into an eviction. If you reduce our ability to encourage tenants to fulfil their leasing obligations, you are taking away the tools necessary for us to keep tenants in property.

A person came on Facebook to ask us what the Section 8 organization could do to encourage more great owners to take on Section 8 tenants. The answer was to help the owners more as the Section 8 demographic is by and large more demanding than tenants outside the Section 8 organization. Having an Ombudsman to work on the tenants side is not the answer but rather having someone that is able to efficiently moderate tenant disputes. I have tenants that constantly swear at me, abuse me, berate me, call me names all because I'm trying to do my job; ask them to fulfill their obligation to pay rent in exchange for having a nice place to live.

To me, CT is already too much of a tenant friendly state. We have tenants that have the money but choose to not pay the rent because they know that there is no recourse. We have judges who have a security deposit be used as rent or deny an appeal from a tenant for a stay of execution but add a footnote that it would not be that much of a hardship to have the tenant stay an extra month. This emboldens tenants to play the system any more, choosing to spend their money on cigarettes, illegal drugs and worse.

There should be assistance for tenants who are truly struggling with landlords but there already are so many. There are fire marshals, building departments, health departments, etc

that all work to police bad behaviors from owners. Why do we really need another organization. This will only make CT even worse to invest in real estate.

Sam

--

**Sam Eddinger**

**Business Manager**

**Ironclad Property Management**

[www.ironcladpm.com](http://www.ironcladpm.com)

direct: 860.254.7343

email: [sam@ironcladpm.com](mailto:sam@ironcladpm.com)

[107 East Main St](#), FL3, Meriden, CT 06450

Licensed Broker in the State of CT